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INTRODUCTION

In the spring semester of 2017, the College of Health & Social Sciences (CHSS) for the first time began a process to develop a college-wide policy manual, with a purpose of increasing consistency and transparency of common practices through-out the College. Discussions across units in the college showed a lack of consistency in governing many activities that are central to the workings of the college, such as advising, office hours, workload issues, assigned time and many others.

Purpose

The purpose of this college-level policy manual is to: (1) outline the policies, procedures, and guidelines that govern the workings of all departments and units within the college; (2) provide transparency around the internal expectations of departments and the college as a whole; and (3) create some uniformity across departments. Individual departments may also have policies that govern their own specific programs and responsibilities. In the event that departmental and college policies conflict, departments may secure permission for their policy to supersede CHSS’ policies with approval from the dean and the Chair’s Council.

Clear policies provide clarity about the roles and responsibilities of the employees of the college and can help in the processes of evaluating staff and faculty members and ensuring fair and transparent distribution of workloads and responsibilities.

Some of the items in this manual are college or university level policies and others may outline college guidelines rather than strict policies. This allows departments freedom to set their own standards or expectations (e.g. grade inflation). Each item is marked as to whether it is policy (mandatory) or a guideline (highly suggested). In addition, the manual contains some university policies that are commonly referred to by faculty and staff members in their daily work. We wanted to create a “go-to” document that includes the majority of the commonly used policies and procedures in one central place.

History of the Policy Manual

The need for a policy manual grew out of discussions in the Chair’s Council, a body that consists of the Deans and senior staff members of the Dean’s office and all department/program chairs or directors. This body meets nearly every week to discuss pressing issues within the college related to budgets, academic planning, enrollment, faculty hires, new university policies and initiatives that affect departments, and many other issues critical to the effective working of the College. In the fall of 2016, a subcommittee was formed, the Chairs’ Leadership Development Committee, to outline plans for training opportunities to help chairs grow and become more effective leaders. As part of the discussion, the lack of written policy on many aspects of professional conduct emerged as a central concern. Conflicts between students, staff, faculty, and administrators were often based on a lack of professional conduct or a misunderstanding of the roles and expectations of employees. Different expectations in different departments or programs sometimes caused faculty confusion or frustration.
This lack of clarity and consistency led to development of a set of policies, guided initially by experiences of the members of the Chairs Council of situations where a clear policy could have diverted or reduced conflict, and guidance from Faculty Affairs on recommended elements of departmental bylaws. In many cases, further guidance from two central sources was used: 1) the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that outlines faculty responsibilities and conduct and 2) Academic Senate policies. In some cases, further clarity was added to existing university policies to make the CHSS expectations clear. For example, the CBA and Academic Senate both require that all teaching faculty hold office hours every week during the semester, but does not specify whether these can be virtual or must be in person. Other policies, like the Summer School Policy, addressed wide disparities in faculty workloads and salaries in summer session offerings. For example, in one department, a faculty member might have taught three sections of the same course with 20 students per section, thus receiving pay for three classes with a workload of 60 students whereas a faculty member in another department taught one section of 75 students in a similar type of class, receiving pay for only one course with a higher workload. The policy seeks to balance equity of faculty workloads and pay with student accessibility and financial viability of courses.

The Process of Creating the Policies

Individual policies were developed in a variety of ways; sometimes by discussion in the full Chair’s Council, sometimes by faculty committee, and sometimes via ad hoc committees of faculty and staff members. Policies as of spring 2019 have been sent out for faculty comment and discussed by a policy review committee. Some policies were sent back to Council for approval of revised wording. This current policy manual was approved by the Chair’s Council, Associate Dean, and Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences, and will reside in the offices of the Associate Dean, who will be responsible for distributing it annually to all faculty and staff members, conducting periodic reviews of existing policies every three years, initiating new policies, and supervising the updating of policies. All CHSS staff and faculty members are welcome to comment on existing policies or suggest new policies by forwarding these suggestions to their department chair, or to the Associate Dean’s office. The process of adding new policies or revising existing ones can also be initiated by any member of the Dean’s advisory group or the Chair’s Council, and all policy modifications will be drafted, discussed, and submitted to a vote by the Chair’s Council. Approval is based on a simple majority vote of the chairs; deans and administrative staff will be involved in discussion, but not vote on these policies. Each policy will contain information on the date of approval of the initial policies and date of any revisions. Each new policy will be sent out to all faculty and staff for a public comment period.

The CHSS Policy Manual will be available to all members of CHSS on the college website, and will be a dynamic document that is revised as needed and policies will be reviewed regularly to determine whether they need the needs of the College.

