

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2016/2017**

**Agenda**

**April 10, 2017, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**  
**Senate Minutes of March 13, 2017**
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the President
- IV. **State of the University Announcements:**
  - ~~B. Associated Students President~~
  - C. Vice President for Student Affairs
  - D. Vice President for Administration and Finance
  - E. Chief Diversity Officer
  - F. Statewide Academic Senators
- V. **Executive Committee Report:**
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –  
**Executive Committee Minutes of March 6, 2017**  
**Executive Committee Minutes of March 20, 2017**
  - B. Consent Calendar –  
**Consent Calendar of April 10, 2017**

C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
March 13, 2017

- I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Kimbarow/an Selst, Lee,  
Sabalius  
Absent: Perea

CASA Representatives:

Present: SchultzKrohn, Shifflett, GrosvenorSen Lee  
Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Faas, Feinstein  
Absent: BlaylockPapazian

COB Representatives:

Present: Reade, RodarCampsey

Deans:

Present: Stack JacobsGreen  
Absent: Schutten

EDUC Representatives

Present: Mathur  
Absent: Laker

ENGR Representatives:

Present:







Questions:

Q: Did the committee consider adding in a clause that says when exceptions are needed consult with Graduate and Undergraduate Studies instead of spelling out all this revalidation in the policy? (Line 53)

A: The committee did not discuss this, but will consider it.

Q: In line 56 it says students must have a B in the course to revalidate it, why a B?

A: Graduate students must maintain a 3.0 average, so a B was thought to be consistent with that.

Q: Are there any courses in say the field Mathematics, where change would be impossible to occur over time and where this whole policy would be useless so that exception might be written into the policy to accommodate those programs? Why would those students take these courses again?

A: Only because of the statute time limit that the CSU education policy puts on us which says these units expire.

Q: You can't make an exception for that?

A: You still have to revalidate it. You don't have to test on new knowledge, but you still have to revalidate it.

Q: On page 2, ton m3qun 6boexake t ut15.61 0 Td [ton to re >>BDC 1 0 Td [( Y)Tu1(t)-1r

uredw(0(05(11e158T3(6B5(Tme)rA)Te.dge)an(e2Q)DU-05054)824(i)-1(t)-1T-1.15-2s)-1(c) [(

Senator Peter presents AS 1643, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to S, 15  
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees, Consideration for Early Tenure for  
Previously Tenured Faculty (Final Reading) The Senate vote vt

---

---



Q: My comments are about lines 114 and 115 regarding the job description being developed in consultation with the department and being periodically reviewed. This strikes me as vague. It bothers me. Where did this come from?

A: In the last policy reform there was a requirement that there be a job description that it be vetted by the department personnel committee. One of our deans objected to this particular language saying that in this particular college there were alternative ways in which job descriptions were created and there wasn't always a personnel committee. The PS Committee removed the language referring to the department personnel committee and made the language a little more general by saying the job description needs to be developed in consultation with the department and be periodically reviewed. If you have other language that you think would work without offending our deans, please send it to the committee.

Q: On line 128 it states that at the meeting faculty may nominate names to appear on the ballot for an election, is that the only mechanism in which faculty can have their name brought forward?

A: There is nothing that restricts or restrains other mechanisms.

Q: Would the committee consider replacing regular or permanent faculty with tenure or tenure-track faculty, and replacing temporary or part-time faculty with lecturer faculty?

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Has the committee considered situations in which external search might be requested by someone other than the department, such as the dean?

