

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

2015/2016

Agenda

April 25, 2016, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

**IV. Executive Committee Report**

honorary Senator on Dr. Judith Lessow -Hrley (Final Reading)

AS Sense of the Senate Resolution, Suprt of the Yu Can  
Play Project (Final Reading)

**V. Unfinished Business –**

**VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**

~~DATE~~ Recommendation: Academic Certificate

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
*AS 1608, Policy Recommendation, Student Rights and Responsibilities (Final Reading)*

*AS 1620, Policy Recommendation, Probation and Disqualification (First Reading)*

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
*AS 1611, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S02-8 (Information Technology Resources Respo*  
*0(n)B.37 0 Td[R]5(rce)-4 1 12 Tc 0.00y*

C



2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
April 4, 2016

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

Ex 108.24 534.6 Tm [(E)- Tm 2Tf -03 Tm50i Q EEE



housing that is being knocked down in some way, and are we using the same contractor we used for the Student Union?

A: No, we will not be using the same contractor. There will be a significant impact on our water sports athletes. Their conferences and practices will be held offsite. It will be painful for those student athletes. As for housing, Campus Village 2 will be ready for fall and will hold 800 students, so when we knock down Royce and Hoover Halls, we will still have a net increase in housing for 400 students.

Q:



**F. Provost** – No report.

**V.**

---

---



Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to add, “, and any other relevant information” after, “exam date and time” on line 144. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Kaufman amendment passed (24-4-2).

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove the double comma on line 143.

Senator Bacich presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 206 to change “off” to “of” before syllabi.

**The Senate voted and AS 1602 passed as amended (34-0-0).**

---

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1608, Policy Recommendation, Student Rights and Responsibilities (First Reading)*.

There is a Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy that has been on the University books since 1990. As you can imagine, many federal and state regulations have changed over the past 26 years. This is an attempt to do something similar to what we did with the syllabi policy. Take all the relevant language and pertinent information scattered across different places on campus and combine it on one website where students can find it all, and the I&SA Committee would review and make updates to every year. The idea is to have a link to this website with further links to important information from all important websites, e.g. the VPSA website.

**Questions:**

Q: I’m really confused about what you mean on lines 48 and 49 where you say “students also have the right to challenge, within legal means, the scholarship of others on scholarly grounds.”

A: I think the idea is that honest debate in classrooms and within the university allows for scholarly work to be challenged by other scholarly work.

Q: What does “within legal means” mean?

A: I will take this back to the committee and get clarification on it.

Q: What was the reasoning for the Nay vote?

A: It was an abstention not a “Nay” vote. I believe it was someone that came in mid-discussion.

Q: When you bring this back for a final reading, could you drop “greensheets?”

A: Yes, thanks for pointing that out.

Q: Why are student organizations part of this list?

A: There is CSU policy that covers what it means to be an official student organization and with that comes certain rights and responsibilities.



there were freedom of information act requests that could by law open a person's email to examination, and then there were other possibilities. The key element of the old policy was that all electronic mail in authorized email accounts would be considered private and confidential, except as required by state or federal law. Over the years concerns have been voiced. Most recently there have been some requested changes that were sent to the Organization and Government Committee and then on to the Professional Standards Committee. We discovered many other issues and we believe that if this comes back to you as a second reading, it will come back in a different form. Nevertheless, we wanted to get the discussion going, so we brought this version for a first reading.

**Questions:**

Q: When I look at line 72 on the third parties, and given that we use Gmail, clearly they are watching who I send emails to because it fills in the line for me when I start typing. This would suggest Gmail

---

---

---

---

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1603, Policy Recommendation, Committee Obligations and Senate Membership (Modification of Bylaw 6) (Final Reading)*.

**Debate:**

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add the word “other” before “special, or special agency” in lines 189 and 198.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 155 to read, “members of the Senate policy committees.”

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to change line 156 to add, “unofficial” before “designee or representative.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Shifflett withdrew her amendment.

Senator Frazier made a motion to return to committee for clarification as to how certain committees where the members are elected by the colleges, such as the Board of General Studies and the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility, will be handled. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Frazier motion passed.**

**E. University Library Board (ULB) – No Report.**

**E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1607, Policy Recommendation, Restoring Options for Students with Quantitative Reasoning Disabilities Affecting Math Skills (First Reading)*.

At SJSU we have historically had processes in place for substitution of our general education Math requirement. The general education Math requirement has changed over time. This policy recommendation provides a pathway for providing students with quantitative reasoning disabilities with reasonable accommodations. For these students, this would be a collaborative effort. Students would be involved, departments would be involved, as well as Graduate and Undergraduate Studies.

**Questions:**

Q: Can we interpret that to mean there can be situations when an accommodation is not made?

A: The Senate Chair recognized Cindy Marota, Director, Accessible Education Center (AEC). Director Marota responded that this was correct. Not every student that is requesting a math substitution will be allowed that substitution. We are not asking for a waiver, just a course substitution where math is not an essential requirement. We cannot and would never waive, or substitute out, an essential element of a major. It is only for

those majors where math is not an essential function.

Q: Why a Senate policy? Aren't we obligated under law to accommodate students with disabilities?

A: Yes, this is a law. The AEC has been trying for a very long time to get a formal policy in place so it is recognized and the student can go through the process seamlessly.