Not all university policies are included in this manual. For example, there are many policies that govern student issues; withdrawing from classes, petitions, challenging grades, and many more. These are clearly spelled out on the university website and are used uniformly across campus.
POLICIES
Academic Dishonesty/Plagiarism Guidelines

The Office on Student Conduct deals with episodes of academic dishonesty and plagiarism: (see http://conduct.sfsu.edu/academic-dishonesty and definitions of plagiarism (http://conduct.sfsu.edu/plagiarism). Faculty members have the right to make decisions about a first incident of plagiarism in their class as outlined by OSC (sanctions can range from a lower grade, no credit for the assignment, or re-doing an assignment). A serious incident of plagiarism or repeated events should be reported to the Office on Student Conduct with a cc to the appropriate person in the department (Chair, Associate Chair, coordinator of a program) and to the Associate Dean, to enable tracking of events. Repeat offenses by the same student may result in removal from a course or program.

Approved: December 1, 2017
Buy-outs/Release Time Policy

CHSS faculty at any rank often have opportunities to buy-out teaching time for research or special service projects, such as necessary work for a department or college or assignments to more intense university committees or task forces. The College values and encourages these buy-outs. Some of these types of buy-outs have clear purposes/missions, but others, such as department level buy-outs may need some clarification. For buy-outs not assigned by the department chair, CHSS recommends notifying the department chair of the possibility as soon as the opportunity arises, and then submitting a written request for buy-outs no later than one month prior to the start of a new semester to allow for time to find replacement teachers. This written request will serve as a contract for the buy-out. It should be written in conjunction with the funder of the buy-out and lay out a list of the activities that will be undertaken during the released time and if not a well-defined research project or university committee, the faculty member should list concrete deliverables with criteria for evaluating whether the release time achieved its objectives. Keep in mind that a .20 release time is equivalent to a minimum of 8 hours of work per week, and the contract should reflect that.

Department chairs cannot guarantee buy-outs or release time if not provided ample time, and may elect to refuse or delay a request for a buy-out of teaching for a specific course. Faculty may indicate their preference for which course they wish to be released, but the ultimate decision is up to the discretion of the chair. Faculty may only be released from courses with a time base equivalent to the reimbursed released time (i.e., a .20 buyout only covers release from a 3-unit course). **Buy-out funding should include the equivalent of 6 checks for one semester or 12 for Academic Year.** All faculty who receive release time for a buy-out other than research funding or typical university service activity must submit a 1-2 page report that outlines their activities and a copy of their deliverables, if applicable, within one month of completing the released semester. This report will be filed with the Department Chair and kept for a five-year period. Faculty members who receive release time, but do not achieve their objectives or report on their activities may not be considered for another release time for the next two years.

**Approved: September, 2017**

**Revised text Approval Date: August, 2019**
CHSS Lecturer Faculty Computer Refresh Policy

The College of Health & Social Sciences (CHSS) is committed to ensuring that lecturers in each of our departments and programs are provided with fully functional new PC/MAC desktop computers. The spirit of this policy is to provide lecturers with access to computers. However, if departments/programs cannot afford the requisite number of new computers, they may either forgo ordering and purchasing new computers through CHSS’ Director of IT Services or reduce the number of new computers needed during scheduled refresh that is financially feasible. The Director of CHSS IT Services or a designee will be responsible for managing the lecturer computer refreshes.

The CHSS Director of Information Technology will consult with each chair or director about how many computers are needed to furnish each department for lecturer use. For the purpose of this policy, departments may be furnished with 1 computer per 1.00 lecturer time base. Full-time entitled lecturers with campus assigned office space, will be furnished with their own computers every three years, which is consistent with tenure-track members of the faculty. Part-Time lecturers with campus assigned office space should be permitted to share a computer with several other part-time colleagues. This is to be negotiated between the department chair/program director and the IT director.

The College agrees to fund 50% of the costs to purchase the initial, first round of lecturer computers for all units and departments/programs must pay the remaining 50%. Thereafter, academic units will be responsible for the full funding of new equivalent replacement computers of comparable specifications to the original purchase for lecturers every three (3) years. As always, the computers being replaced will be e-wasted by IT. Departments need to plan for this expenditure by saving approximately $400 per year per computer (computers are approximately $1,200). The College will track this process based on serial numbers. Following the first round of computer refreshes, the AOCs and/or department chairs will be responsible for contacting the CHSS Director of Information Technology about the needs for an upcoming refresh.

Approved: December 15, 2016
CHSS Retention, Tenure, Promotion Pool Policy

Because many of the departments/programs of the College are small and/or interdisciplinary, they may often need to solicit RTP committee members from outside of their home departments. This policy outlines the duties of a mandatory one-year duration college committee to fill those slots. Each year, a list will be compiled of all full and associate professors, ranked by seniority. This list constitutes the pool and the process will be much like jury duty. Those with the greatest longevity will be considered first. The number of requests for outside committee members will differ each year, so the number of faculty members solicited from the pool will differ, but in general 2-3 more faculty than needed will be solicited. The committee assignments will be circulated to this pool and they will be asked to submit their first and second matches for assignment or a request for exemption or deferment.

