



ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

April 11, 2017

TO: Leslie Wong, President
San Francisco State University

FROM: Troi Carleton, Chair
Academic Senate 

RE: **Senate Policy S17-276: Policy on Collaboration on Consistency in Policy Language and Policy Implementation**

SOURCE COMMITTEE:
Executive Committee

SENATE ACTION:

At its meeting on Tuesday, April 4, 2017, the Academic Senate approved **Senate Policy S17-276: Policy on Collaboration on Consistency in Policy Language and Policy Implementation**

We solicit your concurrence. Thank You.

cc: Jennifer Summit, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mi-Sook Kim, Interim Dean, Graduate Studies
Lori Beth Way, Interim Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Renee Monte, University Registrar
Sheila Tully, President, SFSU CFA
Sacha Bunge, Dean, Faculty Affairs
Luoluo Hong, Vice President of Student Affairs
Cheree Aguilar, Interim AVP, Human Resources
Michael Scott, AVP, Research and Sponsored Programs

cc: The Deans and Associate Deans of the Colleges

REVIEWED AND APPROVED



4/13/17

JENNIFER SUMMIT
PROVOST / VPAA

DATE

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

APPROVED: Leslie Wong Date: 4-13-17



SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Policy #: S17-276
Supersedes: N/A
Senate Approval: 04/04/2017
Presidential Approval: XX/XX/20XX
Effective: 06/01/2017
Last Review: N/A
Next Review: Spring/2027

Policy on Collaboration on Consistency in Policy Language and Policy Implementation, Executive Committee

Abstract

In the shared governance structure at San Francisco State University, it is the primary responsibility of the Academic Senate to develop policy and procedures regarding academic operations of the university and professional lives of faculty on campus. It is the responsibility of the Administration to implement those policies that are enacted. Academic Senate policy must align with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and current executive orders (EO) from the CSU Chancellor's Office. For that reason, the Senate reviews its policies on a regular basis to update and amend as needed. It is imperative that information disseminated to faculty (either written or verbal) through any administrative unit, department head, or committee chair on campus is in alignment with the current CBA and current Academic Senate policy. Close collaboration and cooperation between the main policy drafting body, Academic Senate, and those responsible for implementing policy is central to mitigating confusion through the dissemination of conflicting information regarding policy critical to the professional development and daily responsibilities of faculty on campus. To ensure the greatest synchrony of information, and to reinforce a culture of transparency and open dialogue, this policy aims to put into place a process by which the Senate will review information being disseminated to faculty that refers either directly or indirectly to Senate policy. Furthermore, in the spirit of shared governance and collaboration, the Senate offers a service to the University through this policy.

Key Words: *policy, implementation, and consultation*

Author/Source

Academic Senate Executive Committee

Responsible Unit

Academic Senate

Table of Contents (I. Justification, II. Consultation Process)

Policy (*headings: purpose, rationale, definitions, scope/applicability, sections, related policy/resources*)

I. Justification and Purpose

The Academic Senate recognizes that there is always a good faith effort on the part of Administration to implement Senate policy in the spirit in which it is intended, but at the same time recognizes that all policy is subject to change. While Resolutions have been passed supporting both SF State and CSU concerns (i.e., RS96-148 and RS14-320), there is currently no process in place to formally ensure that implementation is consistent with most campus-based best practices and current policy, especially when it comes to disseminating information to faculty. In order to minimize the dissemination of conflicting information between Senate and those charged with implementation, this policy aims to codify a consultative process by which information being disseminated is checked against current policy to ensure a consistent message.

II. Consultation

A. What gets reviewed?

56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90

1. Any documentation that refers directly or indirectly to Senate policy and procedures that will be disseminated to Faculty by those charged with implementing said policy. This includes but is not limited to any policy that impacts faculty hiring practices, peer-review, retention, tenure & promotion, sabbaticals & difference in pay leave, departmental rights & obligations.

B. Who reviews the documentation?

1. The Executive Committee will assign the task of reviewing the submitted documentation for consistency with Senate policy and procedure to the appropriate Standing Committee.

C. What is the scope of the review?

1. The appropriate Senate standing committee will only review documentation for alignment with Senate policy and procedure.

D. What happens if there is inconsistency between the documentation under review and Senate policy?

1. The Senate Chair or designee will initiate a conversation with the originator of the submitted documentation to collaboratively and cooperatively address the inconsistency. The objective of the collaboration is to reconcile the policy with what will be disseminated to faculty.

E. What happens if information being disseminated to faculty is inconsistent with Senate policy?

1. The Academic Senate will consult with the appropriate administrative unit or committee about rectifying the issue.
2. The Administrative unit and Academic Senate are responsible for informing the faculty and campus community of any changes to the information that has been disseminated before it was made consistent with Senate policy.

III. Process and timing

All documentation submitted to the Senate for review will be considered as quickly as possible, and a written response will be sent to appropriate administrative unit head. The written response will be followed up with a conversation to ensure that all parties are in agreement with the assessment.