SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2021/2022
Agenda
May 9, 2022, 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
via Zoom: https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/88485286431

If you would like to attend this meeting, please contact the Chair (Karthika.Sasikumar@sjsu.edu) or the Senate Administrator (Eva.Joice@sjsu.edu) for the password.

I.   Call to Order and Roll Call:

II.   Land Acknowledgement:

III.   Approval of Minutes:
> *Senate Minutes of April 18, 2022*

IV.   Communications and Questions:
> A. From the Chair of the Senate
> B. From the President of the University

V.   Executive Committee Report:
> A. *Minutes of the Executive Committee –*
> *Executive Committee Minutes of April 11, 2022*
> *Executive Committee Minutes of April 25, 2022*
>
> B. Consent Calendar –
>
> C. Executive Committee Action Items –

VI.   Unfinished Business:
> **A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**
> *AS 1832, Senate Management Resolution, Update of the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (Final Reading)*
>
> **B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):**
> *AS 1831, Policy Recommendation, Adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses "W" symbol Refunds (Final Reading)*
>
> *AS 1834, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S09-7, Grading Symbols, Drop and Withdrawal; Retroactive Drop and Retroactive Withdrawal; Assignment of Grades and Grade Appeals; Change of Grade; and Integrity of the Academic Record (Final Reading)*

AS 1835, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes after Advance Registration (Final Reading)

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

    A. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

    B. **University Library Board (ULB):**

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

    D. **Professional Standards Committee (PS)**
AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards: To include within the category of Academic Assignment, activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities (Final Reading)

    E. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**
AS 1807, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (Final Reading)

AS 1836, Amendment A to University Policy S16-17, Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (First Reading)

IX. **Special Committee Reports:**

X. **New Business:**

XI. **State of the University Announcements:**
    A. Associated Students President
    B. Vice President for Administration and Finance
    C. Vice President for Student Affairs
    D. Chief Diversity Officer
    E. SJSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)
    F. Statewide Academic Senators
    G. Provost

XII. **Adjournment**

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
April 18, 2022

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Fifty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:
   Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Kaur
   Absent: None
	CHHS Representatives:
	   Present: Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn, Baur
	   Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:
   Present: Perez, Wong(Lau), Faas, Day, Del Casino
   Absent: None
	COB Representatives:
	   Present: Rao, Tian
	   Absent: None

Deans / AVPs:
   Present: Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Shillington, Lattimer
   Absent: None
	COED Representatives:
	   Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz
	   Absent: None

Students:
   Present: Chuang, Cramer, Kumar
        Sandoval-Rios, Allen, Walker
   Absent: None
	ENGR Representatives:
	   Present: Saldamli, Kao
	   Absent: None

Alumni Representative:
   Absent: Walters
	H&A Representatives:
	   Present: Khan, Frazier, Riley, Han, Massey, Kataoka
	   Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:
   Present: Jochim
	COS Representatives:
	   Present: French, White, Switz, Andreopoulos
	   Absent: None

Honorary Representative:
   Present: Peter, Lessow-Hurley, Buzanski
   Absent: None
	COSS Representatives:
	   Present: Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman, Haverfield
	   Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:
    Present: Monday, Yang, Higgins, Masegian, Lee
   Absent: None	

II.   Land Acknowledgement: Senator Switz presented the land acknowledgment. The land acknowledgment is a formal statement that recognizes the history and legacy of colonialism that has impacted our Indigenous peoples, their traditional territories, and their practices. It is a simple and powerful way of showing respect and a step towards correcting the stories and practices that have erased our Indigenous people's history and culture and it is a step towards inviting and honoring the truth.

III.   Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The Senate Minutes of March 21, 2022 were approved as amended (40-0-2).

IV. **Communications and Questions –**

A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that former Senator and Librarian Paul Kauppila passed away earlier this month. The Senate took a few moments of silence in remembrance of Senator Kauppila.

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that Interim President Perez has signed all policies submitted to him since his arrival.

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that Administrative Professionals Day is April 27, 2022. She encouraged Senators to acknowledge their Administrative staff on April 27, 2022.

B. From the President:
Interim President Perez commended the Academic Senate on the most recent policies passed by the Senate that are very impactful policies and he is very impressed with the Senate for taking on these policy topics. The discussions in the Senate have been very productive.

From the end of April through the end of May is normally a very fun time of the year with the Commencement, Celebration of Research, faculty and staff service awards, the Honoring Heroes event at the library, etc. However, it is also a very stressful time of year so be kind to each other. Also, if you have students that need assistance, please refer them to SJSU Cares or CAPS to support them. We have lots of services out there for them.

Last week you saw an email from the Interim President stating that the mask mandate will continue through the end of the year. The president is proud of the fact that we continue to take each other's well being into consideration. Continuing the mask mandate maximizes our ability to have an in-person commencement, which the president is very much looking forward to this event.

The CSU system has named a new Interim Chancellor, Dr. Jolene Koester. She will start in early May. The interim president met her a couple of times at Sacramento State. The Interim President's and Interim Chancellor's time at Sacramento State University never overlapped, but they knew of each other. Everyone that the interim president has met that knows Interim Chancellor Koester, speaks very highly of her.

We had our WASC visit. The team came and stayed a few days. The president thanked everyone that was involved. They had 30 separate meetings including the open forum. WASC provided both commendations and recommendations after the numerous meetings We will get the recommendations from WASC in a few weeks and we will then have the opportunity to make factual corrections. The team will then take that into

consideration before making a final report to WASC at which time we will have the opportunity to respond to the report and then, somewhere around the early 20's of June, the WASC board will meet, and we will be able to hear the final report from WASC. The president anticipates that the result will be relatively good. There was nothing in the exit session by the WASC team that really surprised or shocked the president. They also said a lot of good things about us. The president is a fan of audits and assessments. This process brings those from outside the institution to provide input on how to improve and do a better job, We will learn from this.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
Executive Committee Minutes of March 7, 2022 – No questions.
Executive Committee Minutes of March 14, 2022 – No questions.
Executive Committee Minutes of April 4, 2022 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar:
There was no dissent to the Senate Consent Calendar of April 18, 2022.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:
Senator Frazier presented ***AS 1830, Policy Recommendation, Emergency Short Term Loans for Students (Final Reading).*** Senator Khan presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike line 34.

Senator Van Selst presented a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes to finish the unfinished business. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted ant the motion passed (29-4-3). **The Senate voted and AS 1830 passed as amended (30-4-1).**

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)
Senator Mathur presented a motion to suspend Standing Rule VII in order to adjust the agenda to allow ***AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards: to include within the category of Academic Assignment, activities and specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity, and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities (First Reading)*** to be taken out of order as the first item under the Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed (36-0-5).

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy***

S15-8, Retention, Tenure, Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards: to include within the category of Academic Assignment, activities and specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity, and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities (First Reading).

PS looked very closely at the Sense of the Senate Resolution that was passed last spring SS-S21-2. It called for PS to modify all three RTP categories to specifically address inclusion, educational equity, and achievement. The category of academic assignment has been modified to recognize that faculty may have an academic assignment that includes additional responsibilities beyond teaching and PS provided examples such as working with diverse students, recruitment efforts, providing specific academic support for students, and academic assignments that includes academic responsibilities to the chairperson, supervisor, or coordinator. PS is not trying to change the categories of S15-8. They are just trying to make the academic assignment category broader to recognize the diversity of academic assignments of the SJSU faculty.

Questions:
Q: I would like to propose moving line 107 through line 112.
A: Point of order, this is not a final reading so it is time for questions only. Please send your comments to the committee.

Q: I would suggest PS take a look at University policy F12-6, which is the teaching evaluation policy. It gives cautionary language about SOTEs and you want to make sure the new language you are using in the RTP policy is in agreement with the teaching evaluation policy. For example, the teaching evaluation policy talks about the need to train everyone using the SOTE guide because of potential bias, and so forth and so on. Comparing the two policies might be helpful to you.

Secondly, in the descriptors for Academic Assignment going from baseline to good, it seemed to me as if there is some repeated language. Any information that appears in baseline is already included in the criteria for good. You may want to reexamine the progression between baseline and good. My final suggestion is to think very carefully about the instructions the policy gives about dividing academic assignment from service. If you are going to make it possible that the faculty member can decide which bucket each item goes into, then you need to make it clear who gets to choose. Otherwise the committee reviewing the dossier could say, "No, we think it belongs under this other category."
A: Thank you so much. Those suggestions are very helpful.

Q: Regarding the norming of the SOTEs on lines 126-131. Has PS consulted with SERB on the norms. The norming rates have greatly

increased. I think they have went from 4.2 to 5.3 meaning that a faculty member cannot receive above the norm, which is a criteria for excellence. Would PS consider, since the norms are so high, not putting them in the baseline, or at least consulting with SERB on this?

A: Yes, we are looking at that. One of the things we are trying to address is that there is diversity within the norms if you are talking about 1 standard deviation or 2 standard deviations from the mean. We were trying to diminish the reliance singularly on norming data and taking a more holistic approach.

Q: Has PS discussed the possibility of relying solely on the narrative SOTEs and discontinuing the use of numerical ratings entirely?

A: The committee looked at SOTEs being used from a holistic perspective. Eliminating the numeric SOTEs is not something we were looking at. We were trying to elevate the use of the narrative aspect of the SOTEs. We were looking at the courses and, particularly, the demands of the course. There are courses that are going to be high stakes, and then there are other courses that faculty may find themselves with different teaching experiences. This would be something we have not looked at as wholesale elimination of the numeric portion of the SOTES. We can look holistically at all of it, not just taking one portion over the other.

C: One other thing PS did discuss and change was University Norm Range to Norm Ranges, because we know there are department norm ranges, college norm ranges, and some departments may be teaching a particularly difficult class and the department norm ranges may be low. Maybe we need to tweak this a little to give departments flexibility in articulating which norm ranges are most relevant to their dossier.

C: I think our SOTEs should be categorized between tenure/tenure-track and lecturer. I think our ratio right now captures 60% lecturer and 40% tenure/tenure track. Breaking that data down could be really useful.

Q: Have you looked at any data with regard to the percentage of students who provide SOTEs out of the total number of students in a given class, and having done that, how did that inform your decisions to make changes in the policy?

A: Although we don't have the actual SOTE data to know how many are submitted, there were several of us on PS that have served on various RTP Committees. Part of PS concern was that based on the periodic SERB reports, there is a tendency to take a single data point and base it on that. We wanted this amendment to highlight that there should be that ballistic vantage point that includes not only the numeric data, but also looks deeply into the narrative. The other thing that is also part of the RTP training, is that when there is a low response rate that needs to be one of the contextualized things that needs to be considered; looking at that data whether it is the numerical or narrative data.

