

---

---



**B. Consent Calendar** – The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as amended by AVC Ng to remove Elizabeth Favila, Student, from the Student Success Committee.

**Election Calendar** -- The Senate voted and the Election Calendar was approved with No Nays, or Abstentions.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

The Executive Committee members presented *AS 1498, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Commending Associated Students on the 2012 Campus-Wide Voter Registration Drive (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1498 was approved as written with No Nays, or Abstentions.**

V. **Unfinished Business** - None

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

**A. University Library Board (ULB) –**

The written ULB report is attached to this Senate packet.

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

Senator Peter presented *AS 1492, Policy Recommendation, Omnibus Recision of Lapsed and Obsolete Policies Previously Recommended by the Professional Standards Committee (Final Reading)*. Senator Frazier presented a friendly amendment to replace “superceded” with “superseded” in the table. **The Senate voted and AS 1492 was approved as amended with No Nays, or Abstentions.**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1493, Policy Recommendation, Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (Replaces S99-10 – Responding to Allegations of Scientific or Other Misconduct in Funded Research (Final Reading)*. Senator Buzanski presented a friendly amendment to pages 13 and 17 to change, “Deciding Official (The President of San José State University)” to read, “Deciding Official (The President of San José State University or his/her designee).” **The Senate voted and AS 1493 was approved as amended with No Nays, and 1 Abstention.**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1496, Policy Recommendation, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (First Reading)*. Senator Peter explained the purpose of the policy is to change the peer observation intervals to be more in sync with actual reviews. The current 1991 policy calls for a peer observation review every third semester which is out of sync with the contracts faculty receive. Another item being changed involves the passage of the new contract allowing for electronic Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTEs). The PS Committee needed to implement language for those electronic SOTEs. The Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) is in charge of adopting the structure needed to keep SOTE response rates high. In the event that SERB decides to adopt a grade withholding structure, the PS Committee “built-in a number of safeguards to make that humane and reasonable.” The current policy also needed to be revised to fit the universal language in the new contract. In addition, faculty will be able to exclude one course from their review per year, particularly if they want to try and incorporate a new course with new technology. This policy also combines nine policies

that involve SOTEs into one policy.

SERB gave the PS Committee a number of suggestions including reducing the number of peer evaluations for tenure/tenure-track faculty while increasing their quality. Many colleges have college-level or department-level criteria. In return for cutting down on the number of peer evaluations, the PS Committee wants to make sure all departments have some criteria and guidelines as to how to do the peer evaluations.

In addition, the PS Committee wants to improve the norming process. The size of a course, level of course, and other items that have some effect on SOTEs will also be able to be normed electronically. SERB recommended that all results from SOTEs be published. The PS Committee thought this would be difficult, so the compromise they came up with is to allow for one qualitative question to be asked at the same time as the SOTE, which would be made available to the public. That question would be advice students might have for future students taking the course. It would be separate from the SOTE, although it would be administered at the same time.

This draft policy also allows for SERB and the Center for Faculty Development to possibly use SOTEs for formative purposes. In addition, the draft policy also allows for SERB and the Center for Faculty Development to possibly use SOTEs for improvement of teaching purposes. This has to be done very carefully and not violate confidentiality. However, an automated program could alert faculty to opportunities that are available in the Center for Faculty Development based upon SOTE results.

**Questions/Comments:**

Concern was expressed that current evaluations by peers are evaluative, and not formative. The PS Committee was asked to consider revising the policy to have the evaluation by peers include checkboxes that have *meets expectations*, *exceeds expectations*, or *below expectations*, and if it is *below expectations* there would be comments. The formative review would have evidence that it occurred, but the information given to the faculty member would be confidential. This would allow the faculty to be evaluated and comments provided when needed, but at the same time provide a formative process without wasting faculty time.

Clarification was requested on item C.4.d. as to whether a department chair could request an extra observation. The PS Committee changed this language so that an extra observation could be requested for any faculty member, and not just a full professor, but as a safeguard the request would have to be made by the personnel committee and not by the chair alone.

The Senate discussed the statement in C.4.e. about temporary faculty receiving a direct observation of at least one course their first semester, but if not feasible then observations could be made as often as practicable. The PS Committee discussed this, but the problem is that this policy will reduce the number of peer evaluations departments that have many senior temporary faculty need to conduct, but will increase the number of evaluations for departments that mainly have new temporary faculty. The PS Committee has heard from some departments that they do not have enough people to do annual peer observations for all their temporary faculty members on one-year contracts. This gives those departments a way out. However, concern was also

expressed that the very next sentence calls for “observations to be made in a representative sampling of courses,” and if courses are only being evaluated every three years, how will that be accomplished.

Footnotes need to be added to E.1., page 8, to identify where the information was taken from that shows “a positive correlation between class satisfaction and effective teaching,” and “better teachers having more satisfied students and higher evaluation scores.” The PS Committee received this information from SERB and will get the citations from them.