Q: But, there are a number of other disabilities that are taken care of without a Senate policy, so why do we neethoesvunct >>BDC 0 Tr 1an proced undel 0.00Th2(i)-1-1(AE)-4(CS)-8(

---



Faculty, staff, and administrators all reported incidents of discrimination with the most common type being in group, e.g. faculty-to-faculty and administrator-to-administrator. The most common type of discrimination for faculty was gender. For administrators, the most common discrimination was gender and age. Lastly, for staff the most common type of discrimination was race and age.

Another common theme that emerged is that there were quite a few problems around open communication or the idea of voicing an unpopular opinion. There is a lot of concern that the environment is not conducive to open communication and there are not a lot of opportunities to voice your opinion, and sometimes there is direct hostility to having these type of conversations.

One frequent comment from students is that they would like to have more events on campus, but this was also expressed by faculty and staff as a need to build more campus community and to have deeper engagement outside of the classroom.

One large difference between the 2010 survey and this survey was huge increase in the number of students that reported safety problems on campus. Students feel a lot less safe.

Faculty morale also had a big decrease from the 2010 survey results. Faculty expressed a lot of concern about decision-making, shared governance, and the sharing of information on campus. Staff also reported a pronounced trend looking for greater recognition and opportunities for career advancement. All employee versions of the survey showed concern over the administration since 2010.



**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.**  
**March 21, 2016**

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Frazier, Shifflett, Kaufman, Lee, Mathur,  
Heiden, Martin, Feinstein, Blaylock, Laroche, Lanning

Absent: Backer, Amante

1. The Executive Committee minutes of March 14, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Shifflett (13-0-0).

2. Updates:

a. **From the President** –

The *Inspiration to Innovation* gala on March 19, 2016 in the SU Ballroom was a wonderful event, and Mrs. Lupe Diaz Compean was very pleased.

Interim President Martin is in contact with President Papazian and is keeping her

c. **From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –**

The VPSA recently met with graduate students from around the world in the *Pathways to Graduation* open forums. VP Blaylock thanked all the faculty. These forums were well received and this is largely due to the number of faculty that showed up.

Student Affairs will be moving into the new Student Union on March 25, 2016. Both Subway and Starbucks are already open.

The *Coffee with Professors* Blog (a) (5) is located on Student Affairs (e) (1) (2) (b) (7) (o) (1) (a) (2) (d) /T1\_0 1 Tf ( )Tj EMC /Span <</MCID 1 >>6DC /TT2 1



j. **Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

PS is working on a resolution to amend the RTP procedures in relation to the election of a general unit representative.

PS is also working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution calling for widespread consultation regarding electronic communication changes.

In addition, PS will be working on an amendment to S15-6 regarding how documents received by recruitment committees are handled.

PS is also reviewing how program coordinators are chosen and removed. There are currently no policies on this.

3. The committee discussed the College of Business Dean Search Committee. Since this was a failed search, a new search will begin soon. The current committee has a Faculty-at-Large (FAL) member but if the amendment to the Selection and Review of Administrators Policy passes in the Senate at the next meeting, search committees will replace the FAL with a Dean. The committee discussed whether the FAL could remain on the committee, or would this person would have to be removed. The committee suggested the amendment include a transitional phase.
4. The committee discussed whether the Vice President of University Advancement (VPUA) needed to be on the Executive Committee and the Senate, or would his time be better utilized on fundraising activities. A member noted that removing the VPUA from the Senate would require constitutional amendment which would mean a campus-wide faculty vote. However, removing him from the Executive Committee would only require a bylaw amendment.
5. The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on March 21, 2016. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on March 23, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 11, 2016.

**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**April 11, 2016**  
**12-1:30 ADM 167**

Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Peter, Frazier, Shifflett, Heiden, Feinstein,  
Backer,  
Larochelle, Lee, Mathur, Blaylock, Lanning, Amante

Absent: Kaufman

1. Approval of 3/21/16 meeting minutes.

M/S/To approve the minutes with corrections of 3/21/16 (9-0-1).

2. Consent Calendar

There is no dissent to the consent calendar.

3. Policy Committee Updates:

a. C & R

Chair Mathur reported that C&R is looking at its third ORTU. The internship policy should be brought back to Senate on 4/25. They are moving forward with a Sense of the Senate resolution regarding AB 798 (Affordable Textbook Act).

The rescinding of the responsible use policy is going to be brought to the next



Senator Lee pointed out that many departments don't understand the relationship between department scholarships and the aid levels allowed for individual students.

g. Associated Students

AS has voted on the new position descriptions for the restructuring of AS. On March 13-14, she brought 10 students to Sacramento to lobby. AS is collaborating with Spartan Shops on Spartan Thursday. It was a big day of advocating—Senator Amante went with the SJSU President to Washington.

This year, there are six people running for AS President.