A: No, we haven't. We did substantially change the external search after one of the deans made suggestions. You may recall under the old policy external searches were only

---



specifics hav

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

-----

IX. Special Committee Reports -None.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Executive Committee Meeting

March 6, 2017  
12-1:30, ADM 167

Present: Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Feinstein, Faas, Kaufman, Kimbarow, Papazian, Perea, Wong(Lau), Blaylock, Riley

Absent: Perea

1. The minutes of February 20, 2017 were approved as amended by Senator Shifflett and Senator Kaufman (14-0-0).
2. The consent calendar of March 6, 2017 was approved as written (14-0-0).
3. Election of Committee Chairs:  
Chair Kimbarow will be sending an email to all operating committee/special agency chairs requesting that they conduct their spring elections for new chairs for next year by April 15, 2017. They will also be asked to provide the meeting dates and times for Fall 2017 so that faculty that wish to be on the committee will know if they can make the meetings. The elections of the committee chairs are needed early this year due to the change in the bylaws allowing for the seats to go at-large at an earlier date.
4. CIO Search Committee Update:



- j. From the Senate Chair:  
At the March 13, 2017 Senate meeting there will be a 15-minute break and short presentation by the Spartans Supporting Spartans Campaign.
- k. The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice on March 6, 2017. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on March 15, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 20, 2017.

Executive Committee Meeting  
March 20, 2017  
12-1:30, ADM 167

Present: Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Feinstein, Kaufman, Kimbarow, Perea, Blaylock, Riley

Absent: Papazian, Wong(Lau), Faas

1. The minutes of March 6, 2017 were approved (12-0-0).
2. Updates from the Administrators:

- a. From the Provost:

- The Dean of Humanities and the Arts search process has commenced with the solicitation of individuals to serve on the search committee. No decision has been made yet on an interim dean. However, an interim dean will be appointed effective July 1, 2017.

This year we are in better shape from a planning perspective than previous years. Charlie Faas has instituted a rolling three-year budgeting process which has considerably improved our ability to plan. Provost Feinstein will be focusing funding requests on student success and RSCA.

Provost Feinstein attended the Records Clearance Event on Friday. There was a group of ~25 law students from Columbia University and our students working to clear records for 21 individuals. It gave our students a chance to work with students from a top law school.

The committee discussed graduation rate changes. Feinstein expressed concern about our 4- and 6- year rates for next year as they are based on a class that arrived in fall 2013. The 6-year rate will be based on the fall 2011 cohort. These cohorts were not as strong as more recent cohorts and may impact our rates negatively.

Questions:

A member expressed concern that there is some obsolete data on the university website. Provost Feinstein suggested sending him an email with the information that needs updating.

A member asked about what would be done with regards to the Hammer Theatre now that Dean Vollendorf would be leaving. The Provost will meet with VP Faas and COS Jaye Bailey to make sure it has proper oversight.

A member asked about Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA). AVP Stacks is reviewing how we use assigned time. This is where a new VP of Research and Innovation position could be very helpful in moving along these types of issues. The Provost spends roughly \$1 million a year on RSCA. AVP Stacks is working on ensuring that all colleges measure RSCA performance.

A member asked if there was any progress on moving to a 3/3 class load. The committee discussed how SDSU moved to a 3/3 load by exploding class sizes. However, classrooms



at SDSU have been built large enough to support larger classes. It is left up to the departments to determine whether they will go with the larger classes.

A member asked how we are doing with regard to tenure density. We are at ~54%. The



7. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice on March 23, 2017. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on March 23, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 3, 2017.







78 If this is in fact the CSU's position, it should rethink it. HEERA does set up a  
79 division of labor between collective bargaining and collegial governance, but that  
80 division of labor can in no way be thought to restrict the role of academic senates  
81 on this issue. The 16 campus policies on Intellectual Property have all existed  
82 for many years under the collective bargaining agreement, including during the  
83 time that article 39 has been in effect, and this provides prima facie evidence that  
84 article 39 and policies crafted by Academic Senates can indeed coexist. If in fact  
85 some of the policies are not in conformity with article 39, then CFA can be relied  
86 upon to point out the non-conforming policies so that the affected campuses can  
87 take corrective action.