Possible reasons for exemptions: current department chairs, current RTP committee chairs for one’s home departments with a heavy load, elected members of the university-wide RTP committee (UTPC) for that year, being considered for full professor that fall, conflict of interest with the candidate, and those on leave or sabbatical in a fall semester. Faculty may also petition for exemption or deferment if they have extraordinary service loads that school year. The names of exempted faculty will go back into the pool and they will be considered again the following year.

All tenured faculty are expected to serve on an RTP committee outside of their department during their time in the college, typically every 3-4 years. Once a faculty member serves on a committee, their name is moved to the bottom of the list for the following year. In addition, faculty members who volunteered for committees outside of their departments in the past two years prior to approval of this policy will be moved to the end of the list.

The procedures for implementation of the CHSS RTP Pool include:

1. In late February, department chairs forward their lists of faculty members to be reviewed the following fall semester, with a request if they need outside members as well as noting the rank of needed outside members.

2. CHSS Dean’s office constitutes the pool from records of seniority among faculty. These faculty are notified of their selection by mid-March.

3. Pool members rank preferences for departmental assignments. We recognize that most outside reviewers will not be familiar with the research of the candidate, but all are equally capable of evaluating teaching and service, and most can comment on the rigor of the scholarship and the candidate’s discussion of impact of their work.

4. Department chairs discuss outside members with candidates to get their approval.

5. Assignments are finalized by April 1. Departments will conduct an election in the manner designated in their RTP guidelines, and consistent with CBA and Academic Senate policies, to
determine departmental faculty approval of the selection. If the department does not approve of that outside reviewer, the next person in the pool will be considered as a substitute.

6. Pool members may choose to schedule peer observations of teaching (if needed) and/or interviews with the candidates prior to September 15 of the fall semester if needed to become familiar with the candidate.

7. Pool members not chosen are retained in the pool until the start of the fall semester in case of late decisions by faculty to seek promotion for full professor or other changes in assignments.

8. Pool members attend a training session offered by the college (usually held in May).

9. Pool members will receive assignments by late April of the spring semester (in some cases, need may arise over the summer and assignments may be made in early September).

10. Pool members will review files in the fall semester and contribute to the RTP committee report, typically due in mid to late October. In some rare cases, the faculty member from the pool may be asked to chair the RTP committee, with more significant oversight and input on the RTP report that is generated.

Initial Policy Approval Date: April 11, 2017
Modified Policy Approval Date: March 19, 2019
Vetted by Faculty Affairs and CFA: March 26, 2019
Sent out for Faculty Comment: April 15, 2019
Revised by subcommittee: May 14, 2019
Approved by Chair’s Council: May 22, 2019
**Conflicts Between Students and Faculty Guidelines**

Each department should make clear to students the process by which conflicts can be addressed. These may include conflicts about grading, conduct in class, assignments, small group work, and other issues. Typically, the process is first having a meeting with the instructor, and if no satisfactory resolution is reached, students are referred to the Department Chair or designee (appropriate student advisor or designated faculty member) to address these concerns. If further mediation is needed, the next step is the Associate Dean’s office. The appropriate chain of reporting for each department must be provided to all students. University guidance on dealing with student conflicts can be found at [http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/policies-procedures/grading/](http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/policies-procedures/grading/) and here: [https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/grade-appeal-practices-procedures](https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/grade-appeal-practices-procedures).

**Approved:** Spring 2018
Departmental Service Guidelines

Service to campus and community is addressed in Senate Resolution RS16-345 (http://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/support-role-service-and-shared-governance-san-francisco-state-university) and the CBA (Article 20). Whereas the College and all the departments value all types of service to one’s community--including local communities, professional organizations, and other non-university entities-- the work of a university depends on service from faculty members. Therefore, we recommend that a minimum of 4 hours of the total 8 hours of service per week (on average, recognizing that work is distributed across the entire semester and some service may be in concentrated bursts), be dedicated to departmental service such as participating on standing committees or short-term projects. For junior faculty all service activities may at the department level, but tenured faculty members are expected to have some college and/or university-wide service activities each year. In most cases, advising is considered under one’s teaching load rather than as service, but this may be handled differently at the individual department level. If advising is to be considered service, this should be designated in departmental policies.

Approved: Fall 2017
External Funding for Research or Service Work Policy

Department chairs must be notified prior to the submission of any grants or contracts for any external funding. For accountability and legal purposes, any faculty member seeking outside funding for research or special projects must also seek approval from the university before submitting any proposals. All research proposals must be initiated by completing the Principal Investigator checklist on the ORSP website. Seeking money from local businesses, foundations, or individuals may require working with the university development officers. In no circumstances can individual faculty or staff members negotiate external funding on their own.

Approved: Spring 2017
Grading Expectations Guidelines

Students and the academic enterprise in general are harmed by both extremes of grading policies: grade inflation and excessively high failure rates in classes. CHSS recommends that grading standards be a topic of discussion at new faculty orientation, new lecturer orientation, and general departmental faculty meetings at least once each year. For courses with multiple sections, CHSS recommends that all faculty teaching the same course have at least one conversation per semester about expectations for grading in an effort to achieve some consistency across sections. Department Chairs shall review all grades within a department, and may ask for a meeting to discuss grading with faculty members who consistently give all high grades or consistently has very high failure rates in their classes.