23 campus delegates are coming to SJSU on Saturday.

h. Library Board—no report

We will move remaining agenda





<b>Consent Calendar 2015-2016</b>				
<b>April 25, 2016</b>				
<b>Policy Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Professional Standards	Joseph Rios	Student Senator	2016	
<b>Operating Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Faculty Diversity	Joseph Rios	AS Director of Campus Climate Affairs	2016	
<b>Other Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Athletics Board	Sen Chiao	Fac. Ath. Rep	EXO	
Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	Scot Guenter	Humanities & the Arts	2020	
Board of General Studies	Revathi Krishnaswamy	Faculty-Humanities & the Arts	2019	
<b>Remove:</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Student Success	Julio Soto	Science	2017	
Athletics Board	BJ Campsey	Fac. Ath. Rep	EXO	



44 department/program level), these changes will be reviewed and approved by the  
45 University Curriculum & Research Committee; and be it further

46  
47 **Resolved** That a department and/or college will utilize the UOA template for its Internships,  
48 Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences but can modify it, as  
49 needed, in consultation with Administration and Finance (e.g., Contracts and  
50 Purchasing, Risk Management) and the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate  
51 Programs; and be it further

52  
53 **Resolved** That the student's individual Learning Plan (LP) and Participation Guidelines  
54 (PG) be created at the department level to ensure that the non-SJSU learning  
55 site, the faculty member coordinating and overseeing the internship, service  
56 learning, or off-campus experience and the students involved are in agreement  
57 about the nature of the academic requirements and expected outcomes; and be  
58 it further

59  
60 **Resolved** That the outcomes of the LP relate to the course learning outcomes or  
61 the program learning outcomes; and be it further

62  
63 **Resolved** That full implementation of UOA, LP, and PG documents; and training as  
64 necessary be developed and overseen by GUP and designated offices (i.e.,  
65 CCLL); and be it further

66  
67 **Resolved** That the campus investigate and implement solutions to streamline and develop  
68 a more facile process for establishing agreements with partner sites; and be it  
69 further

70  
71 **Resolved** That all learning sites be entered into the CSU database in a timely fashion  
72 consistent with the development of this system-wide database, and the training of  
73 SJSU faculty and staff with its implementation with particular emphasis on risk  
74 management issues; and be it further

75  
76 **Resolved** That this policy be effective Fall 2016 and the UOA approval process formalized  
77 by Fall 2017.

78  
79 **Approved (C&R):** April 21, 2016 (electronic vote)

80 **Vote:** 12-0-0

81 **Present:** Anagnos, Bacich, Backer, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Matoush,  
82 Sarras, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks

83 **Curricular Impact:** This policy will bring SJSU into compliance with the governing CSU  
84 Executive Order. It will also establish procedures to document that credit-  
85 bearing internships, service learning courses, and off-campus learning  
86 experiences have established learning goals.

87

88 **Financial Impact:** Very closely tied to the Workload Impact.

89

90 **Workload Impact:** Workload will involve time spent orienting students to these requirements;  
91 time spent in coordination with SJSU offices and the students in  
92 handling/processing the required forms (LP, PG, UOA); and time spent  
93 maintaining updated information on the status of these forms and our  
94 partnering organizations.

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
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





1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7







136 except an ex officio member, is eligible as chair. Chairs of policy committees  
137 shall be elected annually by the Senate from its faculty representatives.  
138 Nominees for Chair of Professional Standards must be tenured full professors.  
139

140 6.9 a) All policy committee appointments shall be for one year, commencing  
141 with the first meeting of the Senate for the year (in the last month of the  
142 Spring semester).  
143

144 b) Seniority shall not be the primary factor in selecting members of policy  
145 committees.  
146

147 c) Tenured faculty should be given priority for appointment to the  
148 Professional Standards Committee.  
149

150 6.10 Policy committees shall normally be composed so that at least one half of  
151 the members of a policy committee are also members of the Senate. Thus, all  
152 Senators will normally be appointed to a policy committee prior to appointments  
153 of faculty who are not senators. Generally, no person shall serve on more than  
154 one policy committee. Exceptions may be made for the President of the  
155 Associated Students, officers of the Senate, and university administrators.  
156 Members of Senate **policy** committees, including ex officio members, can vote  
157 and be counted for quorum only if present in person.  
158

159 6.10.1 Normally, one faculty member from each of the units from which  
160 faculty representatives are elected is assigned to each policy committee.  
161 In no instance shall more than two faculty members from any of the units  
162 from which faculty representatives are elected be assigned to one policy  
163 committee.  
164

165 6.10.2 The senators representing the Emeritus Faculty Association and  
166 the Alumni Association are eligible for appointment to policy committees  
167 with the exception of the Professional Standards Committee. If they wish  
168 to serve, they shall, at the beginning of the academic year, request  
169 appointment. They may request a specific committee assignment; they  
170 may not serve on the same committee. Requests shall be made to the  
171 Executive Committee. When appointed, they shall have the status of ex  
172 officio members.  
173

174 6.11 Appointments of faculty to operating committees shall be for staggered  
175 three- year terms unless otherwise specified. After service for a full three-year  
176 term, members should be reappointed only in special circumstances. Appropriate  
177 administrative officers or their officers or designees shall be included on  
178 operating committees as ex officio members.  
179

180 Student membership on operating committees is normally for a one-year term.  
181



\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

—

1 **San Jose State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Organization and Government Committee**  
4 **April 25, 2016**  
5 **Final Reading**  
6

**AS 1605**

7 **Senate Management Resolution**  
8 **Electronic Voting**  
9

10 Legislative History: Modification of Senate standing rule 3 to allow for electronic  
11 voting and clarify the voting procedure.  
12

13 **Whereas:** Depending on the issue, voting by the academic senate has been  
14 known to take a considerable amount of time, and

15 **Whereas:** Recently the senate acquired electronic devices that could record  
16 and display votes as they occur, and

17 **Whereas:** Clarification is needed regarding the allowed methods of voting,  
18 therefore be it

19 **Resolved:** That Senate standing rule 3 be modified as suggested in this  
20 resolution, and be it further

21 **Resolved:** That on sensitive matters, or matters when undue administrative  
22 pressure might be brought to bear, the chair of the senate shall de-  
23 clare a vote to be by secret ballot, and be it further