5

C: While looking for one kind of balance, you may be creating another kind of imbalance, which is that you are asking folks to take a closer look at narrative evaluations and it may be the case that those represent a very small percentage of the students in a class.

A: Our point was just to try to avoid having just the single SOTE item 13 used, but to look more holistically at the data that is available.

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

C. University Library Board (ULB):

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

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

VIII. **Special Committee Reports:**
Athletics Board Report for 2021-2022 presented by Professor Annette Nellen, Chair of the Athletics Board, Tamar Semerjian, Faculty Athletics Representative, Shonda Goward, AVP for UG Advising and Success, Jeff Konya, Director of Athletics, Kristan Kelly, Director of Compliance, <u>Time Certain: 4:00 p.m.</u>

Annette Nellen: The purpose of the Athletics Board as stated in the policy, F07-2 and modifications to it, is to be a sounding board. We are required to make an annual report to the Senate. We report to both the President and the Academic Senate. It is a special board. It does not have a representative from every college, but does have a majority of faculty as members with the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) as a member. There are two students including the AS President or their designee and the Chair of the Student Athletic Committee (SAC), an athlete, as required by the NCAA. A lot of time is spent at meetings asking questions so we can better understand the operation of athletics.

Jeff Konya (Athletics Director): [A video was presented remotely from Palm Springs, CA by Jeff Konya] After consulting with our students, the AS Board has come up with a new vision for athletics. It is replicated in the video. It preaches cutting edge experience with student athletes and building championship in the classroom, in competition, and in the community. Embedded in that vision are several different considerations and one of them is a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion and social and racial change. We hired our first-time day-to-day individual to look after those important considerations and we brought speakers in to speak to those particular items. We have as part of all our hiring an increased emphasis on diversity and inclusion. As far as Title IX updates, gender equity will be very prominent in terms of what we are trying to build. In terms of the Department of Justice (DOJ), we have ramped up our policies with respect to well-being attendant policies, sometimes referred to as the "chaperone" policies. All of our coaches and staff go through Title IX training.

We have also increased the ability of our student athletes to report issues in real time for an immediate response. They can remain anonymous. The report will immediately go to an administrator so we can figure out where these issues are coming from. As far as other aspects, amplification of the Spartan brand is very important to us. This is a strong marketing consideration for the university and intercollegiate athletics. Our Spartan brand relationship extends into NBC Bay Area in terms of real SJSU student athletes, their life stories, and academic successes. Our first broadcast was well received and had great viewership. We have also tried to emphasize the Spartan brand in social media. We've doubled some of our followers in social media. We are very cognizant of what is going on around us especially with the NCAA. There was a vote in January in terms of the NCAA trying to establish new governance and set of rules regarding how to conduct business in Division I. In essence it unbundled Division I, II, and III. Kristan Kelly will give an update in her comments on what the transformation committee is doing in trying to set the stage for what Division I could ultimately look like from a governance perspective. Some of you may know the buzz word, "name, image and likeness" that has come into the intercollegiate athletic space circa summer 2021. The NCAA allows student athletes to profit from the name, image, and likeness legislation. California is number one in law that allows student athletes to profit from their name, image, and likeness in rhythm with the intent of the NCAA. In consideration for those perspectives, SJSU worked with open door policies to establish our name, image, and likeness policies for our student athletes.

Kristan Kelly:
What you see on your screen are the 2020/2021 and 2021/2022 APR numbers. There will be no public release this year. The NCAA is planning on possibly going back to a public release next spring. So, what is APR? Academic Progress Rate (APR) is where the NCAA measures your academic success. It is based on four semesters where you get is two points for each student athlete that is receiving athletic aid. What they are looking at is one point each semester if you are academically eligible and then you get another point if you are a full-time student athlete. There are some exceptions if you are in your final semester before graduation, or if you graduate. If you notice in the numbers, we went up in 12 points in sports from the 2020/2021 year to the 2021/2022 year. We stayed the same in four sports. We dipped in four sports, but nothing was more than a four-point dip.   Some of the things we want you to know, and I want to thank the Provost and Shonda Goward, the SAS team right now is making a shift. We've been doing some really incredible work with them. The one thing we are going to start doing is using the colleges to advise student athletes. This is really cool for us. We are hoping it is going to be two-fold by giving our student athletes the best opportunity to have that advising and allow students to be engaged with faculty. Then from an NCAA perspective, in the past for anyone that transferred, in order for us to get that adjustment they had to leave with a 2-6. NCAA has recognized that the 2-6 is a little off especially if student athletes were able to leave and use their one-time transfer.   In August 2021, the NCAA took that

requirement off. Now if you leave an institution and you meet those regular progress sports rules, they are going to give you the adjustment anyway. We are making changes and we are expecting things to get better and better, especially with our partnership with Shonda Goward, her staff, and ongoing training.

The next subject I'll cover is the transformation committee. Just last week we met and tabled all the 2021/2022 legislation and they put a moratorium on any legislation for the 2022/2023 academic year. What they are saying is that they recognize the importance of the work of the transformation committee. It is going to make changes to legislation and they want the committee to really focus on what they are doing. There are five key elements that the transformation committee is charged with. The committee is focusing on three this year and they are student athlete experience, regulatory structure, and the impact of direct financial support for students. What does that look like? They are saying that when it comes to rules they keep academics at the forefront, but at the same time they are looking at things that really impact the student athlete especially in the 21st century. They are looking at things that will impact their ability to pursue professional endeavors. They are also looking at the transfer portal and how to make it more streamlined. Finally, they are looking at the infractions process. They want this to be a more streamlined, time-sensitive process, and the penalties need to fit what the violation is. They are also looking at financial benefits and how can we allow student athletes to benefit in this new world. As a transformation committee, SJSU has put a moratorium on legislation to let the committee focus on these areas. Next week the transformation committee will have another zoom meeting.

Tamar Semerjian:
Thank you for having me. I'm chair of the Kinesiology Department, but here today as the university's FAR. There have been significant changes in the athletics leadership and it has been a joy to work with them. I began the year developing several goals with the President's Office and I wanted to highlight those. One of the goals was to conduct a cluster analysis for majors with an eye toward any differential patterns towards gender and race. I'm hoping to have that analysis available by Fall 2022. The second goal was to have the Athletics Board consulted on competition and class schedules. We needed to have a conversation on how schedules might impact academic success. We also setup exit interviews for student athletes that are either graduating or going to other institutions. With have also submitted a referral to the Organization and Government Committee regarding the Athletics Board and the FAR policy. We look forward to working with the Senate on this policy. The final goal was to strengthen communication between the student athletes, athletics, and the FAR. We have had several meetings and have now setup regular meeting schedules with the FAR and athletics. The FAR is also working with a former student athlete, Dr. Hannah, to encourage student athletes to pursue a stem field in their baccalaureate work.

Questions:

Q: Can you give us an accounting of concussions at SJSU? Your predecessor gave us a previous report and promised annual reports we could compare to.

A: [Nellen] Because of the limited time to report today, we didn't include this. However, we can provide a report, or come and give a report to the Senate in the Fall. We have an independent doctor not affiliated with SJSU that does the report. [Konya] We will get the data for this group. There have been a lot of advances in this area over the last several years including advanced football helmets that are starting to reduce the number of concussions from a national perspective.

Q: The numbers in the APR were mostly between 900 to 1,000. How do the numbers for 2021/2022 and 2020/2021 compare to the pre-pandemic years?

A: That is a good question. These numbers are better than the pre-pandemic years, especially in men's sports. There was one sport that had a particularly low number and we are making progress in that sport now as well. The APR measures eligibility and retention predominantly. We also have a Graduate Success Rate (GSR) which is a compilation of a cohort in real time predictive of graduation success of the current student athlete population. And, we also have a Federal Graduation Rate (FSR) that we report to the government. These numbers compare the student athlete graduates to the overall university graduates. The most current rate that we can give you is the APR, because that is a track of the current population within the student athlete portfolio.

Q: There were two requirements that the DOJ made and one was that student athletes were to be surveyed on their knowledge of Title IX requirements. Another requirement was that a meeting take place every semester between the SAC, the Title IX Coordinator, and the Athletics Director. Can you provide a quick status on meeting these requirements?

A: We are in the process of fulfilling that last requirement. We had a Fall meeting with our new Title IX Coordinator (Skip Bishop), myself, and the SAC. We have another meeting setup for early May. We will then record that and put it into the DOJ compliance report. In terms of the Title IX knowledge base, we did have an outside group come in to assist with this. We've had different presentations depending on the audience. We've had student presentations and also staff presentations and analysis. It has been followed-up on with our student athlete's medical team, which is led by Laura Alexander. She will also be doing the concussion report. Laura is responsible for making sure we are in compliance with those regulations.

Q: I have some questions, maybe for next year. I'm particularly interested in how the academic challenges play out and hope you are tracking these changes and how our student athletes respond to different advising methods. They seem to run a little counterintuitive to what our students expressed before about what they prefer for academic advising, particularly around advising for student athletes. You also mentioned hiring somebody for athletics to focus on

[Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion] DEI work. I would be interested in seeing what initiatives are started and how they work out next year.

A: We are going to post what we are trying to achieve to the public and we can certainly include that document as well.

Q: I'm also interested in seeing the work on student financial support and helping student athletes see what their options are.

A: [Nellen] Thanks for the questions. Many things that the NCAA requires are really quite helpful to the students and the student athletes tend to have a higher graduation rate and speed. Student athletes also get very involved in talking to high school and junior high school students as far as being involved with the community. As far as financial aid, all our students need better knowledge. I've made notes on the reports you are looking for.

Shonda Goward:

The SAC team still exists. They are primarily focused on academic support and eligibility. We have shifted advising into the college, because they are the experts on updated curriculum and policy. We want student athletes to have the same experience as everyone else and also get the most updated information on what the curriculum is for their particular major. We also want them to interact with faculty. We also want them to meet people in their area outside of athletics. We don't want athletes that don't remain with their team to feel disconnected from their college and those are some of the reasons that we have shifted advising to the colleges. [Nellen] We want to make sure the student athlete is getting the same information from their college that every other student is getting. We think this is quite valuable.

