

~~SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE~~

2015/2016

Agenda

May 9, 2016, 2:00pm – 4:00pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call –
- II. Approval of Minutes –  
Senate Minutes of April 25, 2016
- III. Communications from the Chair of the Senate  
B. From the President of the University
- IV. Executive Committee Report
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –  
Exec. Minutes of April 18, 2016
  - B. Consent Calendar –
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –  
AS1614, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting Efforts to  
Reduce Student Costs for Textbooks by Encouraging the Use of  
High r





---

**B. From the President of the University –**

Interim President Martin is working closely with incoming President Papazian.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**Executive Committee Minutes of March 21, 2016 –** No questions.

**Executive Committee Minutes of April 11, 2016 –** No questions.

**B. Consent Calendar**

---

---

---

**V.**

**VI.**

facile" with "simpler" before "process" in the 6<sup>th</sup> Resolved clause on the 2<sup>nd</sup> line.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was seconded to add to line 39, "by the SJSU contracts and purchasing office" after "template be created" in the first line of the 1<sup>st</sup> Resolved clause. The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment failed (1-32-0).

**The Senate voted and AS 1583 passed as amended (33-0-0).**

---

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

**The Senate voted and AS 1607 passed as written (30-0-1).**

---

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1609, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to F13-2, Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs (Final Reading)*.

**The Senate voted and AS 1609 passed as written (29-0-0).**

---

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1622, Policy Recommendation, Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: What was the second to the last item you noted was changed?

A: The proposal content is clarified for the departments.

Q: Is it possible to substitute the requirements for "other certificates" using academic coursework?

A: I don't think so. The "other certificates" are non-credit.

Q: Right. If a non-credit certificate is in word processing or something, and I have an academic credit-bearing course that gives me that skill, where does that fall in this policy?

A: The policy doesn't speak to this. This policy is laying out the guidelines for academic certificate programs.

---

**B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**

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

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove everything from line 91 through line 103.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 77 to add, "and maintain a webpage with

links to each item." after "Responsibilities." The amendment was seconded. Senator Shifflett withdrew her amendment.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to line 75 to replace "all" with "exemplar." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed (7-26-0).

Senator Laker presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to replace "all" with "relevant."

**The Senate voted and AS 1608 passed as amended (33-1-0).**

---

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1620, Policy Recommendation, Probation and Disqualification (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: Is there was anything in the policy that is different than what our current practice is?

A: Not that I'm aware of.

Q: Can we get a copy with the changes highlighted for the final reading?

A: Yes, absolutely we can do that.

Q: Is there anything you know about that will change, especially relating to graduate students?

A: Yes, one thing. Previously there was a rule on the books that if a graduate student finished their degree program entirely with a GPA under 3.0, there were a set of rules they

Q: Why can't they try all five categories?

A: You would be willing to accept a petition from a student for extenuating circumstances

---

---

---



---

Senator Peter presented

---

---

A: Yes. I asked this question to the Chair of SERB and was told the pros outweighed the cons and that this was important information that should go out.

Q: Is it the intention of SERB to use this information for institutional reporting?

A: The intention was to get faculty feedback that would help, and it would be useful to department chairs to report back to Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) the number of hours per credit unit per week that students report working on classwork.

A: The PS Committee was not unified in its understanding of how the data would be used on that point. Most members of the PS Committee would like to receive that data for their personal use. A few members were skeptical about putting that data to institutional use. It might be helpful for IEA to clarify how that data might be used for the final reading.

Q: It would certainly help me decide how to vote if SERB included information on which of these questions would come back to the faculty member and which questions would be used for other purposes.

A: The PS Committee will inform SERB. We cannot change the questions, but we could insert a Resolved clause about how the data would be used.

Q: I've heard various answers to this question, but I'd like this in the minutes. There are a lot of people concerned about SOTE questions because they are asking about teaching instead of learning. I understand it is difficult to measure learning on a survey of this nature, but I would argue it is just as hard to measure teaching. My preference would be to have the whole SOTE be a survey of learning. I'd like a response to this.

A: The PS Committee asked SERB to include questions about learning and the response was that there have been some studies done and students are notoriously poor at judging their own learning.

Q: What policy says that SOTES can't be amended, is it this one?

A: No, it is the teaching evaluation policy.

Q: The SOTES are supposed to be about teaching effectiveness and the questions from 14 on really aren't about teaching effectiveness. As all of us that deal with surveys know, one item influences other items on the survey. We are now increasing the length by about one-third, and I think decreases student interest in completing the survey. I also think that some of these questions have the potential to drive the answers to other questions.

A:

A: In the teaching criteria of the RTP policy, there are a couple of different levels of achievement that identifies improvement from prior norms. That is built into the RTP policy. In terms of what SERB can do, in our last revision of the teaching evaluation policy we gave them broad latitude to design a variety of norms.