88  
89 The report of the CSU Intellectual Property Committee itself points out the fallacy  
90 in the argument that collective bargaining somehow rules out full senate  
91 consultation. As it describes article 39 in its section on "Need for Labor  
92 Negotiations" (p. 9) it points out that the article only concerns certain narrow and  
93 specific provisions related to intellectual property. The draft policy (and we might  
94 add our campus policies) address a vast range of issues unrelated to article 39.  
95 To rule out collegial governance on an entire issue area merely because a  
96 narrow part of that area has been bargained is unreasonable.

97  
98 Furthermore, the CBA and collegial governance already work in an integrated  
99 fashion on a wide range of topics including (most especially) appointment,  
100 retention, tenure, and promotion. The fact that the CBA sets a few parameters  
101 on ARTP issues has never been taken as an excuse to suppress collegial  
102 governance on those vital policies. Why then would similar parameters be used  
103 to suppress full collegial participation on intellectual property? If every topic area  
104 mentioned in the CBA were off limits to collegiality, then there would be very little  
105 collegiality left indeed.

106  
107 Fortunately, we suspect that this unreasonable argument that the CSU is alleged  
108 to have made is in fact little more than rumor. The CSU, after all, has decided to  
109 allow the ASCSU to comment on the proposed policy, which seems to be an  
110 admission that collective bargaining does not in fact rule out the full operations of  
111 the collegial governance system. We choose to accept this interpretation of the of





168 Instructional Materials. In the UC policy, the UC gets license to use the approval  
169 docs for educational purposes; the CSU version extends this license to the actual  
170 course materials. This is a huge difference and a very troubling one. We believe  
171 that the UC policy makes the proper distinction and the CSU proposed policy is  
172 too broad in its claim to a permanent free license to faculty instructional  
173 materials.

174  
175 The AAUP statement on intellectual property makes this distinction clear, and  
176 while the UC IP policy conforms to the AAUP statement, the CSU proposed  
177 policy does not:

178  
179 Course syllabi at many institutions are considered public  
180 documents; indeed, they may be posted on universally accessible  
181 websites. It is thus to be expected that teachers everywhere will  
182 learn from one another's syllabi and that syllabi will be  
183 disseminated as part of the free exchange of academic knowledge  
184 Faculty lectures or original audiovisual materials, however, unless  
185 specifically and voluntarily created as works made for hire,  
186 constitute faculty intellectual property.<sup>3</sup>

187  
188 The CSU, however, asserts a very broad claim that "CSU Course Instructional  
189 Materials include documents, digital products, or other materials developed for  
190 instruction of CSU courses," and while copyright resides with the Author, the  
191 CSU

192  
193 retains a free-of-cost, perpetual and nonexclusive worldwide  
194 license to use the Course Instructional Materials for research and  
195 educational purposes, including without limitation the right to  
196 reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute, perform and display  
197 the Course Instructional Materials

---







342  
343  
344

2) If a system wide policy must be adopted, then the SJSU Academic Senate  
recommends that the draft policy not be immediately adopted. Instead it sh

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

48 For these principles to be realized, efforts need to be made to include the full breadth of  
49 voices of the campus community, with attention to those who are often absent or  
50 silenced, and to ensure that norms in committee deliberations allow all voices to inform  
51 the decision-making process.

52

53

54 Approved: 4/3/17

55 Vote: 6-1-1

56 Present: Bailey, Boekema,





\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_





350 period is specified at the time of the appointment. An interim appointment may be  
351 renewed or extended by the President or Provost as needed in consultation with the  
352 elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

353

354

## 355 1.9. Acting Appointments

356

357 The title “acting” (e.g., acting dean) shall be applied to an individual who is designated  
358 to act on behalf of an administrator covered by this policy, who is on a short-term  
359 absence (illness, vacation, etc.), on leave, or has left his/her position on extremely short  
360 notice. The President or designee in consultation with the elected members of the  
361 Senate Executive Committee may make an acting appointment. In an emergency or  
362 when the Senate Executive Committee is not available, acting appointments may be  
363 made by the President or Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Academic  
364 Senate. Acting appointments usually are of short duration, lasting until either the  
365 incumbent returns or an interim appointment can be made according to the procedures  
366 described in this policy. In unusual circumstances, an acting appointment may be  
367 renewed or extended by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected  
368 members of the Senate Executive Committee.