IX. **New Business:**
Election of Two Faculty Members to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP), **Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.**

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that only the faculty could vote in this election. Senator Peter explained that the reason only the faculty were voting is that the other groups (staff, students, etc.) are holding their own elections for representatives to the committee. The nominees were: Monica Allen, Kathryn Blackmer-Reyes, Nancy DaSilva, Stefan Frazier, Mahendra Nidhi, Brandon White, and Hiu-Yung Wong. The candidates presented their statements of interest. **The Senate voted and Senator Frazier received a majority of the votes and was elected**. The nominee that received the lowest vote count was dropped. The Senate followed this procedure and voted six additional times until a majority vote was received. **Nidhi Mahendra was elected as the second faculty member to the committee with a majority of the votes**.

X. **State of the University Announcements:**
A. **Associated Students President (AS):** Moved to the next meeting.

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF): Moved to the next meeting.

C. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA): Moved to the next meeting.

D. Chief Diversity Officer: Moved to the next meeting.

E. CSU Faculty Trustee: Moved to the next meeting.

F. Statewide Academic Senators: Moved to the next meeting.

G. Provost: Moved to the next meeting.

XI.   **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Executive Committee Minutes
April 11, 2022
12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Karthika Sasikumar (Acting Chair), Brandon White, Julia Curry, Ravisha Mathur, Patrick Day, Stefan Frazier, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Steve Perez, Charlie Faas

Present Via Zoom: Tabitha Hart, Kimb Massey

Absent: Anoop Kaur, Kathleen Wong(Lau), Vincent Del Casino

1. Approval of the EC Agenda of April 11, 2022 (EC Agenda of April 11, 2022, Consent Calendar of April 11, 2022) (11-0-0).

2. Update from the President:
    Last week the WASC accreditation team was here for 2 ½ days. They had about 30 meetings while on campus. There appears to be nothing surprising from their findings of the visit. The draft report will be available for review in four to six weeks at which point we can make factual corrections. After that, the team will submit their report and there will be a response time prior to the final decision by WASC.

    A message will go out to the campus that we will be continuing our mask mandate through the end of the semester.

    Questions:
    Q: To what extent did people share their thoughts on modality, because up until now we assumed that any sort of hybrid counted as an online class?
    A: [President Perez] I was not in those meetings with WASC so I am not sure how this was discussed.
    C: WASC shouldn't require hybrid classes to be listed as online unless they are at least 50/50.

    Q: Will the mask mandate extend through the semester or the summer?
    A: [President Perez] The current plan is to remove the mask mandate after Spring graduation. However, it may need to be extended if circumstances warrant.
    C: Several universities that removed the mandate are considering reinstating it. Thanks for keeping the mask mandate. We don't want to be flip-flopping back and forth.

    Q: The audio quality at the WASC forum was terrible. Will there be a message sent to the campus with the specific recommendations?
    A: [President Perez] I don't want to paraphrase what was said in the summary recommendations. I don't have the report yet, but will provide the information when I have it.

Q: Regarding the petition students started that would require faculty to record and upload classes, we need to acknowledge that post-pandemic, we are in a new world. Students on campus are not reacting the same way they used to. They are less engaged. What is the best way to respond to this?

A: [President Perez] This is not just this campus but system-wide.

A: [VP Day] Students want to have a maximum level of support.

C: Faculty need to be brought into this conversation.

Q: Is it even permissible for me to upload the recordings into canvas? Part of me wants to do this for students, but part of me doesn't want to in case it might get someone into trouble by their comments. Are we talking about making it a requirement or a strong recommendation?

A: [President Perez] We are not discussing requiring faculty to do this [record and upload every class session]. The question is how do we deliver instruction for our students in a way they can best learn?

C: This is about so much more than just this petition from students. It is about the transition to post-pandemic times. There are faculty and staff concerns as well. I would like to advocate for building some structure and ways the administration can consult with the whole campus routinely. Open forums would allow us to get at what the challenges continue to be. The transition period will extend for years to come in my opinion. Having these forums and a process would strategically position us for the future.

A: [VP Day] There are situations where this would be a good fit. For this particular issue, there are many, many students that want in- person classes. We don't want the pandemic to be used by some students that want a different way of education. There is a group that wants to be able to decide how much of their class is in person and how much is online.

C: Faculty are concerned about going to a meeting while not being able to do anything but listen without action. We can't make every course recorded every time, so what do we say to students? The Senate takes the hit that we aren't doing enough for students.

A: [VP Day] There is value in listening to what students are saying. We need to think this through. We need to let students know they are being heard even if we can't do this right now, and need to look at the future.

C: I concur. However, if no actionable item is to come out of it, then that needs to be clearly communicated to students. A larger number of Senators need to hear this.

A: [VP Day] Right now we are having a healthy conversation in a small group, but when you expand to huge groups it can become less effective. There is no perfect way to do this or an easy fix. In students' minds, it is an easy fix, they see that before COVID-19 we couldn't do zoom, and in five minutes everyone went to being able to do zoom.

3. President's University Governance Award:

The committee discussed the President's University Governance Award and made a recommendation to the President. The recommendation was seconded. The committee voted and the recommendation was approved unanimously.

The committee discussed the low turnout in getting students to apply for everything this year including scholarships and awards, and ways this might be addressed. Several suggestions were made including having past recipients act as mentors, doing focus groups to see what the issues are, and getting the information out earlier where possible.

4. Updates from the Policy Committees:
   a. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
      C&R will be working on the GE Guidelines today. They will not be coming to the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting. C&R will also be doing curriculum reviews today.

   b. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
      I&SA will be bringing resolutions on Emergency Short-Term Loans and Add/Drop dates to the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting for final readings. I&SA may also be bringing a resolution to another policy that discusses add/drop dates. I&SA is working on an amendment to the grading policy that may come to the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting as a first reading. Finally, I&SA is working on the Probation and DQ Policy, but it will not come to the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting.

   c. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
      PS will be bringing an amendment to University Policy S15-8 on RTP to the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting. PS may have a resolution on University Policy S15-7 for the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting. PS will be hosting an in- depth training session on the guidelines on April 19, 2022 at 9 a.m.

   d. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
      O&G will be working on a resolution regarding the standing rules for the April 18, 2022 Senate meeting. Some of the highlights include removing explicit directive language that is restrictive. O&G is working on language that allows flexibility.

      C: These standing rules are the outcome of a previous consultative process and discussion including a vote in the Senate.

5. Update from the Vice President of Administration and Finance:
   The VPAF distributed a flyer on a meeting to be held by UPD with the community on April 28, 2022 from 2-4 p.m.

   Due to an increase in incidents around the perimeter of campus, UPD is advising students to be careful and alert when walking and try to avoid the perimeter.

   Questions:

Q: After the incident yesterday, what are you doing to provide safety tips to students in terms of walking the campus?
A: For those of you not aware, a 5'3" woman confronted a student with a knife. The woman became upset with the student for some reason. The student went one way and the lady went the other way and that was the extent of it. The VPSA has reached out to the student. We are telling students to go in pairs and walk in daylight. Most of the time these incidents are non-affiliate on non-affiliate, meaning they are all non-affiliated with SJSU.
C: There might be other strategies/tips we could give students that would be worth looking into.
C: [VP Day] This is a nationwide problem for urban schools.

6. Update from the CSU Statewide Senator:
    The next ASCSU meeting will be this Friday.

7. Update from the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):
    Admitted Spartan Days worked very well online this year and we are discussing whether future Admitted Spartan Days should be online or in person.

    New Student Orientation will be in person this summer.

    Our transfer student numbers for Fall are down, because transfer students from community colleges and the enrollment in community colleges is down. The majority of our transfer students come from DeAnza and their graduates are down by 15%.

    Our frosh student numbers for Fall are up and should balance out the transfer students. We are not terribly concerned at this point.

    The VPSA sent out the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) information this a.m. to committee members.

    Questions:
    Q: I attended an event on Friday and a Business alum asked me why SJSU never contacts the alum? This alum felt disconnected since they are never contacted. We should begin to treat students like alums as soon as Orientation.
    C: I had someone say the same thing to me, but when I researched it I found out she had told people not to contact her and had forgotten she did that.
    A: [President Perez] It does impact our alums and makes them feel as if we don't care about them when this happens. We need to show our appreciation. We are working on a strategy to put University Advancement into Orientation.

    Q: Last Friday a student contacted me and said they received a letter stating their application was pulled because they did not live in the area. Can you comment on this?
    A: There must be more to this story. Please send the information to the VPSA. He will do a follow-up.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 11, 2022.
The minutes were edited by Wynn Schultz-Krohn on April 20, 2022.
The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 25, 2022.

Executive Committee Minutes
April 25, 2022
Noon to 1:30 p.m.
CLK 551, Provost's Conference Room

Present: Karthika Sasikumar (Acting Chair), Kimb Massey, Brandon White,
               Julia Curry, Ravisha Mathur, Patrick Day, Stefan Frazier,
               Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Steve Perez, Vincent Del Casino,
               Anoop Kaur

Present Via Zoom: Stefan Frazier, Kathleen Wong(Lau), Charlie Faas,
                     Tabitha Hart

Absent: None

1.   There was no dissent to the EC agenda of April 25, 2022.

2.   The Executive Committee approved the EC minutes of April 11, 2022 as
       amended by Senator Mathur (12-0-1).

3.   Update from Interim President Perez:
       President Perez attended a Choraliers' and Hammer Theater production. Both
       were great performances.

       Enrollment headcount is up, but average unit loads seem to be down. SJSU is at
       103% of the funded FTES target, but that doesn't include out of state
       students. This is just California students. It would be good to have the average
       unit load increased. Evidence shows students who take full loads (15 units) do
       better with degree completion and graduating with less debt, so we need to
       continue working towards the goal of undergraduate students taking 15
       units/semester.

       Basic needs roundtable: Interim President Perez wants all 37,000 students to be
       treated the way his own children are treated. A call will be sent out soon
       regarding basic needs, food, and housing. SJSU Cares does a tremendous job,
       but we need to work on distributing information about services that are available.
       This will be an opportunity to discuss housing, digital equity, and technology
       needs.

       An email was sent last Friday about get-togethers (without a scheduled agenda)
       as an opportunity to strengthen the community. Please stop by to see friends or
       meet somebody new.

Questions:
Q: How can we get more questions and interaction with Interim President Perez at the Senate meetings?

Lack of questions at the last Senate meeting is troubling for Interim President Perez and the Senate Executive Committee as well. This might be due to the full agenda at the last meeting, or that more experienced Senators need to mentor new Senators (i.e., that asking questions at the Senate meeting is the right time and place to do so). It may also be due to people feeling intimidated or fatigued, so the above-mentioned get-togethers could really help.