24 **Resolved:** That secret ballots may be cast electronically, and be it further

25 **Resolved:** That except in circumstances where a secret ballot is necessary,  
26 the use of electronic devices for official voting shall be done in par-  
27 allel with an unofficial show of hands.  
28  
29

30 **Rationale:** The use of electronic devices has the potential to streamline certain  
31 elections, such as those where secret ballots are required, and/or multiple run-off  
32 elections are expected, however, other times a show-of-hands is expected to be  
33 more efficient.  
34  
35

36 **Approved:** 4/11/16

37 **Vote:** 7-0-0

38 **Present:** Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Curry, Mathur, Laker, Gleixner

39 **Absent:** Grosvenor, Romero

40 **Financial Impact:** None expected

41 **Workload Impact:** Increased work for senate administration to administer  
42 electronic devices, slightly offset by the reduced work in  
43 tallying votes.  
44  
45

46 **Standing Rule 3 Modification Recommended:**







41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**RESOLVED** The process shall honor CSU commitments to critical thinking and logical reasoning consistent with the overall aims of the GE program while respecting the requirements of SJSU degree programs; and be it further

**RESOLVED** This substitution of the B4 requirement be determined through the collaborative efforts of the SJSU degree program (or, in the case of an undeclared student, the intended degree program), a representative from

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
Academic Senate  
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
April , 2016  
Fi Q D O Reading

AS 1608

Policy Recommendation:  
Student Rights and Responsibilities

Whereas 7KHUH KDYH EHHQ VLJQLILFDQW FKDQJHV LQ VWJ  
UHVSQRVLELOLWLHV VLQFH DQG

Whereas 5HIHUUHQFLQJ DQG PDHLYDQW QLIQ R UDQDQWU R Q LV LP  
LQ D VWDWLF SROLF\ WKHUHIRUH EH LW

Resolved 7KDW 8QLYHUVLW\ 3ROLFLHV 6 DQG 6 EH U  
UHSODFHG ZLWK WKH DWWDFKHG SROLF\

\$SSURYHG 0DUFK  
9RWH  
3UHVHQW %URRN %UXFN 5HQYHQW Q&DPSVH\ :DQWH  
0HGLQD %UDQJ QRQ YRWLQJ .DXIPDQ 6RIL  
.KDQ :LOVRQ 6LPSVRQ 1DVK \$EXNKGHLU  
\$EVHQW \$PDQWH \*D\ 6HQ 6XOOLYDQ \*UHHQ  
)LQDQFLDO ,RSDEWQ LILFDQW LPSDFW  
:RUNORDG LPSDFW LQF,US&RHPRLU WWH LQ UHYLHZLQJ FK  
WR WZLFH SHU \HDU DV ZHOO DV VOLJKW LQF  
ZHEPDVWHU LQ XSGDWLQJ WKH SDJH RI OLQN



FRPPXQLW\ WR SXUVXW DWD B B Q Q J F R Q E H Q W 5LJKWV DQG  
5HVSRQVLELOLWLHV LV VXEMHFW WR DQG OLPLWHG E\ DC  
&RQVWLWXWLRQ RI WKH 6 W D W H G D Z W D Q F H O X G L Q G J R W K H U H J X  
RUGHUV GXO\ PDGH E\ WKH 7UXVWHHV DQG WKH &KDQFHQ  
8QLYHUVLW\

Applicable Policies and Procedures

7KH XQLYHUVLW\ VKDOO PDLQWDLQ DQ HOHFWURQLF UHS  
SURFHGXUHV HWF WKH D W H J H Q B S B O X G E H O W R S W R K W V D Q G  
5HVSRQVLELOLWLHV D U 7 W K H P S H P E H U V R I W K H , Q V W U X F W L R  
\$ I I D L U V & R P P L W W H H , & S F R H Q W K H H \$ F I D G O U H Y L H Z W K H S  
F R Q W H Q W V R I W K L V S D J H F R P S H O W W M G H Z Q V K B Y O P E H U I R U F I  
W D N H H I I H F W W K H I R O O R Z L Q J V S U L Q J D Q G \$ S U L O I R U F K  
I D O O W K L V Z L O O D O O R Z I D F X O W \ D Q G V W X G H Q W V W L P H  
F K D Q J H V W R W K H U H T X L U H G O D Q J X D J H \$ X W K R U L W \ I R U D  
O L Q N V U H V W V R Q O \ Z I W Q N V 6 \$ L O K H E L K R W W I H G X Q G H U W K  
6 W X G H Q W V ' W D E R Q W K H X Z H O O U D V L W Q K R K H S F D J H D O R J D Q  
Z H E V L W H V R I D S S U R S U L D W H V R I E E G V P X R F \$ X G G H P L F \$ I I D I  
\$ F F H V V L E O H ( G X F D W L R Q H G Q W K G H W L F W R F L R O O H J H D Q G  
G H S D U W P H Q W D O Z H E 6 V L W H V F H Y Q U B D G R D W W D Q G 8 Q G H U J U  
3 U R J U D P V + R X V L Q J + X P D Q 5 H V R X U F H V 5 H J L V W U D U 6 W X  
6 H U Y L F H V 6 W X G H Q W S O I G L E W 6 W X G H Q W & H U Y L F H V D Q G  
2 P E X G V S H U V R Q Z H E V L W H V