369

## 370 2. Reviews of Administrators

371

### 372 2.1. Timing of Review

373

374 If the incumbent wishes to continue in his or her position beyond the sixth year, a review  
375 of the incumbent shall be initiated according to the provisions of this policy in the  
376 second semester of the fifth year of an incumbent's term. The review shall be concluded  
377 by the beginning of the sixth year of the incumbent's term. The President may at any  
378 time initiate an interim review.

379

### 380 2.2. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee

381

382 For all offices covered by this policy, a review committee shall be appointed and  
383 constituted in accordance with the procedures specified in Part 1, Sections 1.3 and 1.4  
384 of this policy. The Provost shall not be eligible to serve on committees to review  
385 academic administrators.

386

### 387 2.3 Criteria for Review

388

389 The review committee, in consultation with the President (for vice presidents) or the  
390 Provost (for all other offices), shall specify the criteria for evaluating the incumbent's job  
391 performance, based upon the incumbent's job description, goals and recommendations  
392 arising from prior performance reviews (when such has occurred), and the function of  
393 the particular administrative office. The incumbent shall be asked to examine the criteria  
394 developed and to make such comments or suggestions as may seem advisable.

395

### 396 2.4 Procedures for Review

397



446 sources of information, the President is inclined to believe a decision other than that  
447 recommended by the committee would best serve the interests of the University, before  
448 acting on that inclination the President shall consult with the Executive Committee of the  
449 Academic Senate, at which time both the report of the review committee and the  
450 reasons why the President is inclined to a decision other than that recommended would  
451 be revealed to and shared with the Executive Committee. The purpose of such a  
452 meeting would be to ascertain if some mutually agreeable course of action or decision  
453 can be found upon which the President could act. Failing that, the President shall make  
454 such decision as he or she considers best for the welfare of the University.  
455





42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

POLICY RECOMMENDATION  
Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preamble

Department Chairs are the leaders of communities of faculty as well as the most important stewards of the mission of the University at the local level. Their effectiveness depends upon the continual support of the faculty they represent. The selection of a as



145 department should proceed with the normal process to nominate a  
146 department Chair.

147  
148 3.7. At the open meeting, faculty may suggest names to appear on the ballot for  
149 the nominating election. The meeting shall provide the opportunity to  
150 ascertain the willingness of candidates to serve, for candidates to make  
151 statements, and for candidates to take questions.

152  
153 3.8. The nominating election. All faculty may then vote by sec(dat)at t]TJ -0.001 Tc 0.001 Tw 5.

---













457 should only be undertaken for compelling reasons. A Chair will be given  
458 an opportunity to meet with the Provost and Dean to defend his/her  
459 record prior to removal. Following removal, the President or Provost  
460 should meet with the Dean and the faculty assembled in a department  
461 meeting to announce the action and solicit advice on the transition.  
462 Replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures  
463 in sections 3 or 9 of this policy.  
464

- 465 11.2. Faculty initiated removal. Faculty may not initiate the removal of their  
466 Chair unless a formal review has been completed within the previous six  
467 months. (They may initiate such a review as per 7.2 of this policy.)  
468 Following the conclusion of any faculty-initiated early review, the  
469 department will vote to determine if their Chair should be recalled. A recall  
470 vote will follow the same procedures as a vote to recommend a Chair  
471 nominee as described in section 3 of this policy, save only that it requires  
472 a vote of 2/3 of the tenure/tenure track faculty to forward a  
473 recommendation to the President that the Chair be removed, with the  
474 votes of lecturers

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Professional Standards Committee  
4 April 10, 2017  
5 Final Reading  
6  
7  
8

an 2w]TJ -0hTd [(n)3(c)2(ti)4(v)2(e)]TJ -0.001 Tc 0.00thoor  
AS 1647

9  
10 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**  
11 **Rescinding and Replacing F97 -7 Policy on Privacy of**  
12 **Electronic Information**

13  
14 Resolved: That F97-7 be rescinded.