Q: Is there an opportunity to let the wider campus know about the 2030 strategic plan and progress made? For example, Charlie presented specific details about one goal to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee last year and there has been so much progress that the wider community should know about.
A: When is the best time to do it? End of this semester, or the beginning of the next semester?
C: Fall is always a good time. There is excitement and energy at the beginning of the AY.
I went to Folklorico, and there were new seats in Tower Hall! I think Fall is the best time.

Q: What happened to the emptied spaces in Tower Hall?
A: The Alumni Association is using those spaces. There is limited office space in Tower Hall.

Q: The Senate wrote a Sense of the Senate (SOS)in 2018 asking for a creative solution to address bullying. There was a subsequent task force headed by CDO Wong(Lau) and Senate Chair McKee and the campus is waiting for this. Can we go back to that resolution and either start again or finish it to move forward, because bullying is still going on around campus?
A: Interim President Perez is aware of this SOS and asked CDO Wong(Lau) about it last week. She is waiting for Chair McKee to return from medical leave to revisit. She isn't sure how we will proceed. Campus civility and how we treat each other and engage in conversations is very important. We are hoping to start the work over the summer. A few people shouldn't be doing this, it should be a wider group.
Q: Please think about who is on the committee as too many supervisors may mute participation.
A: Agreed. It should be a wider group involved in the process, then a document written, and then taken out to the larger SJSU community for participation and input.
Q: What format do you imagine it might take? What would be the next steps?

A: It should be a descriptive document to create expectations and hold people accountable. If we put it in policy, then it is more involved (unions, etc.). This could be a better effort as a shared agreement instead of a policy.

Q: Yes, this is important because what do you do if your chair is bullying you? An Ombudsperson could be in order.

Q: Statewide policies have been put in play addressing this, so we are not starting from nothing. We should examine those resolutions (that discuss harassment, retaliation, ombudspersons).

Perhaps a task force that works with existing resolutions and materials and maybe even complaints? This isn't isolated incidents; it is happening on a much wider scale.

A: In past positions, the president addressed such incidents and issued reprimands accordingly. The president believes in professional conduct.

Q: One of the commendations from WASC was our Title IX reporting. There still isn't a lot of information available to campus (or on the Title IX website). Is there an opportunity to share this positive progress news?

A: Yes, there will be appropriate updates about what and when.

Q: Can there be a public statement (op-ed?) outside of campus? It is important to make statements about wrongs and how we are dealing with them.

A: We will see what we can do.

4. University Updates
   a. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs:
   The Provost has been traveling (some of it resulted in funding). The Provost will look at the average unit load indicator (so we can find out students who do not have full-loads).

   RTP is in full swing and the Provost loves reading these dossiers. He also enjoys providing feedback on them, as heand he tries to reads each file and meaningfully report back. There is a fair amount of different in ratings across levels of review. Perhaps more training is needed so that candidates know to include the right information and review committees rely less on one source of evidence, such as SOTEs, for evaluations. We need to better our evaluation and responses to make sure it is clear why a recommendation was made one way or the other. And, there is an over-reliance on SOTEs for the teaching evaluation portion of RTP. The third round of public voices applications are going out. The Provost is starting to see results in RTP with increased interdisciplinary research endeavors. The Provost is happy to see more interdisciplinary work being done.

   HonorsX update: HonorsX is only for upper-division students and transfer students. We received 200 partial applications and now almost 100 complete applications. We will accept 30 students who will be enrolled into the minors their second year. The Provost read some anecdotes that were positive from students

that will complete the interdisciplinary minor. The Provost feels it will attract transfer students. The faculty who are passionate about this drove this venture.

Questions:

Q: While it is true that students who take full loads do better, it may be just a choice because higher units may not work for all. So many students have so many other things going on that a full load isn't feasible. Let students make decisions that best work for them. Encourage nuances in the messaging so we don't pressure students to take on more than they can handle.

A: [Provost] Yes, and expectation-setting is important. There is data in the literature that setting expectations and engaging students about progress is important for diversity and equity. As a reminder, most students take more than 6 but fewer than 15 units which means you will spend 150% more on education, and that is very important. Setting a high bar for, and having robust conversations with our students can be a good thing.

A: [VP Day] This has been a critical component to the strategy of our peer institutions that have been able to move the needle. Encouraging a full load as a way to graduate sooner can be a very critical component to our strategy.

Q: The complex lives of students entails more than work. It can be divorces, domestic violence, leaving the country, etc. Students want not only to make it to graduation, but DO WELL when they do it (creates a sense of empowerment). However, debt is important. The depth and complexity of this conversation should be considered.

A: [VP Faas] Not only 150% of tuition, but two more years of time is added without the full load. This adds up.

Q: More scholarships could really help as well. Can we find funding to support students?

A: [Pres. Perez] Everything everyone is saying is correct.

Q: C&R got the strategic enrollment plan and was asked to respond, but doesn't know what to do with it. It was sent by Thalia Anagnos. Part of that document was about program growth (we aren't hiring enough lately). What is this document going to mean to the future of enrollment and curriculum? What's going to happen with this? How can C&R use this information to guide our review of new degree programs?

A: [VP Day] There are a number of academic decisions that need to be made. The document is a starting point.

A: [Provost] Without a larger budget investment, we often find ourselves moving the widgets around the table. Are we growing here and shrinking there? The challenge is: To grow another major with a thousand students, let's even see if we could hire the faculty for that. Would the system readjust allocations to meet where the growth is? Should we say no to programs (Data Science)? Probably not. If we get to 50% 4-year graduation rates, and 75% 6-year graduation rates,

we have more room to take new students. We have students we can't let in (who are qualified), because there is no room. There isn't an easy answer, because there aren't growth dollars coming in.

Q: When looking at this and making a decision, does it mean they lose FTEF? If you see that a program is low-enrolled, then build it up. However, is that what we want to do? The document shows only the top five programs and not the bottom five. It seems to be coming up with a plan.

b. Update from the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO): *Note that the CDO had to leave the meeting early for another critical meeting.*

c. Update from the VP of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
Last week the President asked the question, are we higher than normal with 5150s (mental health holds). The data net version is, we are in the same place we were pre-pandemic. It looked higher for affiliates last year, because we didn't have anyone living on campus. Most numbers reflect non-affiliates (people not affiliated with campus) declining. November and April seemed to have a slight spike for affiliates. We are looking at comparing data affiliates/non-affiliate incidences. We are looking to have mental health professionals working with the police department using a model similar to San Diego State. We are also working with Santa Clara county.

d. Update from the AS President:
The Spartan Showcase Gala is tonight, it should be a great event. AS is working on their 2022-2023 budget. We are continuing their search for the new CDC director. There is a conditional offer and we hope to conclude that process soon.

The elections board 2022-23 had some grievances and they are managing those right now.

AS won four places at the ACUI graphic competition. They won first place for their 20-21 annual report. They also had a Cal State Association visit last Friday on campus.

There will be two graduate students on the next board (AS is broadening their inclusivity to students).

e. Update from the CSU Statewide Senate:
The ASCSU had meetings of the policy committees on Friday, April 22. Senator Curry provided a report on the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee, of which she is a member, but did not have information from Senators Rodan and Van Selst. During their meeting they had a visit from Trustee Sabalius, who

discussed their resolution, *AS-3542-22/FA Loss of Confidence in the Board of Trustees' Handling of Former Chancellor Castro's Resignation and Call to Reform Executive Compensation Upon Separation from the CSU.* They introduced this at a previous meeting, and needed to integrate comments before the May plenary. In general, they received conflicting feedback, but in light of the Sonoma, Fresno, and SJSU incidents, we are taking it forward. The intent is to let the BOT know that "we don't have confidence in how they handled things in the past." They also recognized that they took a step in the right direction mandating Title IX and retreat rights policy revisions. The committee indicated that if it were not for the journalism reports, these investigations would not be taking place. By the same token, the external review is still being done by a firm that is known for spin and may have the interest of putting CSU and the BOT in good light rather than doing a thorough examination. A major concern is how to right the ship of a culture that has been against survivors and for defending the university's reputation.

Another policy with great discussion was *AS-3550-22/FA Chancellor and President Search Process in the California State University (CSU) system: Announcement of Finalists and Campus Visits.* The faculty want transparency and shared governance beginning with reopening the search process.

Further discussion on the low morale in terms of workload, emotional labor, isolation, and burnout, partly due to these unfolding elements of a hostile culture and policies.

Lastly, we were told that the May policy committee and plenary meetings will be in person in Long Beach on May 18-20.

Questions:
Q: AB 928: Will the recommendations for the common pathway be sent to campuses for feedback? If so we need to prepare to provide information and feedback.
A: The calendar states recommendations will be disseminated 5/6. We should utilize the summer to discuss how we can collect feedback from the campus in early Fall.

f. Update from VP Student Affairs (VPSA):
Admitted Spartan Days were great. This past Saturday we had many admitted students on campus and it was a great day. It was not intended for everyone, but for people who wanted to see campus. There were lots of out-of-town folks. We are working on intent to enroll all the way to the end and welcoming students. We are seeing people waiting until the last second to file application paperwork. The Cal Grants reform policy looks like it is going to happen and details will be provided about that later. The proposal looks to expand Cal Grants to support additional students.

Q: Can you provide an update regarding modality for fall? Are we sticking with the 70% in person? What is the demand based on enrollment?
A: [Provost] We are sticking with the 70%. Not for every single program, it is a discussion within the colleges.
Q: There has been discussion about criteria for closing a class. What are those criteria?
A: [Provost] We are not micromanaging this process. There are many pressures on the academic budgets, and we don't want to create bottlenecks. We need to be student-centered.

The minutes were taken by the Associate Vice Chair, Kimb Massey on April 25, 2022. The minutes were edited by Eva Joice, Senate Administrator, Senator Winifred

Schultz-Krohn, Senator Ravisha Mathur, and Acting Chair Sasikumar on April 28, 2022. The minutes were amended and approved by the Executive Committee on May 2, 2022.

1	**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2	**Academic Senate**
3	**Curriculum and Research Committee** **AS 1807**
4	**May 9, 2022**
5	**Final Reading**
6	

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)

Rescinds: S14-5

Whereas: The current Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) have not been updated or reviewed since they were approved in 2014; and

Whereas: To be compliant with CSU General Education Breadth Requirements (formerly called EO 1100), Curriculum and Research (C&R) recommended to the Academic Senate changes to Area D and creation of Area F effective Fall 2021 that were signed by the president; and

Whereas: Those changes allowed C&R to continue gathering feedback and incorporating changes where appropriate through Fall 2021 semester; and

Whereas: C&R consulted extensively over two years with many stakeholders (including hundreds of faculty, advisors, students, administrators, and others via a GE summit, and thirteen forums in Fall 2021 alone); therefore, be it

Resolved: That the attached GE Guidelines be adopted effective Fall 2022; and be it further

Resolved: That C&R is the body responsible for maintaining, updating, and interpreting the GE Guidelines. C&R shall be authorized to recommend changes to the GE Guidelines as needed. All recommended changes shall be presented on the Consent Calendar to the Academic Senate; and be it further

Resolved: That Section VII of University Policy S17-11 (Organization of the Program Planning Process at SJSU) will be revised to reflect modifications to GE Program assessment and continuing certification of GE courses. Annual assessment reports for General Education courses will no longer be collected at the university level beginning in Fall 2022.