Approved: Spring 2018
Lecturer Evaluation Committee Policy

The University policy is as follows: (https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/temporary-faculty-lecturers)

Process of lecturer evaluation, 2015-16 and beyond: University Policy

A. Inform all your lecturers (new and continuing) in writing at the beginning of the semester or academic year (within 14 days) of the department’s evaluation criteria and process.
B. For one-semester lecturers, evaluation must at least include review of SETE data (quantitative and qualitative data), but the specifics of who does the review and what it includes is at the department’s discretion (use Temporary Faculty Evaluation Form for reporting).
C. For all other lecturers, the following steps in the evaluation process are required (also referred to as Periodic Evaluation): (use Temporary Faculty Evaluation Form)
D. Departmental Peer Review Committee reviews teaching effectiveness data [SETE (quantitative and qualitative data); classroom observations (if applicable); course materials; office hours; other]; submits summary report
E. Department Chair reviews teaching effectiveness data and summary report; submits comments
F. College Dean reviews teaching effectiveness data and summary report; submits comments
G. Summary report and SETE data are entered into PAF with HR (forwarded by College Office)
H. Faculty member may submit rebuttal within 10 days of receiving summary report at each level of review

Form: https://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/TemFacEvalJun16.pdf

CHSS Guidelines

Each department shall identify whether the department lecturer evaluation committee is constituted by the department RTP committee or a separate body. A lecturer evaluation committee may be one of the standing committees of a department. Department level guidelines for the evaluation need to be outlined (e.g., what criteria are used to determine if the lecturer’s teaching is adequate? What happens if the teaching criteria are not met?). Peer observation of teaching of lecturers will use the same forms and processes as the department uses for tenure track peer observations.

Approved: Spring 2018
Off Campus Student Events Policy

Liability issues related to requiring any off-campus work for students are complicated, and all faculty need ample time to plan for these events prior to the start of a semester. If a faculty member wishes to sponsor or co-sponsor either an on-campus or off-campus event tied in any way to the academic department, including any of its programs (e.g., undergraduate major, graduate major, certificate programs, etc), it will be necessary to propose such a sponsorship to the program coordinator and/or department chair so a determination about sponsoring such an event can be made. It is critical that such a decision involve broad faculty governance and be approved by the leadership in the department. Faculty wishing to sponsor events should make the request to their coordinator approximately 30-45 days before the event is planned to take place. It is mandatory that advance notice is given to the academic office coordinator prior to a field trip. Please consult the following webpage: https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/student-field-trip-policy
All of the forms and paperwork must be completed, submitted, and approved before any field trip takes place.

Approved: Spring 2018
Office Hours Policy

All faculty are required to hold a minimum of 20 minutes per week of office hours per unit value of a course (20 minutes for a 1 unit class, 1 hour for a 3-unit class, etc.). CHSS requires that all full-time tenure track and lecturers hold at least three hours of office hours, with two hours in person on campus per week to accommodate students in their classes as well as drop-in advising. One exception is if all the courses in a faculty member’s workload are completely online courses, their office hours may also be on-line. CHSS recommends that faculty office doors are open during office hours to encourage a stronger sense of welcome and openness to students.

- Office hours are to be explicitly noted in course syllabi and iLearn sites if used (including faculty office location, telephone number, email address, and office hours). Office hours are to be posted on or near a faculty member’s office door. Office hours may not be held during teaching hours or regular faculty meeting times.

- If any faculty member is going to miss office hours and/or class meetings it is expected that they e-mail students to inform them of the cancellation of office hours (with the exception of emergencies). Additionally, please contact the department office or the academic office coordinator with a cc to the Department Chair to report a cancellation of office hours and reason for the cancellation. A note will be posted on the faculty member’s office door indicating cancelled office hours for that day/ evening. Department chairs may request a formal meeting to address repeated cancellations.

- All faculty members – full-time and part-time -- are to submit their office hours via e-mail to their department office at least one week prior to the first day of instruction each semester so a department faculty office hours sheet can be created and available to students.

Approved: Fall 2017
Sexual Harassment Policy and CHSS Recommendations

The University policy states: Sexual Harassment, a form of Sex Discrimination, is unwelcome verbal, nonverbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that includes but is not limited to sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and any other conduct of a sexual nature where:

1. Submission to, or rejection of, the conduct is explicitly or implicitly used as the basis for any decision affecting a Complainant’s academic status or progress, or access to benefits and services, honors, programs, or activities available at or through the University; or
2. The conduct is sufficiently severe, persistent or pervasive that its effect, whether or not intended, could be considered by a reasonable person in the shoes of the Complainant, and is in fact considered by the Complainant, as limiting his or her ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities or opportunities offered by the University; or
3. The conduct is sufficiently severe, persistent or pervasive that its effect, whether or not intended, could be considered by a reasonable person in the shoes of the Complainant, and is in fact considered by the Complainant, as creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment.