15  
16 Resolved: That the following be adopted as policy effective immediately.

17  
18 Rationale: This document summarizes important principles on privacy of electronic  
19 information found in the AAUP document "Academic Freedom and Electronic  
20 Communications" and elements copied from the UniJ m 47(20ro)[(Fr)-3(eedo)-5(m )5(an)-5(d )]TJ -0d5 ,  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

---

---

---



1 San Jose State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
4 April 10, 2017  
5 Final Reading

AS 1648

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

Policy Recommendation  
Graduate Student Revalidation of Courses that Exceed the 7-  
Year Limit

Whereas:

## Graduate Student Revalidation of Courses that Exceed the 7 Year Limit

1. Courses taken by graduate students at SJSU expire 7 years from the point of grade posting, in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 7, Section 40510. Any one student may revalidate a maximum of 9 units for a 30-unit program, or 12 units for a program with more than 30 units, of expired courses. Programs have the option of setting stricter policy limits on revalidation, such as allowing no units or fewer units to be revalidated. The student must have earned at least a “B” grade in a course to revalidate it. The department that offered the class must administer an examination of the student’s knowledge. The examination could be an oral exam, written exam, research paper, or of any other kind of format approved by the department. The examination must be graded by the faculty member who taught the original course, by one who has taught the course at another time, or by one who has reasonable knowledge of the course content. If there are no faculty members with the requisite knowledge in the discipline, the course cannot be revalidated. The exam must be a rigorous one, invariably requiring studying on the part of the student. It must not necessarily though require recollection of all of the material in the original class; thus, administering an exam similar to the original final exam would not be warranted.
2. Because the course material is considered outdated after 7 years, the goal must be to determine if the student’s knowledge is up to date. That is, simply knowing the original content of an outdated course is inadequate. Students may be presented with a list of relevant books or other materials that would help bring them up to speed with respect to current knowledge in the field. The exam should reflect and test their understanding of that more current material. Testing the current knowledge of the field should be the goal even if the course has changed little or the field has not progressed past the point of the original class.
3. Unless a department makes an exception, independent study, seminar, research, project, thesis, or comprehensive exam preparatory courses cannot be revalidated. Graduate courses taken as a senior undergraduate at SJSU to be used for graduate credit are eligible for revalidation (with departmental consent), but those taken at other institutions are not. If these courses expire, they must be repeated or replaced. Expiration of projects and theses is an extremely rare event given that they usually occur at the end of the curricular program. If they were to expire, they would have to be replaced by entirely new ones that did not





1 San Jose State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
4 April 10, 2017  
5 First Reading  
6

AS 1649

7 Policy Recommendation  
8 Registration Priority Policy  
9 (also Amendment A to University Policy S73- 4)

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

Legislative History : Rescinds F14-1, Amends Section 2 of S73-4

Resolved:

1.0 Scheduling of Registration

Students shall be allowed to register in the following order:

”

43 2.0 Categories of Group 1: Specific Priority Students

44 2.1 Category A:

45 " Students who are required by external agencies such as the National  
46 Collegiate Athletic Association, or by law, to receive priority. This  
47 excludes students covered by SB 412 , the California Promise program  
48 unless they also fall under another group with required priority  
49 registration. Priority registration for students in the California Promise  
50 program is addressed in the regular registration as outlined in Section  
51 1.0.

52 " Students who do not have such as SB 412 or the California Promise program

85 must be set prior to the first day of the semester.  
86

87  
88 2.3 Category C:

89 Students enrolled in an integrated package of courses that meets all of the  
90 following criteria:

- 91 " covers at least four areas of the General Education Program
- 92 " involves being part of a cohort group of students from multiple colleges
- 93 " requires enrollment together in a specified course sequence over  
94 multiple semesters.