43	**Resolved:**	That the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), in consultation with the
44		Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, will begin recertification of all courses
45		starting in Fall 2022 and completing all recertifications no later than Fall 2025
46		using ad hoc General Education Review PanelsGRPs in accordance with
47		University Policy F15-13 ; and be it further
48		
49	**Resolved:**	That the General Education, American Institutions and Graduation Writing
50		Assessment Requirements (GWAR) Guidelines shall undergo a full university
51		review with submission of a program planning document that will be initiated by
52		the General Education Advisory Committee beginning in AY 2030/31. Any
53		recommended changes to the GE Guidelines shall be referred to C&R for
54		deliberation.
55		
56	**Rationale:**	In the academic year 2016/17, SJSU's General Education Program was
57		reviewed through the Program Planning Process and an action plan was
58		developed in 2018 to review and update the program learning outcomes and
59		develop more effective processes for assessment. An *ad hoc* committee was
60		created to review and modify the program learning outcomes in the academic
61		year 2018/19. These new learning outcomes were presented to the C&R
62		Committee which, in conjunction with the Academic Senate Office, held two
63		campus-wide General Education Summits in late Fall 2019 and early Spring
64		2020 to gather feedback on the program learning outcomes, the GE Area
65		Learning Outcomes, and many other aspects of our GE Guidelines. These
66		guidelines were also distributed in early Spring 2021 and C&R carefully reviewed
67		all the feedback that was received. Thirteen additional forums were held in Fall
68		2021. This extensive community input was reviewed, summarized, and
69		considered when creating the new GE Guidelines. Based upon consideration of
70		the feedback that has been received by the Curriculum and Research
71		Committee, these updated guidelines incorporate the creation of the new GE
72		Area F (Ethnic Studies) with reduction of Area D to 6 units as well as changes to
73		each GE Area, the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (formerly known
74		as Area Z on our campus), and the American Institutions Graduation
75		Requirements.

76 **Timeline and Implementation**: All undergraduate students entering SJSU Fall 2022 and after
77 will be subject to the 2022 GE Guidelines. According to CSU policy, continuing SJSU students
78 and continuously enrolled California Community College transfer students can opt to adhere to
79 the GE Guidelines aligned with their catalog rights.

80	**Approved:**	May 5, 2022
81	**Vote:**	12-0-0
82	**Present:**	Richard Mocarski (seat A), Thalia Anagnos (seat B), Marc d'Alarcao (seat
83		C), Gigi Smith (seat D), Faranak Memarzade (seat E), Cara Maffini (seat

84		F), Katy Kao (seat G). Wei-Chien Lee (seat H), Sharmin Khan (seat I),
85		Brandon White (seat J, chair), Marie Haverfield (seat K), Chloe Cramer
86		(seat L)
87	**Absent:**	None
88	**Workload impact:**	There will be a temporary increase in workload for (1) faculty to update
89		syllabi and curriculum to bring courses into compliance with the new GE
90		Guidelines, (2) temporarily, faculty to switch from assessing GE ALOs
91		(formerly known as GELOs) to PLOs, (3) the General Education Advisory
92		Committee (GEAC) and ad hoc General Education Review Panels
93		created to help GEAC recertify courses to align with the new guidelines,
94		and (4) staff to make changes to the online catalog, various websites,
95		publications and PeopleSoft.

1   **San José State University**
2   **Academic Senate**
3   **Committee on Instruction and Student Affairs   AS 1831**
4   **May 9, 2022**
5   **Final reading**
6
7   **Policy Recommendation:**
8   **Adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses; the "W"**
9   **symbol; and refunds related to withdrawals**
10
11 *Legislative history: rescinds and replaces S05-12 and F04-2. Amends F15-3.*
12
13 Whereas: Current policy allows insufficient time for students to adjust their course
14   schedules in the first few weeks of the semester; and
15
16 Whereas: Allowing students to drop courses up to the census date would prevent
17   them from incurring "W" grades on their transcript, which count toward
18   "units attempted" for semester enrollment and financial aid eligibility
19   purposes; and
20
21 Whereas: Allowing students to drop courses without a petition up to the census date
22   will speed up this process, opening up seats for other students; and
23
24 Whereas: Having a single deadline for both dropping and adding courses adds
25   clarity and consistency; and
26
27 Whereas: Until the seventh day of instruction, students are automatically enrolled in
28   courses if they are on waitlists, in accordance with F20-1; and
29
30 Whereas: Permission codes can therefore be required in order to add courses
31   starting on the eighth day of instruction, giving faculty control over
32   enrollment at that point; be it therefore
33
34 Resolved: That S05-12 and F02-2 be rescinded, and the following become university
35   policy.
36
37 Resolved: That in F15-3 "Establishing a Committed Presence in a Class," the
38   sentence "Six instructional days before Census Day, i.e. the 14th day of
39   instruction, is the last day for the student to add a class" be modified to

40		"One instructional day before Census Day is the last day for the student to
41		add a class."
42		
43	Approved:	April 11, 2022
44	Vote:	11-1
45	Present:	Allen, Frazier, French, Hill, Jackson (non-voting), Kumar,
46		Leisenring (non-voting), Lupton, Merz, Sen, Walker, Wilson, Yang,
47		Yao
48	Absent:	Kaur, Masegian, Rollerson, Wolcott
49	Financial impact:	Reduced late add fee for students: late add fee between add
50		deadline and Census Day (currently $45) would no longer apply.
51	Workload impact:	Reduced workload for Registrar's Office, Undergraduate Education,
52		and College of Graduate Studies in processing late drop and add
53		petitions in the pre-Census period. Reduced workload for faculty,
54		department chairs, and administrators in signing late drop and add
55		petitions. Potential increased workload for faculty if students are
56		granted permission to add classes late.
57		
58		

Adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses; the "W" symbol; and refunds related to withdrawals

Note: Census Day is the 20th day of instruction.

1. Adding, dropping, and withdrawing from courses; and the "W" symbol

    a. *Starting on the 8th day of instruction, instructor consent (a permission code) shall be required for a student to add a class. The online registration system (currently PeopleSoft) will be programmed accordingly and per F20-9.*

    b. The last day for a student to add class (with a permission code) and / or drop a class shall be *one instructional day before Census Day.*[1]

    c. Late drops (*withdrawals*): on or after Census Day, a student may withdraw from class only for "serious and compelling reasons" ~~which shall be defined as circumstances and genuine emergencies beyond the student's control.~~ Poor academic performance or non-attendance, in the absence of other extenuating circumstances, are not valid reasons for withdrawing from a course.

    d. ~~These circumstances must be documented with such evidence as death certificates (or equivalent) of immediate family members, letters from employers, or notes from healthcare providers, doctors, or death certificate (or equivalent) of immediate family member.~~

    e. The Vice Provost~~President~~ for Undergraduate Education, ~~Studies~~ *and the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies* shall *together* develop a list of acceptable circumstances and guidelines for *supporting documentation* ~~certification~~ of said circumstances, petition forms ~~to be issued to all colleges~~ (which shall include space to state the reasons for the proposed withdrawal, and the current grade the student is earning), and appropriate sanctions for those submitting fraudulent *documentation* ~~certification~~

    f. The President shall appoint one individual (in accordance with Executive Order 1037~~268~~) to administer course and university withdrawals. This

---

[1] See separate policy S20-9 for instructor drops.

97	individual will be responsible for distributing and receiving petitions,
98	verifying *supporting documentation* ~~certification~~, and approving withdrawal
99	from the University. ~~A department, school or college, (hereafter referred to~~
100	~~as an academic unit) that wishes to be exempt from this provision may~~
101	~~apply for an exemption for a period of three years by submitting a written~~
102	~~statement to the Undergraduate, or if appropriate, the Graduate Studies~~
103	~~Office, explaining how an exemption best serves its academic mission.~~
104	~~Upon receipt, either the Associate Vice President of the Undergraduate or~~
105	~~Graduate Studies Office shall either approve or deny the exemption~~
106	~~request. If the exemption request is approved, the exempted academic~~
107	~~unit's highest ranking administrative officer shall have the authority to~~
108	~~approve or deny late drop petitions for their courses for a period of three~~
109	~~academic years, beginning with the semester the exemption request was~~
110	~~granted. The highest ranking administrative officer for a department is the~~
111	~~department chair; for a school, the highest ranking administrative officer is~~
112	~~the program director and for a college, the highest ranking administrative~~
113	~~officer is the dean. Within 3 working days of approving or denying a late~~
114	~~drop petition, an academic unit shall convey the decision to the~~
115	~~President's appointee using electronic mail and also send to the~~
116	~~President's appointee the original, signed late drop petition and a copy of~~
117	~~all other supporting materials related to the late drop petition. In the event~~
118	~~of an approved late drop petition, upon notification by the administrative~~
119	~~unit, the President's appointee shall then immediately notify the~~
120	~~appropriate administrative units of the late drop decision.~~
121	
122	g. In the case of course withdrawals, students must first obtain the faculty
123	member's signature. This signature *acknowledges that the faculty member*
124	*has been informed of the student's intent to drop the course* ~~indicates that~~
125	~~the student has been advised of his/her options regarding the course.~~
126	Students will be advised to *consult with their appropriate academic*
127	*advisors about the possible impacts of dropping the course*, ~~about the~~
128	~~possible negative impact of the "W" on their transcript and where~~
129	~~appropriate~~, *and will* be encouraged to consult with *the Financial Aid*
130	*Office about how this may impact their financial aid eligibility or award, if*
131	*appropriate* ~~Academic Services~~. If a faculty member does not sign the
132	petition, the matter will be resolved ~~either~~ by the President's appointee. ~~or~~
133	~~the highest ranking administrative officer for the exempted academic unit~~
134	~~(Department Chair, School Director, or College Dean. The President's~~
135	~~appointee or the highest ranking administrative officer of the exempted~~
136	~~academic unit will verify the certification that the student uses to indicate~~

137 ~~"serious and compelling" reasons for needing to withdraw before signing~~
138 ~~the petition.~~

140 h. ~~When a "W" appears on a student's transcript, the transcript will contain a~~
141 ~~notice that withdrawals at San Jose State University are given only for~~
142 ~~circumstances beyond the student's control, and not for any other reason,~~
143 ~~including academic performance. The "W" will~~ *not be counted* ~~remain~~
144 ~~uncounted in the student's GPA, as before.~~

146 i. The option of the Incomplete remains as before.