Sexual Harassment could include being forced to engage in unwanted sexual contact as a condition of membership in a student organization; being subjected to video exploitation or a campaign of sexually explicit graffiti; or frequently being exposed to unwanted images of a sexual nature in a classroom that are unrelated to the coursework.

Sexual Harassment also includes acts of verbal, non-verbal or physical aggression, intimidation or hostility based on Gender or sex-stereotyping, even if those acts do not involve conduct of a sexual nature. This policy covers unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature. While romantic, sexual, intimate, personal or social relationships between members of the University community may begin as consensual, they may evolve into situations that lead to Sexual Harassment or Sexual Misconduct, including Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking, subject to this policy.

If a faculty member experiences sexual harassment, or a student reports to the faculty member that they have been harassed, the procedure is to report the harassment to the Title IX Coordinator (http://titleix.sfsu.edu/contact) in the Student Services Building. Faculty should refrain from reporting this event to the department chair or Dean, and report directly to the Title IX Coordinator. This prevents issues of retaliation and keeps the circle of confidence as small as possible.

CHSS Recommendation: in at least one faculty meeting per year, faculty members are reminded of this policy, and a brief discussion of how sexual harassment may manifest in the classroom, advising, faculty and staff interactions, and in other university activities shall be held.

Approved: Fall 2017
**Student Conduct Guidelines**

The Office on Student Conduct outlines situations where students may be reported to their office for behaviors that disrupt a class, department, or affect other students adversely in terms of safety or academic progress ([http://conduct.sfsu.edu/standards](http://conduct.sfsu.edu/standards)). Many departments in CHSS that deal with clinical sites or have professional codes of conduct for their profession, may have more stringent requirements for student conduct. These shall be conveyed to students in writing, in the form of student handbooks, in student orientations, and/or on syllabi. Sanctions for violating these codes of conduct shall be outlined.

**Approved:** Fall 2017
Summer School Policy

Background of Policy: These college-wide policies on summer school sessions were developed by a college-wide ad hoc committee during the summer and fall of 2016 comprised of two department chairs, the associate dean, the assistant dean of faculty development and scholarship, and the CHSS academic resources specialist. These policies are intended to address a broad range of issues to ensure that summer sessions operate smoothly and efficiently with particular attention to curricular offerings, student access to courses, student success, faculty equity, and other issues that have arisen related to summer sessions. These policies were approved by the CHSS College Council and ultimately by the CHSS dean in consultation with the dean of faculty affairs and professional development.

1. Process for Strategizing Course Offerings for Summer Sessions

a. Department/Program Policy for Summer Sessions: Each department/program is to submit a departmental policy (1-2 pages) to the associate dean outlining how the respective academic unit will utilize summer sessions with particular attention to maximizing curricular need connected to student access to courses and success toward graduation. This policy outlines how decisions are made about what courses will be offered and how faculty are selected to teach in summer session. This policy is due by March 1, 2017 and will be in effect as a guiding document for departments/programs on an ongoing basis unless otherwise modified. Any future modifications of the policy will be due to the associate dean before the schedule building process for summer sessions, which occurs in early February of each year.

b. Brief Annual Strategic Plan for Summer Sessions Schedule: At the time of schedule building for summer sessions each year, chairs/program directors shall submit a one-page rationale or strategic plan for the coming summer session to the associate dean about how the department’s/program’s proposed summer course schedule addresses needs of the academic unit in terms of course offerings with particular attention to curricular need (e.g., helping students persist toward graduation, “relieving pressure” of bottlenecks in curriculum, offering major courses that are depending on augmented funding, offering GE courses that have high demand, etc.). Summer sessions course offerings should be based primarily – if not solely – on curricular need.

2. Faculty Teaching Opportunities for Summer Sessions

a. Chairs/Directors must offer summer sessions teaching to at least 48% of probationary and tenured faculty members in accordance with the CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 21 (see specifically 21.24). Link to CFA’s CBA: http://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017#article-21

b. To the extent possible, faculty members will be offered one course to teach and then will only be offered a second or third course to teach if other faculty members have declined the opportunity to teach. An equitable rotation system in
the department/program shall be put in place (as outlined in the departmental policy).

c. All summer school courses must be self-sustaining and not only reach the minimum enrollment necessary to fund the instructor’s salary, but also each course must also reach an enrollment level needed to generate the target revenue determined by the college for that particular summer session. Failure to meet these requirements will result in course cancellation. Chairs will be notified of such enrollment “shortfalls” before the first day of instruction. The College reserves the right to cancel courses that do not meet enrollment levels needed to generate target revenue determined by the college for that particular summer session.