127( WKH IROORZLQJ WZR SDJMKFRQLWDLRIQLWHPWFRIRYH  
FXUUHQW SROLF\ DQG E D SURSRVHG OLVW EDVHG RQ F  
DSSO\ WR VWXGHQW ULJKWV DQG UHVSQRVLELOLWLHV 7

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Curriculum and Research Committee  
4 April 25, 2016  
5 Final Reading  
6  
7

AS 1609

8 Policy Recommendation:  
9 Amendment to F13 -

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





50  
51 Approved: 2/15/16 in a different format by Organization and Government

52  
53 Vote: 8-0-0  
54 Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Romero, Laker, Curry,  
55 Grosvenor  
56 Absent: Gleixner

57  
58  
59  
60  
61 Approved 3/21/16 by Professional Standards

62  
63  
64 Vote: 6-0-0  
65 Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Sandoval-Rios  
66 Absent: Kauppila, Riley, Hamedi-Hagh  
67 Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.  
68 Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy.





46 messages for posting on the You Can Play website and  
47 played at intercollegiate athletic events; and  
48  
49 Whereas, San José State University Athletics aims to provide a safe  
50 and inclusive environment for all student athletes to succeed  
51 regardless of their sexual orientation or identity; therefore be  
52 it  
53  
54 Resolved, That San José State University actively supports the You  
55 Can Play project; and be it further  
56  
57 Resolved, That San José State University allocate funds to promote the  
58 principles and message of the You Can Play project through  
59 activities and communications including, but not limited to,  
60 the production, use, and distribution (including submission to  
61 the You Can Play website) of a video reflecting SJSU's  
62 commitment to inclusive excellence.  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73 Approved: April 21, 2016 by email vote  
74 Vote: 14-0-1  
75 Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Larochele, Lanning, Blaylock, Feinstein,  
76 Frazier, Backer, Lee, Kaufman, Mathur, Shifflett, Amante,  
77 Peter, Heiden  
78 Absent: None

8 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

9 Amending S15 -6 to Clarify Procedures for Recruitment Committees

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

Resolved: That the following amendment be incorporated into S15-6, and edited into the public copies of S15-6; be it further

Resolved: That this amendment becomes effective for all searches beginning AY 2016-17.

17 3.0 Procedures for Initial Appointment

18 ....

19 3.3 Recruitment committee procedures.

20 3.3.1 Recruitment committees shall be charged by the Dean or the Dean's  
21 designee and shall sign an appropriate agreement to protect the  
22 confidentiality of candidate applications.

23 3.3.2 Faculty Affairs will provide all recruitment committees with  
24 comprehensive guidelines for organizing the recruiting process.

25 3.3.3 Recruitment committees shall evaluate all candidates for  
26 appointments to regular positions and determine the order of  
27 desirability of finalists for the position. The recommendation of a  
28 recruitment committee shall be approved by a simple majority of the  
29 committee; abstentions will not be counted when determining the  
30 committee recommendation. Abstentions will be counted as  
31 "present" for the purposes of establishing a quorum.

32 3.3.3.1.1 Committees shall provide a clear rationale for their  
33 recommendations to the Dean and to Faculty  
34 Affairs. The committee vote and the written  
35 recommendations of the committee, including the  
36 order of desirability of finalists, shall be recorded  
37 and signed by all committee members. When  
38 committee recommendations are not unanimous,  
39 reasons shall be stated for all votes cast. A  
40 statement of the reasons shall be included in a  
41 single report from the committee, with the possibility  
42 of a separate "minority" report. In either case, the  
43 confidentiality of voting shall be maintained, and  
44 signatures on the report(s) shall not indicate how  
45 individual members voted when recommendations  
46

48 3.3.2.1.1 Normally, offers shall be extended to candidates in  
49 the order recommended by the committee. If,  
50 however, information emerges after the committee  
51 makes its recommendation (e.g., a subsequent  
52 reference check) that calls the order of desirability  
53 into question, the committee shall be given the  
54 opportunity to change its recommendation.

55 3.3.2.1.2 In the event that the President (and his designees)  
56 cannot (for any reason) accept the recommendation  
57 of the committee, the search will

58 Rationale: When the ARTP policies were split apart for ease of use, a few procedures  
59 that under the old policy applied to “all committees” were not moved to the Appointments  
60 policy but remained behind in the RTP policy. This amendment restores these  
61 procedures to the Appointments policy.  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97

98 Approved: April 11, 2016  
99 Vote: 8-0-0  
100 Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios,  
101 Hamedi-Hagh  
102 Absent: Riley  
103 Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.  
104 Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy.

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 Professional Standards Committee  
5 April 25 , 2016  
6 Final Reading

AS 1617

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  
46  
47  
48  
49

Sense of the Senate Resolution  
Calling for Widespread Consultation  
Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies  
Pertaining to Electronic Communications

Resolved: That, prior to finalizing any standards and/or implementation strategies pertaining to electronic communications, the Information Security Officer share widely with faculty, staff, administrators and students the draft standard on Email and Campus Communication ([http://its.sjsu.edu/docs/security/Standard\\_Email\\_Campus\\_Communication.pdf](http://its.sjsu.edu/docs/security/Standard_Email_Campus_Communication.pdf)) and solicit input on revisions, and be it further

Resolved: That following campus consultation, a revised draft of the standard on Email and Campus Communication be shared with the Senate's Professional Standards Committee to guide their development of a policy recommendation.