Q: On line 341 where it specifies, "(NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, ...)" does that mean there is a blank space there, or are there numbers already on it?

A: I presume it means you put in a number in a certain range. It originally came to PS with five different ranges to choose from and the PS Committee requested that SERB do something different, because that would have to be a question that would apply to a course that was one-unit, three-units, and six-units. That is why SERB inserted the number field.

Q: Where it specifies that, "the course units will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course units ...," does this mean a report will be generated after everything, and the users are the people that get the report?

A: I'm not clear about this either.

Q: There is a perception that the SOTES have declined in ranking with the new online SOTES and there is also a perception that there is a correlation between grades and quality of teaching, e.g. that students perceive the higher their grade the better the teaching. Where would one go to find those kind of answers if indeed there has been deflation in the SOTES and inflation because of the grades?

A: There has been deflation when the electronic SOTES went into effect the drop was about 3/10<sup>th</sup> of a point. This is why we re-normed to reflect that. That's why we sent a memo out saying judge according to norms and not raw numbers, because the norms are quite different betwe

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the last Resolved clause to read, "Resolved: That except in circumstances where a secret ballot is necessary, when electronic devices are used for official voting it will be done in parallel with an unofficial show of hands."

**The Senate voted and AS 1605 passed as amended (27-4-0).**

---

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

**The Senate voted and AS 1603 passed as written (30-0-0).**

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1590, Senate Management Resolution, Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, "thus the bylaws place" in line 41 to read, "thus the standing rule places."

Senator Peter presented an amendment to lines 66 through 71 to strike, "At the discretion of the Senate chair remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the Senate will not be compromised. Such accommodations should be rare. The individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary arrangements needed to facilitate remote attendance." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter Amendme59b(aci)-6(l)-6(i)-6(n)-a1 AtsolutD Aat1 lgemvVng rtdance

---

---

from their home departments to chair other departments and they are still very involved in

retirements, they are resignations. Last year we had 15 faculty resign. We are making gains in tenure and tenure/track density, but it is slow since we continue to lose faculty. The demographic profile of the 15 that we lost roughly parallels the demographic breakdown of the campus tenure and tenure/track faculty.

We had the largest percentage of female faculty hires this year at 58.6%. We had a larger percentage of white hires this year than in the past three years. The three-year breakdown of tenure and tenure/track hires over the past three years is 52.2% white, 30.4% minorities, and 17.4% unknown. The unknown category is troubling and is enough to make a difference if we knew where people might fall, but this is self-reported data. Other CSUs don't have as high a level of reporting "unknown" as SJSU does.

Out of the 58 hires this year, there were 14 international faculty. These included three from Canada, four from China, one from Iran, two from Russia, one from Serbia, two from S. Korea, and one from Turkey.



**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**April 18, 2016**  
**12-1:30 ADM 167**

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

Absent: None

1. The minutes of April 11, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Mathur (14-0-1).
2. Consent Calendar

There was no dissent to the consent calendar of April 18, 2016.

3. Updates:

a. From the President:

Interim President Martin continues to keep President Papazian up-to-date with recent policy recommendations from the Senate and campus events.

The Honors Convocation was held on Friday, April 15, 2016 at 6 p.m. in the Event Center and it was an outstanding event.

b. From the Provost: There was a reception held at the President's house on Saturday, April 16 for the members of the California State Student Association (CSSA) who were here for their spring meeting hosted by the SJSU Associated Students. It was a wonderful event.

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

Saturday, April 16, 2016 was "Admitted Spartans Day" on campus and they received over 11,000 RSVPs. The event was well attended and there were many departments and student organizations represented at the event.

Linked In has launched their careers app for students. SJSU was one of the first to test this app.

There are 54 candidates in the AS Elections and this is the largest number of candidates in the history of the campus.







5  
6 **Sense of the Senate Resolution**

7  
8 **Supporting Efforts to Reduce Student Costs for Textbooks by**  
9 **Encouraging the Use of High-Quality Open Educational Resource**  
10 **Course Material**

11  
12 **Whereas** Assembly Bill 798 (AB 798), “College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015”  
13 aims to encourage faculty to consider alternatives to high-cost textbooks  
14 by adopting open educational resources (OER) of high quality that will  
15 reduce student costs; and

16  
17 **Whereas** AB 798 has created a financial and professional development incentive  
18 program to facilitate faculty development, consideration, and integration of  
19 high quality OER materials into their courses; and

20  
21 **Whereas** The State legislature has recognized the role of the faculty and senates on  
22 each campus to control all issues pertaining to curriculum, and