148 j. A "WU" *is the appropriate grade* ~~remains appropriate~~ to assign when a
149 student, who is enrolled on Census Day, does not successfully petition for
150 a "W" but fails to complete course requirements, and those assignments
151 that were completed were insufficient to make normal evaluation of
152 academic performance possible. A "WU" counts toward the GPA as an
153 "F."

155 2. Refunds in relation to dropping or withdrawing from courses

157 a. For regular state supported semesters, refund regulations for the CSU
158 system are prescribed by the California Code of Regulations Title 5,
159 Section 41802 and applicable CSU Chancellor Executive Orders. In
160 particular, at SJSU, the principles for refunds include the following:

162 i. Dates for full refunds shall be as close as possible to the first day of
163 instruction (not the first course meeting), but shall in no case be
164 more than five business days before the first day of instruction;

166 ii. Information regarding refunds shall be stated clearly and
167 disseminated widely as early as possible so that students and
168 departments can plan in a timely manner. For regular state
169 supported sessions, all refund information will be posted in all
170 versions of the Schedule of Classes where fee and payment
171 information is publicized. The information will also be detailed on
172 the Bursar's website.

174 b. Title 5, Section 41802 states that for self-support, special sessions and
175 extension course fees, refunds shall be made in accordance with policies
176 and procedures established by each campus. At SJSU, the refund

177 procedures shall be established by the *College of Professional and Global*
178 *Education* ~~International and Extended Studies Office~~, and shall include the
179 following:
180
181   i. Dates for full refunds for self-support, special sessions, and
182   extension courses shall be as close as possible to the first day of
183   instruction (not the first course meeting) ~~for those events~~ but shall
184   in no case be more than five business days before the first day of
185   instruction;
186

1   **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2   **Academic Senate**   **AS 1832**
3   **Organization and Government Committee**
4   **May 9, 2022**
5   **Final Reading**
6
7   **SENATE MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION**
8   **Update of the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate**
9
10 **Amends: Senate Standing Rules**
11
12 **Rationale:**
13 The SJSU community is now emerging from the disruption caused by the global
14 COVID-19 pandemic. For the last two years the Academic Senate, like many SJSU
15 units, suspended its in-person activities and, with the ongoing support of its members,
16 conducted its business remotely. Now, however, we anticipate the resumption of our
17 community's post-pandemic operations.
18
19 The topic of meeting modality, which was discussed at the Spring 2022 Senate Retreat
20 (a brief summary of which is included on the final page of this document), was helpful in
21 surfacing two main tenets of Senators' experiences: that it is important to honor
22 cherished and impactful traditions of the Senate; likewise, that it is important that the
23 Senate as an organization be responsive and adaptable to the times. In considering
24 how the Senate Standing Rules handle meeting modality, we recognize the implications
25 not simply for attendance but also, more importantly, on Senators' active participation in
26 and deep engagement with the work of the Senate as carried out through its meetings.
27
28 In careful consideration of our current and future Senators' experiences and needs, and
29 in keeping with the Senate's mission to provide for effective participation and
30 deliberation by the academic community in the formulation of governing policies for our
31 university, we therefore recommend that Item 17 Section g of the Standing Rules be
32 updated and that the updates contained herein be adopted once passed by the Senate.
33
34

35

Senate Management Resolution
Recommended Updates to Senate Standing Rules

Item 17 ~~Committee~~ Meetings and Minutes, Section g ~~Remote~~ Attendance

1) Academic Senate:
Any action taken by the Academic Senate requires a quorum of members in attendance.The Senate Chair shall determine the modality (including remote attendance where appropriate) utilizing an advisory poll of the Senate members at large, and seeking consensus among the members of the Executive Committee of the Senate. Such decisions shall be guided by current conditions; available resources; the needs of Academic Senate members; and the efficacy of the meeting modality for facilitating the Academic Senate's work.

2) Executive Committee of the Senate:
Any action taken by the Executive Committee requires a quorum of members in attendance. The Senate Chair shall determine the modality (including remote attendance where appropriate) after seeking consensus among the members of the Executive Committee of the Senate. Such decisions shall be guided by current conditions; available resources; the needs of Academic Senate members; and the efficacy of the meeting modality for facilitating the Academic Senate's work.

3) Policy Committees:
Any action taken by the Policy Committee requires a quorum of members in attendance. The Policy Committee Chair shall confirm the modality (including remote attendance where appropriate) after achieving consensus among the members of that policy committee. Such decisions shall be guided by current conditions; available resources; the needs of Academic Senate members; and the efficacy of the meeting modality for facilitating the Academic Senate's work.

4) All Other Committees:
Any action taken by the committee requires a quorum of members in attendance. The Committee Chair shall confirm the modality (including remote attendance where appropriate) after achieving consensus among the members of that committee. Such decisions shall be guided by current conditions; available resources; the needs of Academic Senate members; and the efficacy of the meeting modality for facilitating the Academic Senate's work.

Approved: DATE

Vote: 10-0-0

Present: Andreopoulos, Baur, Hart, Higgins, Jochim, Kataoka, Millora, Muñoz-
                Muñoz, Tian, Zhao

82   **Absent**:   Sandoval-Rios

83

84   **Financial impact**: None anticipated.

85   **Workload impact**: None anticipated.

86

87

Senators' input on modality, collected at 2022 Senate Retreat

Modality	Pros	Cons
in person	Sense of community, togetherness Ability to have in-person side conversations Can see how others vote	Reduced body language Difficult to have side convos Seating hierarchy of the physical room Not all seats are good Accessibility & barriers to attendance
online synchronous (via Zoom)	Easy to see each speaker Can clearly hear speakers Ease of participation More equal participation Enhancement of chat feature	Votes have become secret Less personal Technology & equity issues
hybrid	Allows for choice Maximally accessible	Concern about differential treatment Difficult to facilitate

1	**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2	**Academic Senate** **AS 1833**
3	**Professional Standards Committee**
4	**May 9, 2022**
5	**Final Reading**
6	

7   **Amendment H to University Policy S15-8**

8   **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**

9   **Criteria and Standards: To include within the category of Academic**

10   **Assignment, activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational**

11   **equity and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities**

12

Amends: **University Policy S15-8**

14–15   Resolved: That S15-8 be amended as indicated by strikeout and underline as appropriate.

16   Resolved: That these changes become effective for AY 2022-2023.

17–25   Rationale: S15-8 revised S98-8 to improve and enhance the clarity of criteria in the category of Academic Assignment for faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion decision. The following changes were informed by SS-S21-2 Support for Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity and Inclusion and the following documents: UP-FS Fall 2020 Faculty Survey, the RTP Process for BIPOC Faculty report from UP-FS, Black Spartans Community Letter to President Papazian, Asian Pacific Islander Faculty & Staff Association Letter to President Papazian, and discussions with the Faculty Diversity Committee.

26   Approved: May 2, 2022

27   Vote: 8-0-0

28–30   Present: Magdalena Barrera, Nidhi Mahendra, Priya Raman, Alaka Rao, Shannon Rose Riley, Gokay Saldamli, Neil Switz, Winifred Schultz-Krohn (Chair)

31   Absent: Nina Chuang, Nyle Monday

32   Financial Impact: No direct impact

33–34   Workload Impact: Additional training of RTP committee members addressing SOTE/SOLATE interpretation

35   S15-8 text:

36   2.2 Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

37 2.2.1 Academic Assignment is the specific role given to a faculty member to support the
38 educational mission of San José State University. Academic Assignment is the primary,
39 but not the only, consideration in evaluating a faculty member's performance and is the
40 essential condition for continuation and advancement within the university. For most
41 faculty, academic assignment consists primarily of teaching; academic assignment
42 includes work in the department to support educational equity and/or close equity gaps
43 through the recruitment, mentoring, retention, and academic support for historically
44 underserved students in the department, and training of colleagues in such efforts. For
45 some faculty, such as department chairpersons, coordinators, and field supervisors,
46 part or all of their academic assignment is of a non-teaching nature, and they should be
47 evaluated accordingly; RSCA release should be evaluated under
48 Scholarly/Creative/Professional Achievement. However, release for departmental
49 administration and the like can be evaluated as appropriate in other Categories of
50 Achievement (Academic Assignment, Service, or Scholarly/Creative/Professional
51 Achievement), depending on the emphasis of the work as represented by the candidate.

52 2.2.2 Considerations in applying the criteria for Academic Assignment to teaching.

53 2.2.2.1 When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and
54 administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. The teaching must
55 be considered in the context of its purpose, its objectives, and the degree of
56 difficulty of the assignment. Evaluators must be well versed in the University
57 policy F12-6 "Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching", especially the most recent
58 "SOTE/SOLATE Interpretation Guide", and have explicit training with respect to
59 issues of subjectivity and bias in SOTEs, especially for faculty traditionally
60 underrepresented within their field.

61 2.2.2.2 Examples of contextual factors include whether the teaching resulted
62 from newly created or substantially modified curricula (e.g., but not limited to,
63 changes to promote educational equity); participation in team or interdisciplinary
64 teaching; the adoption of new pedagogical or technological approaches; whether
65 the level or kind of teaching or number of students created special demands or
66 challenges; and the extent to which student learning occurs outside formal
67 instruction through mentoring, advising, or the integration of students into a
68 research program, especially where these impact historically underserved
69 students.
70

71 2.2.3 For non-teaching Unit 3 faculty employees, effectiveness in academic assignment
72 will be evaluated in conformity with guidelines developed by the unit of assignment, with
73 appropriate components of peer evaluation and evaluation of impact on students.

74 2.2.4 Department Chairs, Directors, Coordinators, etc. may be nonteaching faculty due
75 to the portion of their chair assignment or other academic assignments. In such cases,
76 their related duties should be discussed as part of Academic Assignment – especially
77 as related to curriculum and program development and oversight. Other areas of a
78 Chair's or coordinator's Academic Assignment may also be discussed more thoroughly
79 under RSCA or Service.

80

3.3.1 Academic Assignment

3.3.1.1 Committees and administrators shall write an evaluation of a candidate's achievements in academic assignment and shall rate the overall performance in this category according to the following descriptive scale. When a candidate's achievements are significant but depart from the general description below, evaluators should exercise judgment and give credit for unusual, unique, or unanticipated activities at the same level as better known activities of comparable significance. Especially in unusual cases, candidates should carefully document the significance of their accomplishments in academic assignment.