Rationale: The draft standards on email campus communication contain numerous important changes that would substantially alter how faculty, students, and staff communicate through electronic media at SJSU. Some of those changes may be inconvenient or controversial. It would be prudent to solicit the widest possible feedback in order to devise the least disruptive implementation, and to determine if the campus community can suggest alternatives or improvements to the Standard Email Campus Communication plan.

Approved: February 16, 2016 in a different format (part of a larger package) by Organization and Government

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Romero, Laker, Curry, Grosvenor

Absent: Gleixner

Approved: March 21, 2016 by Professional Standards

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, S-0.004 Tw [(l)1.J /T(004 Tw [(0.002 Tc 0















168 12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work:  
169 5. Strongly Agree  
170 4. Agree  
171 3. Neutral  
172 2. Disagree  
173 1. Strongly Disagree  
174 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
175

176 13. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective:  
177 5. Strongly Agree  
178 4. Agree  
179 3. Neutral  
180 2. Disagree  
181 1. Strongly Disagree  
182 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
183

184 Please answer the following informational items:  
185

186 14. How would you describe your efforts in this course?  
187 Extraordinary  
188 High  
189 Average  
190 Low  
191 Minimal  
192

193 15. How often did you attend class?  
194 Almost always  
195 Often  
196 Occasionally  
197 Seldom  
198 Almost never  
199

200 16. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?  
201 A  
202 B  
203 C  
204 D or F  
205 Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)  
206  
207

208 17. You are a:  
209 Freshman  
210 Sophomore  
211 Junior  
212 Senior  
213 Graduate Student  
214 Credential Only  
215 Other (e.g. Open University)  
216

217 18. During a typical week in this course, how many hours did you spend outside of class

218 on course-related activities (such as reading, completing assignments, studying, service  
219 learning, field work, group work, etc.)?  
220

221 (NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units  
222 will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course  
223 units to generate Carnegie Units.  
224

225 19. Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on this survey?

226 Yes

227 No

228  
229 20. Did your instructor attempt to influence your answers on this survey?

230 Yes

231 No

232  
233 Free-Response Questions:

234  
235 What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?

236  
237 What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?

238 If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice  
239 questions above.  
240

241 Student Opinion of Laboratory and Activity Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) Revision  
242 (SERB, final, March 2016)

243  
244 This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching  
245 performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities  
246 (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical  
247 appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-15 will  
248 be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance  
249 your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for  
250 personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. If the question does not  
251 apply to your course, please select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".

252 The lab or activity instructor:

253  
254 1: made course requirements clear.

- 255 5. Strongly Agree
- 256 4. Agree
- 257 3. Neutral
- 258 2. Disagree
- 259 1. Strongly Disagree
- 260 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

261  
262 2: used grading criteria that were clear.

- 263 5. Strongly Agree
- 264 4. Agree
- 265 3. Neutral
- 266 2. Disagree
- 267 1. Strongly Disagree
- 268 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

269  
270 3: was well prepared for class or activity.

- 271 5. Strongly Agree
- 272 4. Agree
- 273 3. Neutral
- 274 2. Disagree
- 275 1. Strongly Disagree
- 276 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

277  
278 4: showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive  
279 to students

- 280 5. Strongly Agree
- 281 4. Agree
- 282 3. Neutral
- 283 2. Disagree
- 284 1. Strongly Disagree
- 285 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

286  
287 5: made the class environment safe for students, including demonstration of the proper  
288 use of any equipment and techniques.

- 289 5. Strongly Agree





340 C  
341 D or F  
342 Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)  
343  
344 12. You are a:  
345 Freshman  
346 Sophomore  
347 Junior  
348 Senior  
349 Graduate Student  
350 Credential Only  
351

1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Instruction and Student Affairs  
4 April 25, 2016  
5 First Reading  
6

AS 1620

7 Policy Recommendation  
8 Probation and Disqualification

9 Whereas University Policy S10-6 has already been amended twice (S11-1 and S15-5) and  
10 now would require many further amendments to become consistent with policies  
11 such as F12-7 (Former Students Returning), Academic Disqualification and  
12 Reinstatement Review Committee (ADRRC) Guidelines on Probation and  
13 Disqualification in the Major, and changes in ADRRC implementation of  
14 reinstatement criteria; therefore be it

15 Resolved That University Policies S10-6, S11-1, and S15-5 be rescinded and replaced by  
16 the following policy.

17 Table of Contents

- 18  
19 I. [Undergraduate Students](#)  
20 A. [University Academic Probation and Continued Probation](#)  
21 B. [University Academic Disqualification](#)  
22 C. [Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification](#)  
23 D. [Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification](#)  
24  
25 II. [Graduate, Post-baccalaureate, and Credential Students](#)  
26 A1. [University Academic Probation and Continued Probation](#)  
27 A2. [Completion of all Degree or Credential Requirements While on Probation](#)  
28 B. [University Academic Disqualification](#)  
29 C. [Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification](#)  
30 D. [Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification](#)  
31  
32 III. [Appeal of Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification](#)  
33 A. [Student Appeal Filing](#)  
34 B. [Validity of Appeal](#)  
35 C. [Subcommittee Structure](#)  
36 D. [Hearing Rules](#)  
37 E. [Decisions](#)  
38

39 I. Undergraduate Students

40 Per Sections 41300 and 41300.1 Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, undergraduate  
41 s

77 C. Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification

78 Undergraduate students disqualified from the university can petition to be reinstated.

79

119 disqualification (meaning that the academic standing is removed from the transcript).  
120 The rationale for the rescinding of academic standing is that the instructor and not the  
121 student made the error that led to an incorrect posting of academic standing. Generally,  
122 the grade change must be made by the Drop Deadline of the following Fall or Spring  
123 semester. Further extension of this deadline will be considered only when there is  
124 documentation of the student's attempt(s) to contact the instructor and/or the  
125 department chair, and the late submission of the change of grade form is clearly beyond  
126 the student's control, as described in University Policy S09-7.