3. Course-Level Administration

a. Sections of same courses will be put in the schedule one at a time in each session (e.g., R1, R2, R3, and R4) and only if courses fill and there is evidence of further demand will additional sections of courses be opened. In other words, if it is anticipated that there will be more than one section of a course offered, then any sections beyond the first one should be suppressed from public view until the first section fills and then a second section may be unsuppressed and so on. The rotation system of offering faculty additional teaching shall be used when additional sections are opened. In the event that an additional section cannot be filled then the under enrolled course will be combined with another section of the same course if possible or canceled.

b. Each course shall have a minimum of a 5-person waitlist, except in the cases of cross-listed courses in which the university does not allow wait listing.

c. Course enrollment expectations. Course enrollment caps for undergraduate courses should be set no lower than 35 for typical lecture/online courses, 25 for GWAR courses, and the enrollment required for supervision courses and Graduate-level courses will depend on both departmental history of enrollment parameters for these courses in combination with a financial analysis to make sure these courses are feasible without creating a budgetary deficit. In terms of faculty salaries each individual has a separate threshold at which enrollments and faculty pay are calculated. There is a minimum enrollment in which faculty can still receive full pay and also generate the revenue required per course as specified by the college. All courses, however, will have enrollment caps as specified above.

Suggested Departmental/Program Policy

Given the abbreviated nature of summer school courses, it is recommended that departments review any policies in place that govern classroom conduct/instruction. For example, if the department has an attendance policy, is it appropriate for the summer session or does it need to be modified? If there is no departmental policy, instructors should be encouraged to create an attendance policy that is explicitly stated in syllabi.

Approved: January 13, 2017
Syllabi Requirements and Guidelines


A syllabus is a public document that contains information needed for both students and sometimes administrators, other faculty members, and accrediting bodies. The CHSS Dean’s office provides required language about policies and deadlines every semester that must be included on all syllabi in the college. Senate policy requires that students receive a written or digital version of the syllabus by the first course meeting, and that students be notified in writing of any changes to the syllabus in the course of the semester. Other required elements listed on the senate policy include:

- Faculty contact information including name, office hours, office location, email address, and office phone number if applicable.
- Course information (title and number, section #, units, brief description of the class, whether meets GE requirements, any pre-requisites, whether eligible for CR/NC, etc).
- A statement of scope, content, course objectives and student learning outcomes.
- List of texts and materials to be used throughout the course.
- Any fees or costs associated with the class.
- A description of the teaching methods to be employed.
- A description of the grading policy.
- GE courses must also include linkage of all student learning outcomes to the activities and/or assignments that demonstrate student achievement of the learning outcome (specifying the GE area, overlay, and course-specific learning outcomes).
- Majors courses must show how course learning outcomes are mapped to program learning outcomes.
- Must indicate a scheduled meeting during finals week.
- Any required information from the University or College (e.g., disability access, student disclosures of sexual violence, academic deadlines, etc).

CHSS also recommends that the syllabus include the following information:

- Graded assignments are listed and briefly described.
- Grading procedures and policies, including rubrics if used, are outlined.
- A calendar of topics and assignment due dates is provided.
- Any specific codes of behavior or conduct required in the course (lab attire, the use of touch in the classroom, requirements of a clinical site, etc).
- If the program is accredited, a list of the competencies addressed in the course.
- The university plagiarism policy and any sanctions for plagiarism.

CHSS also recommends that syllabi include language that is inclusive of all of our students, such as policies about dealing with racist, sexist, homophobic, transphobic, ableist, ageist, xenophobic, and other offensive comments in the classroom. CHSS also encourages language that is welcoming of students of all genders, sexualities, ethnicities, national origins, religions, and ability levels. For example, a syllabus may include the instructors’ chosen names and pronouns to model to students the importance of respecting gender diversity. We also
recommend that introductions of students in small classes invite them to provide their chosen name and pronouns, or in larger classes, that the iLearn platform have a place for students to provide this information, and any other information that may be conducive to creating a more inclusive and welcoming community of learners.

All syllabi must be available for review in the department office within one week of the start of a semester.

**Approved:** Spring 2018
Technology Use in the Classroom Guidelines

Faculty have the right to limit use of cell phones, laptops, and other technology in their classroom. These policies must be conveyed to students on the syllabus with consequences clearly laid out. Examples may include:

1. Cell phones must be turned to mute and stowed away in backpacks during class.
2. Laptops are not to be used in the classroom unless the instructor gives permission.
3. Cell phones and other devices may not be used to record any aspect of a class session without permission from the instructor. Unauthorized use of recording devices will be reported to the Office on Student Conduct. Under California law, any recording requires consent by both parties, thus unauthorized recording may be reported to law enforcement authorities.
4. Students with disabilities who need technological support during class must discuss the requested accommodations with instructors prior to their use. All reasonable accommodations should be honored.