23  
24 **Whereas** The SJSU Senate has been actively engaged over the last decade in  
25 addressing issues pertaining to curricular and infrastructure developments  
26 that benefit our students, as evidenced by [SS-S06-5](#), “Improving Textbook  
27 Affordability and Availability”; and

28  
29 **Whereas** Support for the adoption of high-quality OER is not intended to prevent  
30 faculty from continuing to publish in the venues of their choice or from  
31 selecting course materials in the format pedagogically best suited for  
32 instruction; and

33  
34 **Whereas** AB 798 requires the support of each campus’ senates to be eligible for the  
35 incentives; therefore be it

36  
37 **Resolved**  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46



**San José State University  
Executive Committee**

Whereas, President Martin demonstrated respect and support for shared governance and attended all Executive Committee and Senate meetings when she was able; therefore be it

Resolved, That the SJSU Academic Senate thanks President Susan Martin for her extraordinary service to the University, and be it further

Resolved, That we wish President Martin a much deserved peaceful and stress-free sabbatical year when she returns to Michigan, and be it further

Resolved, That we will

1 **San José State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**  
4 **May 9, 2016**  
5 **Final Reading**  
6

**AS 1622**

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process**  
9

10 **Rescinds:** S12-5 and S13-10  
11

12 **Rationale:**

13 Executive Order #806 from the Chancellor's office provided a framework for offering  
14 certificate programs and encouraged the development of such programs. The existing  
15 certificate policies, S12-5--Policy Recommendation, Review and Approval Process for  
16 Academic Certificate Programs and S13-10--Policy Recommendation, Modify the Review  
17 and Approval Process for Academic Certificates, provide the review and approval process  
18 for the current certificate process at SJSU (including earning certificates through Open  
19 University). As described in Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40400 provides  
20 that the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the faculty of a campus, shall issue a  
21 certificate to a student who has completed the prescribed course of study. After  
22 implementation of our certificate policies in the last three years, problems have arisen with  
23 undergraduate and graduate admissions, the use of Open University within certificates, and  
24 the review process timeline of certificate proposals within committees.  
25

26 **Resolved:** That the following be adopted as policy; and be it further

27 **Resolved:** That all certificate programs at San José State University must be reviewed  
28 and approved under the process outlined in the attached guidelines; and be  
29 it further

30 **Resolved:** That, within two years, certificate programs that predate the adoption of this  
31 policy must be reviewed and approved under the attached guidelines; and be it  
32 further

33 **Resolved:** That only certificates from approved certificate programs can be awarded  
34 and posted on transcripts.  
35

36 **Certificate Guidelines**

37 **Types of Certificate Programs**

38 1) Certificate programs are defined as any program in which some form of recognition from San  
39 José State University is awarded to participants. There are two basic kinds of certificate  
40 programs, Academic and Other (defined below) but only the former is the subject of this policy.

41 2) Academic certificate programs

42 a) **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as "Academic" if students receive  
43 academic credit for any courses in the program.

44 b) Types of Academic certificate programs

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

i) Basic (undergraduate level)

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

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

ii) Advanced (graduate level)

(1) **Definition:** An advanced certificate program offers post-baccalaureate students coursework leading to a specific, applied, focused goal.

(2) **Jurisdiction:** Advanced certificate programs are under the jurisdiction

---

---



89 one is required for the student's degree. Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken  
90 for a major or minor may be applied to a basic certificate program upon approval from the basic  
91 certificate program advisor/director.

92 7) Students must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 in basic certificate coursework in order to be  
93 awarded a certificate. However, departments or comparable units may elect to set more  
94 stringent standards to ensure the quality of certificate holders with respect to the program.

95 8) The advisor/director of the program is responsible for verifying a student's satisfactory  
96 completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding a copy  
97 of the certificate completion form to the Office of the Registrar. The Office of the Registrar  
98 records the completion of the program on the student's transcript.

### 99 Specific to Academic Advanced Certificate Programs

#### 100 **Requirements**

101 1) Advanced certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of 18 units  
102 of coursework.

103 2) Advanced certificate programs must be comprised of courses numbered 100 through  
104 296 (excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision, and credit/no-credit  
105 courses).

106 3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in the proposal.

107 4) With the approval of the department or school, units may be applied to both an  
108 advanced certificate program and a graduate degree program offered by the department.

109 5) All advanced certificate programs must be constructed solely with courses taken through  
110 San José State University.

111 a) Students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all advanced certificate coursework,  
112 with no less than the grade of "C" in any course. A maximum of 4 units of coursework  
113 with a grade of "C" can count toward an advanced certificate.

114 b) A maximum of 4 units of coursework may be repeated. The grade used for the GPA  
115 for the advanced certificate is the average of the initial grade and the grade upon  
116 repeating the course.