95 Priority registration will be granted to students in this category beginning with  
96 the second semester of enrollment.  
97

98 2.4 Category D:

99 Students who are required by external scholarship granting agencies/donors  
100 to meet progress toward degree milestones that are more rigorous than those  
101 of the institution and/or whose benefits/eligibility to participate expire based  
102 on time limitations of less than 6 years.  
103

104 3.0 Implementation – Approval and Continuing Approval

105 3.1 It is the intention that no more than 10% of the FTES of SJSU be available for  
106 priority registration under the policy.  
107

108 3.2 The Accessible Education Center will review AEC students and note takers in  
109 Category A each semester and provide an updated list.  
110

111 3.3 Coordinators of all groups in Category B, C, and D who wish to apply for  
112 priority registration on behalf of their group of students, including those that  
113 currently hold such status, shall apply to the Student Success Committee for  
114 continuation or granting of priority registration status.

115 Priority registration for groups of students in these categories normally shall  
116 be awarded for periods of up to five years. The Student Success Committee  
117 may authorize priority registration for a shorter time period, and when doing  
118 so, will provide written justification describing concerns.

119 In the case of an application for continuing approval, the coordinator of each  
120 currently approved group is responsible for resubmitting such an application  
121 at least one full semester prior to the expiration of the previous granting of  
122 priority registration.

123 In the case of an application for new approval, the coordinator of a group  
124 seeking such approval must submit an application at least one full semester  
125 prior to the requested implementation date.  
126

127 3.4 The Student Success Committee shall determine which category each

128 applicant group qualifies for and shall notify the coordinator of the group  
129 regarding the granting, extending, or denying of priority registration.  
130 Applications for fall priority registration must be received by the Chair of the  
131 Student Success Committee no later than April 1. Applications for spring  
132 priority registration must be received by the Chair of the Student Success  
133 Committee no later than September 1.

134

135 3.5 An increase of more than 10% of the original number of approved students  
136 approved for priority registration will automatically require a statement of  
137 justification submitted to the committee no later than April 1 for fall semester  
138 and no later than September 1 for spring semester registration.

139

140 4.0 Submission of student names and SJSU ID Numbers to the Registrar's Office

141 Submission of student names and SJSU ID numbers to the Registrar's Office for  
142 groups of students receiving priority registration is the responsibility of the  
143 coordinator of the group. Each coordinator is responsible for contacting the  
144 Registrar's Office for submission deadlines.

145

146 Rationale:

147 Senate Bill 412, passed on September 21, 2016, defines the California Promise  
148 program and legislates the requirement of priority registration for California Promise  
149 students. This program is available to frosh and to transfer students with an associate  
150 degree for transfer. It facilitates a four year graduation rate for frosh and a two year  
151 graduation rate for transfers with commitments on the part of the university and the  
152 student. One such commitment on the university side is priority registration. There will  
153 be an increasingly larger percentage of students eligible for the California Promise  
154 program as SJSU works to meet our CSU Graduation 2025 goals of a 35% four year  
155 frosh graduation rate and 36% two year transfer graduation rate. This policy integrates  
156 the priority registration for students in the California Promise program into the  
157 registration for all students by class level in order to balance the requirement to give  
158 priority registration to students in the California Promise program with the need to  
159 maintain access to classes for all students.

160

161 Approved:

162 Vote: VotTc 0.0072 Tm (156 )Oa 35% fo1(r)-3(om)-1( ft)-3(s)











|

-

221 5.1.1.1 An “All College” GPA, which reflects all graded, accredited  
222 baccalaureate work and assures that the honor is bestowed for  
223 outstanding achievement in the earning of the entire degree; and  
224

225 5.1.1.2 The “SJSU cumulative” GPA, which reflects all graded  
226 collegiate work at this university and assures that the honor  
227 (also) reflects outstanding achievement in work completed at  
228 SJSU.  
229