3.3.1.2 Criteria for nonteaching faculty.

Criteria for evaluating the Academic Assignment of nonteaching faculty, including potentially Librarians and Counselors, will be developed by the units as part of their department guidelines and will parallel the categories identified below, but will reference those specific responsibilities in their academic assignment rather than teaching. Department guidelines for academic assignment will be mandatory for such units.

3.3.1.3 Criteria for teaching faculty.

3.3.1.3.1 Unsatisfactory. The candidate has not documented teaching accomplishments that meet the baseline level as described below.

3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description as evidenced by syllabi and other materials related to the academic assignment. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior ~~performance~~ evaluations. Recent direct (e.g. peer) observations are supportive. ~~Narrative SOTEs must also be examined for a holistic view. Student numerical responses within the university and norms by the end of the review period~~ narrative and/or numerical course ~~evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are generally within the norms by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter.~~

Student numerical SOTEs, narrative SOTEs, and other evidence indicate effectiveness in academic assignment, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Numerical SOTEs are generally within norm ranges by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter.

3.3.1.3.3 Good. In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has documented a degree of innovation within the teaching assignment and provides

evidence of using inclusive or equity-based practices, especially use of related techniques in the classroom.

For example, a candidate at this level may have effectively taught a wide range of courses, or created one or more new courses to fill important curricular needs, or documented the use of high-impact practices in teaching, or been actively involved in mentoring, outreach, or student support, particularly for historically underrepresented students. Candidates meeting this level of achievement have direct (e.g. peer) observations that identify a faculty member with good skills in the academic assignment. Numerical SOTEs, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are generally above mean, and above norm ranges where possible, by the end of the review period, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter. Narrative SOTEs further confirm effective teaching and support for student learning, keeping in mind the nature and subject of the course.

3.3.1.3.4 Excellent. In addition to criteria for good performance as described above, the candidate has ~~either~~ engaged in a higher level of curricular or pedagogical innovation, ~~than described above~~, documented consistent positive impacts for student success ~~and/or~~ educational equity, or received peer and student course evaluations that are consistently above mean (and, where possible, above norms) when taken in context of the nature, subject, and level of classes taught. Excellent teachers may have received recognition or awards for their teaching, ~~they~~ may have mentored other teachers, or ~~they~~ may have created curriculum that is adopted in other departments or at other institutions. Excellence in academic assignment may include exceptional advising, recruitment, retention and mentoring of students, and the like.

6

7   **Policy Recommendation:**
8   **Amendment C to University Policy S09-7,**
9   **Grading Symbols, Drop and Withdrawal; Retroactive Drop**
10   **and Retroactive Withdrawal; Assignment of Grades and**
11   **Grade Appeals; Change of Grade; and Integrity of the**
12   **Academic Record**

13

14 **Legislative History:** *Amends S09-7*

15

16 Whereas: There is a slight ambiguity in the wording of S09-7 regarding precisely
17   who is responsible for assigning grades in class sections; and

18

19 Whereas: The ambiguity must be removed in order to affirm individual faculty's rights
20   to and responsibility for assigning grades; be it therefore

21

22 Resolved: That S09-7, sec. III.A be revised as indicated below.

23

24

25 Approved: April 11, 2022
26 Vote: 12-0
27 Present: Frazier, French, Hill, Jackson (non-voting), Kumar, Leisenring (non-
28   voting), Lupton, Masegian, Merz, Sen, Walker, Wilson, Yang, Yao
29 Absent: Allen, Kaur, Rollerson, Wolcott
30 Financial impact: None.
31 Workload impact: None.

32

33

34

III. Assignment of Grades (Sections A, B, C, D.1) and Grade Appeals (Sections D.2, E, F)

The following principles support the minimum standards governing the assignment of grades and provisions for appeals (per EO 1037):

A. ~~Faculty have the sole right and responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades.~~ <u>The individual instructor of record for each class section has the sole right and responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades in that section.</u>

B. There is a presumption that grades assigned are correct. It is the responsibility of anyone appealing an assigned grade to demonstrate otherwise.

C. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as instructor or clerical error, prejudice or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

D.
   1. Students who believe that an appropriate grade has not been assigned should first seek to resolve the matter informally with the instructor of record (per Section IV).
   2. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, the student may pursue a grade appeal and present his or her case to the Student Fairness Committee (according to University Policy S07-6, Student Fairness Dispute Resolution), have it reviewed and, where justified, receive a grade correction.

E. If the instructor of record does not assign a grade, or if he or she does not change an assigned grade when the necessity to do so has been established by appropriate campus procedures, it is the responsibility of other qualified faculty as determined by the appropriate campus entity. "Qualified faculty" means one or more persons with academic training comparable to the instructor of record who are presently on the faculty at that campus.

F. SJSU shall maintain and implement existing policy and procedures covering the assignment of grades and grade appeals that include the following provisions:

   1. The time and manner of reporting course grades including provisions for assuring that such grades have been assigned by the instructor of record.
   2. Circumstances under which the instructor of record may change a grade once assigned, and procedures for making such changes.

78	3. A means for preliminary review of potential appeals that may resolve
79	differences before initiation of formal proceedings.
80	4. Grounds for which a grade appeal is permitted.
81	5. One or more committees for hearing grade appeals that shall provide
82	safeguards to assure due process for both student and instructor. Such
83	committees shall include student membership. Student members shall not
84	participate in assignment of grades.
85	6. Procedures whereby grades are assigned by other qualified faculty in
86	circumstances where the instructor of record does not do so, including
87	those instances where a grade change is recommended by a grade
88	appeals committee and the instructor of record does not carry out that
89	recommendation.
90	7. Specification of time limits for completion of various steps in the appeal
91	process and of the time period during which an appeal may be brought.
92	8. Description of the extent of the authority of appeal committee(s), including
93	provisions that clearly limit grade changes to instances where there is a
94	finding that the grade was improperly assigned.
95	9. Limitation of committee authority to actions that are consistent with other
96	campus and system policy.
97	10. A statement that there is a presumption that grades assigned are correct.
98	Thus, the burden of proof rests with the individual who is appealing.
99	11. Procedures for dealing with allegations of improper procedure.
100	12. Assignment of authority to revise policies and procedures for grade
101	appeals to the campus faculty senate. The campus president is
102	responsible for ensuring that such revisions conform to the principles and
103	provisions of this executive order.
104	13. Provision for annual reporting to the President and Academic Senate on
105	the number and disposition of cases heard.

1 **San José State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Committee on Instruction and Student Affairs**   **AS 1835**
4 **May 9, 2022**
5 **Final Reading**
6

Policy Recommendation:
Amendment B to University Policy F20-1,
Adding Classes after Advance Registration

10
11 **Legislative History**: *Amends University Policy F20-1*
12
13 Whereas: There is a slight ambiguity regarding the timing noted in F20-1 "Adding
14   Classes after Advance Registration"; be it
15
16 Resolved: That the following changes be made to this sentence in the third
17   paragraph of F20-1: "Waitlists will remain active until the seventh day of
18   instruction ~~for 9 days from the first day of instruction~~ for the semester and
19   will continue to automatically enroll courses to their enrollment caps from
20   the waitlist."
21
22 Approved: April 11, 2022
23 Vote: 12-0
24 Present: Frazier, French, Hill, Jackson (non-voting), Kumar, Leisenring (non-
25   voting), Lupton, Masegian, Merz, Sen, Walker, Wilson, Yang, Yao
26 Absent: Allen, Kaur, Rollerson, Wolcott
27 Financial impact: None.
28 Workload impact: None.
29

6

Amendment A to University Policy S16-17 Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process

10

Amends: University Policy S16-17

12

Rationale:

University Policy S16-17 defines the review and approval process for academic certificate programs. This amendment updates reporting and oversight roles to match current university structures and adds language intended to better defining basic and advanced certificates, provides safeguards for students stacking certificates to complete a master's degree, clarifies double counting of courses for more than one certificate, defines expiration of courses for certificates, and corrects an error in the description of grade averaging.

Resolved: That the following amendments be adopted; and be it further

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

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

Approved (C&R): 05/2/2022

Vote: **11-0-0**

Present: Richard Mocarski (seat A), Thalia Anagnos (seat B), Marc d'Alarcao (seat C), Gigi Smith (seat D), Faranak Memarzade (seat E), Katy Kao (seat G). Wei-Chien Lee (seat H), Sharmin Khan (seat I), Brandon White (seat J, chair), Marie Haverfield (seat K), Chloe Cramer (seat L)

Absent: Cara Maffini (seat F)

Financial Impact: None anticipated

45 **Workload Impact: None anticipated**
46
47
48
49   **Certificate Guidelines**
50   **Types of Certificate Programs**
51
52 1) Certificate programs are defined as any program in which some form of recognition
53 from San José State University is awarded to participants. There are two basic kinds of
54 certificate programs, Academic and Other (defined below) but only the former is the
55 subject of this policy.
56 2) Academic certificate programs
57   a) **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as "Academic" if students
58   receive academic credit for any courses in the program.
59   b) Types of Academic certificate programs
60   i) Basic (undergraduate level)
61   (1) **Definition:** Basic certificate programs provide opportunities
62   for students to pursue specialized, often pre-professional, focused
63   educational objectives that may be separate from a degree
64   program.
65   (2) **Jurisdiction:** Basic certificate programs are under the
66   jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Studies (UGS) Committee and
67   administered by the Office of ~~Graduate and~~ Undergraduate
68   Education~~Programs~~ (UE~~GUP~~).
69   ii) Advanced (graduate level)
70   (1) **Definition:** An advanced certificate program offers post-
71   baccalaureate students coursework leading to a specific,
72   applied, focused goal.
73   (2) **Jurisdiction:** Advanced certificate programs are under
74   the jurisdiction of the Graduate Studies and Research
75   (GS&R) Committee and administered by the College of
76   Graduate Studies (CGS)~~GUP~~.
77 3) Other certificate programs
78   a)   **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as "Other" if no
79   academic credit or grade is required to be awarded for completion of
80   courses in the program.
81   b) **Jurisdiction:** College of Professional and Global Education~~International and~~
82   ~~Extended Studies~~ (CPGE~~IES~~) oversees these certificates in consultation with
83   the AVP of UE~~GUP~~.
84
85   **General Guidelines for Academic Certificate Programs**
86
87 1) Self-supporting certificate programs, both basic and advanced, credit and non-
88 credit, will be administered by CPGE~~CIES~~, but curricular reviews will be conducted
89 through normal curricular review processes and overseen by UE~~GUP~~.