117 c) Advanced certificates may be available to matriculated (regular or special session  
118 status) and non-matriculated students (i.e., taken through Open University).

119 d) A maximum of 30% of any graduate degree program units (e.g., 9 units for a 30-unit  
120 Master's degree) can be completed from another institution and/or units from Open  
121 University (including advanced certificate courses) at SJSU with approval from the  
122 department or school.

123 e) The choice of grading requirements may have implications for transferability to  
124 degree programs.

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

127 7) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs must have their advanced  
128 certificate students complete an intake form and submit an official transcript



174 h) For advanced certificates: if students are allowed to complete certificate courses  
175 through Open University, then the department/program must provide a justification for  
176 this pathway. The justification establishes that sufficient space will be available in the  
177 courses required for the certificate program.

178 i. This justification must comply with Executive Order #1099 which allows OU  
179 enrollment in state-supported courses on a space available basis after enrollment  
180 opportunities have been provided to state-support matriculated students.

181 ii. The justification must also comply with Executive Order #805 which states  
182 "enrollment or potential enrollment of non-matriculated students in state  
183 supported courses shall not be the basis of the addition for a course that would  
184 otherwise be cancelled because of low enrollment of regular matriculated  
185 students".

186 iii. Departments/programs must go through a recertification process every 3  
187 years that re-evaluates the justification for certificate completion through Open  
188 University. These recertification requests will need approval by the college  
189 deans, the Chair of GS&R, and the Provost. GUP will oversee this recertification  
190 process.

191 3) Submission process

192 a) Academic certificate programs (either basic or advanced) may be proposed by  
193 department, school or college curriculum committees.

194 b) Proposals may be submitted, reviewed, and approved at any time during the academic  
195 year.

196 c) For entry into the catalog, the approval must be registered with GUP according to  
197 published catalog deadlines.

198 4) Review process for new proposals

199 The reviewing bodies are responsible for timely review and approval of academic certificate  
200 programs:

201 a) Proposals from either department or college level curriculum committees are  
202



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



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. \_\_\_\_\_

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
29 \_\_\_\_\_  
30 \_\_\_\_\_

31 \_\_\_\_\_  
32 \_\_\_\_\_  
33 \_\_\_\_\_  
34 \_\_\_\_\_  
35 \_\_\_\_\_

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





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  
226  
227

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

228  
229

d. If the course in question is offered by another department, the program may





- 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.





---





533 of study. This conduct could occur in or out of class. It must be highly egregious  
534 for the disqualification action to be taken. Examples include threatening  
535 behavior, repeated disruptions of classes that interfere with the educational  
536 opportunities of other students, and repeated acts of professorial disrespect,  
537 badgering, rudeness, interruptions, and verbal or written abuse. The  
538 disqualification action is still appealable so it is advisable that the program  
539 consult with Graduate Studies before proceeding.

540 c. Conditional acceptance to a program is, in effect, acceptance under probation in  
541 the major. Typically, a specified set of courses or requirements must be passed  
542 prior to attaining good standing in the program. There may be time limits or unit  
543 limits established to satisfy the conditions, which, if not met, may lead to  
544 disqualification from the major degree program without an intervening term on  
545 explicit probation. Cohort programs must provide in their policies a reasonable  
546 accommodation for students who must stop out for legitimate reasons.

547 d. Teaching credential students do not receive a degree from SJSU and are subject  
548 to the regulations of the state legislature and licensing agency. Credential  
549 courses that exceed the seven-year limit cannot be revalidated. As with  
550 graduate master's degree programs in the CSU, the overall GPA and candidacy  
551 GPA must be at 3.0 or above for completion. In the case of credentials, a  
552 recommendation from the university to the state credentialing agency would be  
553 withheld without the requisite GPA. Students who fail to achieve this level of  
554 scholastic success or who are deemed dispositionally unsuitable for a teaching  
555 career can be precluded by the program from repeating courses or taking other  
556 courses to raise the GPA and so are effectively permanently terminated from the  
557 university without the credential recommendation.

#### 558 4. Reinstatement after Administrative Academic Disqualification

559 Without compelling reasons, administratively academically disqualified graduate  
560 students may not be reinstated to the major from which they were dismissed. Should a  
561 graduate student may find a new program willing to reinstate, transfer into that program  
562 w

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 sruptrer

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











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  
194 15. How often did you attend class?  
195 Almost always  
196 Often  
197 Occasionally  
198 Seldom  
199 Almost never  
200

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

352

353 13: During a typical week in this course, how many hours did you spend outside of class  
354 on course-related activities (such as reading, completing assignments, studying, service  
355 learning, field work, group work, etc.)?

356

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

360

361

362

363