It was suggested that item G.2., page 10, be modified to include frequency in addition to means, standard deviations, and medians, and that item H.9., page 12, be modified to require a report to the Senate when any technical and implementation details are changed by the AVP of IEA (Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics) and SERB.

Section H.1., page 11, appears to imply that all students must complete SOTEs electronically. The PS Committee did not intend to imply this, and Section H.2.c. allows a student to “opt out” of completing SOTEs. Students that opt out will also be able to get their grades early just like those completing the SOTEs.

There is no discussion in items D and E, on pages 7 and 8, about faculty informing students how important SOTEs are, or how students will be told that this information will be available to the public. The PS Committee will consider asking SERB to prepare a SOTE Interpretation Guide such as what they have for faculty for students. Currently there is a statement read to students from off of the paper SOTEs. However, the electronic SOTEs may be a superior way to communicate to students by having a screen they must read with this information prior to filling out the SOTE.

The PS Committee was asked to consider mid-semester SOTEs, or another way for students to provide anonymous feedback on a course during the middle of the semester.

The Senate discussed C.2., and what happens if the faculty member that is supposed to be observed avoids meeting with the faculty member assigned to observe them, and also who determines if there is negligence. The PS Committee will consider adding language to identify who determines whether there is negligence, and will consider changing the submission process to allow the report to be submitted to the faculty member being observed and the chair at the same time.

The PS Committee was asked to consider adding a minimum number of days that SOTEs would be available to students.

The Senate discussed whether it was necessary to withhold grades if students have the option to opt out. The PS Committee referred to a survey of students by Brigham Young in which students stated that withholding grades until a student did a SOTE was fair as long as the student had the option to opt out.

Concern was raised that the withholding of grades is referred to as an incentive, and that it

doesn't specify how long grades could be delayed if the student does not go online and complete the SOTE. It isn't clear that the student must go online to complete the SOTE, or to opt out to receive their grade. The PS Committee is leaving it up to SERB to decide if they want to withhold the grade as they do at San Diego State University.

There was discussion about the fact that faculty have a certain amount of time before they have to have their grades posted, and that the incentive of students getting their grades early for filling out the online SOTE may only work if faculty post their grades early.

Concern was raised that the SOTEs would be on MySJSU, and MySJSU is not accessible using an accessible browser. The webmaster stated that MySJSU is accessible, however, parts of Peoplesoft are not accessible. This is a CSU-wide problem.

There was discussion about the utility of having a public anonymous qualitative statement.

Concern was expressed that the direct observation could double or triple the workload for some faculty. The PS Committee was asked to consider having the indirect observation done by a committee and the direct observation done by an individual.

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

The C&R Committee is working on the 120 Unit issue, and WASC Accreditation.

**D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) - No report.**

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

Senator Du presented *AS 1497, Policy Recommendation, Enrollment Priorities for Former Students Returning (FSRs) (First Reading)*. Senator Du explained that returning students have two categories—probation or disqualified students that want to return, and students in good standing that are returning. Our current policy gives priority to new students.

**Questions:**

The I&SA Committee was asked to consider adding language for returning undergraduate students in good standing. There was discussion about the fact that there is no program of study available for undergraduate students like there is for graduate students. Graduate students that are disqualified can continue to enroll in classes in a program of study to regain eligibility and have uninterrupted enrollment. Undergraduate students do not have that program of study available.

Several senators expressed concern about students returning to a different major. However, departments will be able to choose whether to take the student back. The I&SA Committee was asked to consider an alternative to the phrase, “return to major.”

The I&SA Committee was asked to consider adding an implementation date for the policy.



**C. Vice President for Student Affairs** – The application period for Fall 2013 is gearing up for admissions. The enrollment target for 2013-2014 is the same as it was for 2012-2013, 21,045 FTES, but if there is an enrollment target increase the number of FTES will also increase.

**D. Associated Students President** – AS President Worsnup reported that AS had recently passed two resolutions. One resolution had to do with the implementation of online SOTEs. The second resolution spoke against the



The general counsel confirmed that faculty have the right to prohibit recording of their lectures.

Faculty on the Monterey campus got into some trouble for promoting Prop 30. As a reminder, employees cannot use their SJSU email account when advocating for something.

Senator Van Selst gave a report from the Campus Planning Board (CPB). There are a bunch of Elm Trees on the San Carlos side that are diseased. Some are in danger of falling down. The CPB has recommended to the President that most of them be removed. The Senate suggested that this be done gradually so that the most diseased be removed first, and then additional trees would be removed and replanted the next year. Removing them all at once will make what was a shady area barren. The Senate further recommended that the CPB let the campus know what the rationale is for removal. The Arborist recommended removing all trees. Once those trees are gone, that area will be used as a staging area for construction and then replanted when they are finished.

**X. Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.