230 5.1.1.3 Each average will include work completed during the  
231 semester immediately preceding graduation. Graduation programs  
232 will note that indications of honor awards are tentative and depend  
233 on maintenance of honors standards in the student's final semester.  
234

235 5.1.2 Any undergraduate student who has earned a 3.90 or higher  
236 GPA(both All College and SJSU Cumulative), shall graduate Summa  
237 Cum Laude.  
238

239 5.1.3 Any undergraduate student who has earned a 3.70 or higher,  
240 but less than 3.90, GPA (both All College and SJSU Cumulative),  
241 shall graduate Magna Cum Laude.  
242

243 5.1.4 Any undergraduate student who has earned a 3.50 or higher,  
244 but less than 3.70, GPA (both All College and SJSU Cumulative),  
245 shall graduate Cum Laude.  
246

## 247 5.2 Recognition and Privileges 248

249 5.2.1 All those earning Latin honors shall be authorized to wear a  
250 symbol on their academic regalia, which shall be chosen by an  
251 appropriate Academic Senate committee.  
252

253 5.2.2 Latin honors status will be indicated on the transcript, together  
254 with a key explaining what the designation means.  
255

256 5.2.3 Latin honors status will be indicated on the official diploma of the  
257 student.  
258  
259

260	Approved:	April 3, 2017
261	Vote:	11-0-0
262	Present:	Kaufman (Chair), Walters, Yao, Simpson, Miller, Wilson, 263 Nash, Perea, Mendoza, Spica, Sen, Bruck (non-voting)
264	Financial impact:	None
265	Workload impact:	The result of this policy would be a decrease in the number 266 of students receiving honors (elimination of Honors at

267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273

Entrance) and potentially smaller numbers of Latin honors designations due to higher GPA requirements. Semester honors designations will be determined on a shorter time scale, but by eliminating the use of the past 3 semesters work, fewer total honors designations are likely.



38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67

## I. RSCA Advisor - Student Relationship

The involvement of students as active participants in RSCA projects provides students with richly rewarding, and often unique, learning opportunities, and the University encourages student involvement in RSCA. Thus, one of the criteria that may positively influence the decision to undertake RSCA projects or to accept extramural support is the potential to enrich quality of the student learning experience. The University thus adopts the following policy governing the RSCA Advisor - Student Relationship:

### A. RSCA Advisor role

When bringing students into a RSCA project as collaborators, the advisor should encourage the free pursuit of learning, should show respect for the student as an individual, and act as an intellectual guide and advisor/mentor.

### B. Alignment of Commitments and Obligations

Situations may arise in which an advisor allows competing commitments/obligations or third-party involvement to influence his or her role as a teacher, mentor, or supervisor of RSCA, to the detriment of the student's educational experience. Such influence could include pressure on students to undertake RSCA in order to advance the direct interests of the external organization; transmission of student's RSCA results to the organization before the project has been completed; inability of an advisor who is frequently absent from the research setting to give appropriate advice on the conduct of student's RSCA; and pressure on students to change research directions to work on projects that strengthen an external organization's competitive position. The ultimate goal is to establish a clearly defined relationship between all parties and establish a quality educational experience.

Prior to bringing a student into a RSCA project, the advisor and the student



---

---





196 auxiliary to serve as a principal investigator (see Section II B. to review eligibility  
197 guidelines).

198 Funding proposals to support students' RSCA activity must be sponsored by  
199 an eligible PI, as the designated PI. A student may be listed as a co-PI, but  
200 may not be the point of contact or PI for the project. In general, students who  
201 participate in sponsored programs must conform to all rules under the RSCA  
202 Student-Advisor Section 1, in addition to the policies listed in Table 1.

203

204

tcr



277 Any NDA which purports to apply to SJSU or any department or unit thereof (or  
278 to commit or bind SJSU) can only be signed by an authorized SJSU  
279 administrator. Any SJSU faculty or staff member who signs without authorization  
280 could face individual legal liability for non-compliance with 0.98 661.26 TmTj -0.0w 12 0 0 1 0 10.