127 Reinstatement of undergraduates following a second disqualification must generally be  
128 done under Category 1.

129 D. Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification

130 Per Sections 41300.1 Title 5, "A"

---

153 Despite maintaining a SJSU cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, an undergraduate student's  
154 academic performance in the major may fall below the minimum standards for that major.  
155 In these cases, while the student remains in overall good standing with the university, he or  
156 she is subject to administrative-academic probation in and disqualification from the major.  
157 Each college, school, department, and program (hereafter referred to as "program") may  
158 employ program-specific criteria for determining a policy of probation in, disqualification  
159 from, and reinstatement into the major. These criteria must be reviewed and approved by  
160 the ADRRC.

161 Notification. Undergraduate programs must ensure that all students within the concerned  
162 majors are advised of these program-level criteria and the consequences of being placed  
163 on Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification. At a minimum, criteria in addition  
164 to or differing from university regulations must be posted on departmental and/or program  
165 websites and any other program documents, such as student handbooks.

166 Probation in the Major and Disqualification from the Major.

167 1. Probation in the Major

168 Undergraduate students may be placed on probation in the major when their cumulative  
-

---





225 University Policy F08-2). A program may also do this or may consider the final  
226 attempt at the course or the highest grade in the course for the purposes of the  
227 major GPA or to satisfy any requirements prior to completion of the major.

228 d. If the course in question is offered by another department, the program may  
229 consider only the first two attempts in determining probation or disqualification  
230 status. Clearly, the major department cannot restrict the number of times a  
231 student enrolls in a course offered by another department, but it is permitted, for  
232 instance, to ignore the grade from a third attempt to pass a class with a C or  
233 better.

234 Exceptions . Exceptions to the rule that administrative academic disqualification must  
235 be preceded by a probationary period may be made in the following cases:

236 a. In clinical courses, laboratory courses, or other types of programmatic  
237





- 344 1. Raising the SJSU Cumulative GPA to 3.0 or Better . The SJSU cumulative GPA can  
345 be raised through SJSU Open University coursework as part of a Program of Study (see  
346 below), although retroactive (after the last day of classes) actions by students, such as  
347 completion of Incomplete ("I") grades or course drops, can also raise the SJSU  
348 cumulative GPA.
- 349 2. Extenuating Circumstances. Reinstatements in this category will be granted only for  
350 serious and compelling circumstances that were clearly beyond a student's control and  
351 are clearly documented in the petition. The criteria for approval under this category are  
352 similar to those required for a retroactive (course) drop or retroactive (semester)  
353 withdrawal. Sometimes the approval of such retroactive petitions will raise the SJSU  
354 cumulative GPA to 3.0 or better (good academic standing), thus shifting to a Category 1  
355 approval. However, even in such cases, rescinding academic standing already posted  
356 to the record is very rarely approved.
- 357 3. Special Consideration. This category is reserved for students whose petitions cannot  
358 be accommodated within the other categories. Such students will have spent  
359 substantial time (five years or more) away from SJSU since their d



431 prior to disqualification. For example, a substandard grade in one course could not result in  
432 disqualification; rather, the student would be put on administrative academic probation and  
433 afforded the opportunity to repeat that class. Passage of the repeated course with the  
434 required grade would result in the return of the student to good standing. Programs can  
435 limit the number of semesters on probation in the student career to as few as one.

436 Transcript Notation. For graduate students, only administrative academic disqualification  
437 (not administrative academic probation) status should be noted on the transcript.

438 Academic Progress in the Major <sup>3</sup>. Most instances of administrative academic probation  
439 and disqualification result from probation in and disqualification from the major.<sup>4</sup>

440 Despite maintaining a SJSU cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better, a graduate student's  
441 academic performance in the major may fall below the minimum standards established in  
442 that major. In these cases, while students remain in overall good standing with the  
443 university, they are subject to probation in and disqualification from the graduate major. As  
444 with undergraduate programs, each college, school, department, and program (hereafter  
445 referred to as "program") may employ a policy of probation in, disqualification from, and  
446 reinstatement into the graduate major. The criteria must be reviewed and approved by the  
447 ADRRC.

448 Notification. Graduate programs must ensure that all students within the concerned majors  
449 are advised of these program-level criteria. At a minimum, criteria in addition to or differing  
450 from university regulations must be posted on departmental and/or program websites and  
451 any other program documents, such as student handbooks.

452 Probation in the Major and Disqualification from the Major

453 1. Probation in the Major

454 Departments and schools must notify students in writing of (new) probation in the major  
455 or disqualification from the major status no later than two weeks following the posting of  
456 university academic standing. They must also be provided with the conditions for  
457 release from administrative academic probation and the circumstances that would lead  
458 to administrative academic disqualification should probation not be cleared. There  
459 should be a mechanism to permit return to good standing from probation. Graduate

---

<sup>3</sup> Definition of Major .









575 A critical first step in the appeal process is consultation by a student with an advisor  
576 representing the major in which reinstatement is sought. A report of the consultation and the  
577 advisor's recommendation should be forwarded to the ADRRC.