90 2) State-support certificate programs must be credit bearing and must go through the
91 curricular review process overseen by UEGUP.
92 3) Academic certificate programs should establish at least one advisor or director to
93 oversee certificate programs within the unit.
94 4) Certificate programs that are classifiable as "Academic" that do not meet the criteria
95 for this policy must be discontinued or go through a review process prior to Fall 2018.
96
97 <u>**Specific to Academic Basic Certificate Programs**</u>
98
99 **Requirements**
100 1) Basic certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of 18
101 units of coursework. Programs may require that all prerequisite coursework has
102 been completed prior to enrolling in the basic certificate program. At least 6 units
103 must be completed at SJSU.
104 2) Basic certificate programs may include lower-division and upper-division courses
105 numbered 1 through 199 (excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision,
106 and credit/no-credit courses).
107 3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in
108 the certificate proposal.
109 4) Basic certificates are available to matriculated students (regular or special
110 session status).
111 5) Generally, aA maximum of 33% of basic certificate units (e.g., 3 units for a 9-unit
112 certificate) can be completed through Open University at SJSU with approval from the
113 department or school. In rare cases, a basic certificate may be completed entirely
114 through Open University if the student has completed a Bachelor's degree and
115 received approval from the department or school.
116 6) Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken as part of an SJSU Academic
117 Certificate program can be applied to an approved major, minor, or emphasis program
118 where one is required for the student's degree subject to SJSU policies. Unless
119 otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken for a major or minor may be applied to a
120 basic certificate program upon approval from the basic certificate program
121 advisor/director.
122 7) Students must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 in basic certificate coursework in order
123 to be awarded a certificate. However, departments or comparable units may elect to
124 set more stringent standards to ensure the quality of certificate holders with respect to
125 the program.
126 8) The advisor/director of the program is responsible for verifying a student's
127 satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program and
128 for forwarding a copy of the certificate completion form to the Office of the Registrar.
129 The Office of the Registrar records the completion of the program on the student's
130 transcript.
131
132 <u>**Specific to Academic Advanced Certificate Programs**</u>
133
134 **Requirements**

135   1) Advanced certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of
136   18 units of coursework
137   2) Advanced certificate programs must consistbe comprised of courses
138   numbered 100 through 296 (excluding individual studies, directed reading,
139   supervision, and credit/no-credit courses), and must contain at least 3 units of
140   coursework numbered 200 or higher.
141   3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in
142   the proposal.
143   4) With the approval of the department or school, units may be applied to both an
144   advanced certificate program and a graduate degree program offered by the
145   department. A maximum of 3 units of coursework may be applied to two different
146   advanced certificates as long as there are at least 9 unique units in each
147   certificate.
148   5) All advanced certificate programs must be constructed solely with courses taken
149   through San José State University.
150   a) Students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all advanced certificate
151   coursework, with no less than the grade of "C" in any course. A maximum of 4
152   units of coursework with a grade of "C" can be appliedcount toward an advanced
153   certificate.
154   b) A maximum of 4 units of coursework may be repeated. If a course is
155   repeated, grade points and units from all attempts shall be included in the
156   calculation of the student's SJSU cumulative GPA and overall GPA, as
157   described in F08-2.The grade used for the GPA for the advanced certificate is
158   the average of the initial grade and the grade upon repeating the course.
159   c) Generally, a maximum of 33% of advanced certificate units (e.g., 3 units for a
160   9-unit certificate) can be completed through Open University at SJSU with
161   approval from the department or school. In some cases, an advanced
162   certificate may be completed entirely through Open University if the student
163   has received approval from the department or school and the Associate Dean
164   of Graduate Programs in the College of Graduate Studies.Advanced
165   certificates may be available to matriculated (regular or special session status)
166   and non-matriculated students (i.e., taken through Open University).
167   d) A maximum of 30% of any graduate degree program units (e.g., 9 units for a
168   30-unit Master's degree) can be completed from another institution and/or units
169   from Open University (including advanced certificate courses) at SJSU with
170   approval from the department or school.
171   e) The choice of grading requirements may have implications for transferability
172   to degree programs.
173
174   6) These guidelines constitute minimum standards for advanced certificate programs;
175   departments may propose additional requirements for approval by the GS&R
176   Committee.
177
178   7) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs must have their
179   advanced certificate students complete an intake form and submit an official

180   transcript(s) (noting the completion of a U.S. bachelor's degree from an accredited
181   institution or the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree from an accredited and/or
182   recognized institution from a foreign country). Students must have an undergraduate
183   GPA of at least 2.5 (where A=4). A department or program can propose more restrictive
184   requirements subject to approval by the GS&R committee.
185   a) Non-matriculated students who complete an advanced certificate program
186   solely through Open University are required to send copies of this documentation
187   to CPGECIES wherein this information will be retained and tracked by
188   CPGECIES. Matriculated advanced certificate students that go through a formal
189   university admissions review will have the said documentation retained and
190   tracked at the Graduate Admissions and Program Evaluations (GAPE) office
191   within CGSEnrollment Services.
192   b) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs may specify
193   subject matter and/or coursework prerequisites for entrance into the certificate
194   program. Such prerequisites must be listed in the university catalog. Prerequisite
195   courses or equivalent experience must demonstrate current and appropriate
196   preparation as determined by the program. All other grading regulations of the
197   graduate school apply to the courses in the certificate programs (e.g., the
198   prohibition against taking graded classes pass/fail).
199   c) Where appropriate, some form of portfolio presentation, performance audition,
200   or other evidence of specific competence may be required by departments. Such
201   criteria will also be listed in the catalog.
202   8) The advisor/director of the certificate program is responsible for verifying
203   information in the student's intake form and the student's satisfactory completion of the
204   academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding the certificate
205   completion form to GAPE. After a review and evaluation, GAPE then records the
206   completion of the program onto the student's transcript.
207   9) Courses taken in the advanced certificate program expire 7 years from the point of
208   grade posting. A maximum of 3 units may be revalidated in accordance with S17-7, if
209   permitted by department or program policy, for an advanced certificate program. The
210   student must have earned at least a "B" grade in a course to revalidate it. The
211   department that offered the class must administer an examination of the student's
212   knowledge. The examination could be an oral exam, written exam, research paper, or of
213   any other kind of format approved by the department. The examination must be graded
214   by the faculty member who taught the original course, by one who has taught the course
215   at another time, or by one who has reasonable knowledge of the course content. Note
216   that any course(s) that may be applied to a graduate degree program are also subject to
217   expiration 7 years from the date of original grade posting.
218
219
220   **Process for Proposing and Reviewing Academic Certificate Programs**
221
222   1) All courses in a certificate program must undergo the normal course
223   approval process prior to approval of the certificate course package.

224   2) Proposal Content:
225   a) SJSU College Dean Curricular Proposal Approval Form(s).
226   b) Brief statement of purpose.
227   c) Clearly stated learning outcomes mapped to coursework.
228   d) Catalog copy, which includes the following:
229   i. Brief statement of purpose.
230   Ii. Admissions requirements.
231   iii. Course requirements.
232   iv. Any prerequisites for the certificate program.
233   v. Total number of units.
234   e) GPA needed to receive the certificate if other than a minimum of 2.0 for basic
235   certificates and 3.0 for advanced certificates.
236   f) Program advisor.
237   g) For advanced certificates: number of units applicable (if any) to a degree
238   and/or major depending upon matriculation status (with the caveat that the units
239   may not be uniformly applied but require advisor consent).
240   h) For advanced certificates: if students are allowed to complete certificate
241   courses through Open University, then the department/program must provide a
242   justification for this pathway. The justification establishes that sufficient space
243   will be available in the courses required for the certificate program.
244   i. This justification must comply with Executive Order #1099 which allows
245   OU enrollment in state-supported courses on a space available basis after
246   enrollment opportunities have been provided to state-support matriculated
247   students.
248   ii. The justification must also comply with Executive Order #805 which
249   states "enrollment or potential enrollment of non-matriculated students in
250   state supported courses shall not be the basis of the addition for a course
251   that would otherwise be canceled because of low enrollment of regular
252   matriculated students".
253   iii. Departments/programs must go through a recertification process every
254   five years that re-evaluates the justification for certificate completion
255   through Open University. These recertification requests will need
256   approval by the college deans, the Chair of GS&R, and the Provost.
257   CGS~~GUP~~ will oversee this recertification process.
258   3) Submission process
259   a) Academic certificate programs (either basic or advanced) may be proposed
260   by department, school or college curriculum committees.
261   b) Proposals may be submitted, reviewed, and approved at any time during the
262   academic year.
263   c) For entry into the catalog, the approval must be registered with UE~~GUP~~
264   according to published catalog deadlines.
265   4) Review process for new proposals
266   The reviewing bodies are responsible for timely review and approval of academic
267   certificate programs:
268   a) Proposals from either department or college level curriculum committees are

269   submitted to the appropriate department chair(s) or school director(s) for review.
270   b) Upon approval, the department or school reviews are then submitted with a
271   copy of the proposal to the appropriate curriculum committee(s) and college
272   dean(s) for review and approval.
273   c) Upon approval of the college deans, a copy of the proposal (along with
274   reviews from departmental/school and deans) is submitted to the Chair of the
275   appropriate operating committee.
276   i. If the program contains any 200 level courses, the materials are referred
277   to the Chair of the GS&R Committee for review.
278   ii. If the program does not contain any 200 level courses, the materials
279   are referred to the Chair of the UGS Committee for review.
280   iii. During duty days, within one week, the committee Chair will
281   determine if the Committee needs to review the proposal. If no full
282   committee review is required, the proposal and accompanying
283   reviews are submitted to the Provost via the appropriate office
284   (GS&R for programs with 200 level courses or UGS for proposals
285   with 100 level programs) with a statement from the Chair specifying
286   that a review from their committee was not necessary.
287   d) If review by the appropriate operating committee is necessary, the Chair of the
288   operating committee will send recommendations from the committees, along with
289   the proposal and accompanying reviews, to the Provost via the UE~~GUP~~ office
290   (GS&R for programs with 200 level courses or UGS for proposals with 100 level
291   programs).
292   e) The Provost makes the final decision on whether or not to approve
293   the certificate program.
294 5) Review process for existing certificate programs
295   a) Substitution, deletion, or addition of courses to the program will need to go
296   through the minor program change process in the UE~~GUP~~ office.
297   b) Certificates involving multiple programs will be assigned to a home department
298   under which to be reviewed.
299