Approved: Fall 2017
Timely Communications Guidelines

One of the most common complaints about faculty members, administrators and staff members, is not responding to email requests for information. Recognizing that all members of the CHSS community are very busy and receive hundreds of email requests, the CHSS guideline is to respond within 72 hours during the work week to urgent or time-sensitive requests for information. If a request requires more time to fully answer, CHSS members are advised to respond that they received the request and provide an estimate of when they will be able to provide an answer or response.

Approved: Spring 2018
Undergraduate Teaching Assistant Policy

Senate policy on use of students as instructional aides is found at https://senate.sfsu.edu/content/policy-undergraduate-instructional-aides. Each department shall outline the roles and duties of undergraduate teaching assistants, consistent with this university policy. Undergraduate students are not to be involved in grading in any way (grading papers, recording grades, or in a situation to see the grades or personal information of students in the class). Instructors shall not include undergraduate teaching assistants as instructors on iLearn sites, and all activities of an undergraduate teaching assistant must be done under the supervision of a faculty member (for example, a TA cannot teach a class if the instructor is ill or out of town). The student must be enrolled in a 685 course and not concurrently enrolled in the class for which they are serving as a teaching assistant. Undergraduate TAs must be assigned tasks related to the teaching and administration of a class. Other mechanisms are available for student assistants on research or service activities.

Approved: Fall 2017
Website Policies and Procedures for Departments/Programs

This policy is intended to establish and protect quality standards for school, department, and program websites; improve the efficiency of processes for updating websites; protect brand consistency; identify best practices and provide resources. This policy will be evaluated on an annual basis and will be revised as necessary.

This policy does not apply to individual and faculty websites.

Purpose of Department Websites

1. Promote the mission of the school, department, institute or program to core constituents (i.e. prospective students, their families, current students, donors, alumni, friends, the media and casual visitors)
2. Advance student success goals
3. Provide information to the campus community

Responsibilities of Schools/Departments

Departments, schools and programs (“Website Owners”) are responsible for adhering to the policy laid out in this document.

Website Owners are expected to maintain the accuracy and currency of all of their site’s content, including faculty lists, course lists, forms, news and events.

Chairs/directors will assign roles and responsibilities for the web within their units, whether it is the AOC or another designated individual(s). Designated individuals will be provided with the appropriate training, as well as individual assistance from the CHSS Web & Digital Media Specialist, in mastering software and style for the website. Additional training is available upon request.

Website Owners should submit requests for support through the CHSS Help Desk. The Help Desk link can be found on the Employee Resources page of the CHSS website. After logging into the Help Desk, select “Information Technology,” then choose “Add” to start a ticket.

College Office Responsibilities

The College Office web team consists of the CHSS Director of Director of Communications and the Web & Digital Media Specialist.

The CHSS Director of Communications:

- Consults on overall web strategy, content development and organization
- Provides direction with regard to University and College branding and editorial style
- Supervises Web & Digital Media Specialist
The Web & Digital Media Specialist:

- Serves as the college expert on the use of technology to achieve website goals.
- Provides technical maintenance and support, such as maintaining modules, granting access, introducing new modules, and accessibility assessment.
- Coordinates site review process with the Disability Programs and Resource Center (for accessibility) and Strategic Marketing & Communications (for branding).
- Provides training to individuals responsible for maintaining sites.
- Provides analytics reports upon request.

If the College Office web team finds that a department or school website is out of date or is not following the practices laid out in this document, a member of the team will contact the Chair/Director and request that the problem be addressed within 10 business days. The Chair/Director or designee may request a training session with the Web & Digital Media Specialist if needed in order to implement changes. If a website continues to fail to meet these guidelines, the College Office web team may limit the Website Owner’s administrative access to the site and/or make changes.

Review of New or Redesigned Sites

When a site is created or significantly changed, it must pass two University reviews as follows. The Web and Digital Media Specialist will coordinate the review process with the appropriate offices.

1. **Accessibility**
   All SF State websites must be accessible to people with disabilities. The Accessibility Technology Initiative team in the Disability Programs and Resource Center must review new sites or major changes to existing sites before they go live.

2. **Branding**
   The University requires that all new or redesigned sites be reviewed for brand consistency by SF State’s Strategic Marketing & Communications Office.

Website Access

Administrative access to the site should be limited to the Chair/Director and one person that the Chair/Director designates. Access to the site by numerous individuals can result in technical problems and inconsistencies in visual and editorial style. Any additional designees must be approved by the College Office web staff.
Website Structure

The Chairs’ Council has agreed to a common menu structure to be used by all departments and schools. A single menu across all schools and departments provides a better user experience for prospective students and makes sites easier to maintain.

Approved menu for schools and departments:

- About
- Academics
- Faculty & Staff
- Student Resources
- News & Events
- Alumni
- Department Specific #1
- Department Specific #2
- Department Specific #3
- Contact

A school or department may include up to three optional menu items that are specific to that school or department.