578 In cases of extenuation, a student must present evidence of extenuating circumstances  
579 beyond the his or her control that disrupted previously satisfactory academic performance, and  
580 documentation that such conditions will no longer affect academic performance.

581 Establishing and evaluating the procedure for the appeal process is the charge of the ADRRC.  
582 a srupttrr

617 Students have the right to consult with the University Ombudsperson at any point during this  
618 process.

619 Approved: April 18, 2016

620 Vote: 14-0-1

621 Present: Bruck (nonvoting), Brooks, Sen, Sofish, Campsey, Branz (nonvoting),  
622 Walters, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Abdukheir, Medina, Medrano, Khan,  
623 Wilson, Simpson, Nash, Amante.

624 Absent: Gay, Rees

625 Financial Impact: None

626 Workload Impact: None

627 Financial Impact: Not significant



49 Resolved: That the attached policy be implemented following approval by the  
50 President.

51  
52  
53 Rationale: A number of voting related issues have arisen over the intervening 14  
54 years following implementation of F02-4. These include consideration of the various  
55 procedures employed in academic departments for such issues as curricular  
56 changes, policies, determinations of what issues require formal or informal votes by  
57 faculty, implications of appointment fractions, and the opportunities as well as the  
58 limitations of technological resources. This proposed update to the departmental  
59 voting rights policy seeks to provide greater clarity and guidance on such issues. In  
60 addition, as revisions were made, voting guidelines found in both the Senate  
61 constitution (Article II section 3c) and bylaws (1.7) were taken into consideration.

62  
63  
64 Approved: 4/18/16

65 Vote: 9-0-0

66 Present: Laker, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Gleixner, Curry, Grosvenor,  
67 Romero, Mathur

68 Absent:

69 Financial Impact: None expected.

70



118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123

4.1 Voting rights of temporary faculty are terminated by suspension, complete retirement, or other termination of employment.

4.2 Voting rights of temporary faculty are suspended for any semester in which the individual holds a full-time administrative or other non-faculty

167 laws. If the Department does not have an established voting procedure at the time  
168 a decision is to be made, a vote by secret ballot conducted by the Chair and  
169 documented in meeting minutes shall be the default practice.

170  
171 8.1 Any selected method must include a process for verifying the proportion  
172 and eligibility of those voting.

173  
174 8.2 When a vote has been by secret ballot, the method used and the  
175 reporting of results must be done in such a way as to not reveal the identity  
176 of voters.

177  
178 8.3 Voting shall only be conducted after a proposal has been discussed in  
179 person (inclusive of online tools).

180  
181 9. Absentee voting.

182  
183 Because of the importance of deliberations in resolving conflicts and determining  
184 policies, proxy and absentee voting in departmental matters is permissible only if  
185



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

43 a) Definition: Certificate programs are classified as “Academic” if students receive  
44 academic credit for any courses in the program.

45 b) Types of Academic certificate programs

46 i) Basic (undergraduate level)

47 (1) Definition: Basic certificate programs provide opportunities for  
48 students to pursue specialized, often pre-professional, focused  
49 educational objectives that may be separate from a degree program.

50 (2) Jurisdiction: Basic certificate programs are under the jurisdiction  
51 of the Undergraduate Studies (UGS) Committee and administered by  
52 the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP).

53 ii) Advanced (graduate level)

54 (1) Definition: An advanced certificate program offers post-  
55 baccalaureate students coursework leading to a specific, applied,  
56

---

---



127 units may be taken through Open University. However, the program cannot be fully  
128 completed through Open University.

129 e) While advanced certificate courses can be taken through Open University, a  
130 maximum of 30% of any graduate degree program units can be completed from  
131 another institution and/or units from Open University (including advanced certificate  
132 courses) at SJSU with approval from the department or school.

133 6) The advisor/director of the certificate program is responsible for verifying a student's  
134 satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for  
135 forwarding the certificate completion form to Graduate Admissions and Program  
136 Evaluations (GAPE). After review, GAPE notifies the Office of the Registrar which then  
137 records the completion of the program on the student's transcript.

138 7) These guidelines constitute minimum standards for advanced certificate programs;  
139 departments may propose additional requirements for approval by the GS&R Committee.

140 8) Admission

141 a) Students seeking an advanced certificate in matriculated status must apply for  
142 admission and will be evaluated at the university level with respect to the applicable  
143 entrance requirements and then according to the approved requirements set forth by  
144 the individual certificate program. A department or program can propose more  
145





210 proposal and accompanying reviews, to the Provost via the GUP office (GS&R for  
211 programs with 200 level courses or UGS for proposals with 100 level programs).  
212 e. The Provost makes the final decision on whether or not to approve the certificate  
213 program.

214 5) Review process for existing certificate programs

215 a) Substitution, deletion, or addition of courses to the program will need to go through  
216 the minor program change process in the GUP office.

217 b) Certificates involving multiple programs will be assigned to a home department  
218 under which to be reviewed.

219

220 Approved (C&R): April 18, 2016

221 Vote: 9-0-0

222 Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Schultz-Krohn,  
223 Sibley, Stacks

224 Absent: Backer, Matoush, Sarras

225 Financial Impact: Certificate programs have the potential to increase revenue if  
226 students enroll through special session.

227 Workload Impact: As certificate programs -4.2c375eu74.3(ou)-10.5(gh )-10.6(s)-4(pec)5(g m)215 Present