In addition, sites must adhere to the following practices or request an exception:

1. **Keep site to one menu level.**
   Your content should be able to be organized into this main menu as shown above without requiring a second-level menu (aka submenu). This practice keeps content focused and prevents visitors from becoming lost in the site. If you find that you need a second level, you may be putting too much information on your site. If you wish to create a second level, you must consult the College Office web staff. Example of a second-level menu (discouraged):

   **General information**
   - About the Major
   - Faculty & Staff
   - Announcements
   - Contact Us

2. **Do not link directly to another site from the navigation menu.**
   Items listed within the site menu must navigate to a page within the website. Items that appear below the menu text, such as graphics, buttons and seals, may link offsite. Social media icons may also link offsite.
3. **Link to the Bulletin for course lists.**
   Website Owners should link to their unit’s page in the Academic Bulletin instead of repeating course lists.

4. **Do not create pages that consist solely of links.**
   Pages that contain only lists of links should be avoided; if necessary to list resources, links must be introduced with explanatory text.

5. **Use headings and styles that are built into the template.** Do not create your own heading styles or change the style of a heading (i.e., adding other sizes, colors, or italicizing headings). Do not using heading styles for any type of text other than headings. Misusing or changing headings interferes with accessibility, undermines brand consistency, and usually looks unappealing. Use the headings that are building into the template.

6. **Use anchor links.**
   Page content should be kept short — most visitors only spend a few seconds on a page — but if a longer page is necessary, use anchor links in the body of the page to navigate from one place to another on the same page.

   Anchor link example:

   **Student Resources**

   - Advising
   - Student Organizations
   - Internships
   - Scholarships
   - Career Outlook
   - Forms & Documents

7. **Place social media icons within header.** Social media icons, if used, should be placed within the site header as shown below in the lower right.
8. **Use images at full width.**
Images should be set to 100% width whenever possible, meaning that they span the whole width of the page, excluding the menu column. This will significantly improve the website experience for users viewing from mobile devices. This may not be possible if the file size isn’t large enough or the photo isn’t horizontal.

Example of photo used at full width:

![Image of student sitting on bench with smartphone]

**How to upload images**

**Specs for full-width images:** Width: Enter “100”; leave height blank

Images for homepage slideshow should be 1000px X 600px

9. **Make forms accessible.** All forms must pass [web accessibility standards](#). There are resources on campus available to help with creating accessible forms. For training or assistance, you can contact the [SF State ATI Support Team](#).

**Exceptions**

Chairs/directors wishing for their site to be granted an exception to any of these practices must direct their request to the Director of Communications and may expect a response within two business days. Exceptions will only be granted under unusual and compelling circumstances that serve the goal of student success.
Recommendations and tips on content

General

Keep content as brief and simple as possible – visitors will not read long, wordy pages. In fact, most visitors spend only a few seconds on a web page. Imagine who your visitor will be (e.g., students) and keep that visitor in mind when writing copy. This is not academic writing!

Homepage

This is where you make your first impression. Content on this page should be brief and engaging. An effective homepage has compelling visuals and conveys what is special about your program – who you are and what you do – without getting into too much detail or being too text-heavy. (The slideshow module can be used for this purpose.)

About

Content on this page can include information such as your mission statement and program scope.

Academics & Admissions

Information about all your undergraduate and graduate programs should be placed here. Admission information should also be included here. If your department has multiple programs, this page should list each program with a short description about the program. Each section should then link to a separate page with more information about that specific program.

Within the Academics section, program pages should include program overview, admissions, degree requirements and a roadmap. Departments and schools are strongly encouraged to link to the SF State Bulletin for degree requirements. This helps with accuracy and consistency of information for students.

Student Resources

This page should include information about advising, career resources/outlook, forms, scholarships, also include University resources that might be useful such as financial aid and tuition.

Alumni

A unit may choose to include an Alumni tab as one of the three optional menu items available to Website Owners. This is the place to promote alumni activities, highlight notable alumni, and provide information about the SF State Alumni Association or your school’s or department’s own alumni association.

Modules

Modules make site maintenance easier because they automate tasks that would be cumbersome if done manually.

Below are the most commonly used modules:

News/Announcements: Allows users to publish news stories. News can be displayed in different ways throughout the site. Stories can be fed onto the homepage and/or used in
slideshows and are automatically archived and can be viewed in an archived view. Example of news archive

**Events:** Allows users to post events. Events can be displayed in a feed on the homepage as well as a full calendar view.

**People:** Allows users to easily keep track of their faculty and staff directories. Two layouts are available — a simple table as well as an image-focused grid layout. Examples of both layouts can be seen on the CHSS people page. Faculty head shots can be arranged free of charge through Academic Technology.

**Slideshow:** Allows users to easily integrate a slideshow on their website. Slideshow can be powered by news/announcement module which allows news stories to appear in the slideshow. An example of a slideshow can be seen on the CHSS homepage.

**Resources**

- To book a Drupal training with the Web & Digital Media Specialist: Help Desk
  For information about SF State’s content management system: Drupal at SF State
  For information about web and document accessibility: Accessible Technology Initiative
- For templates, tools and resources for creating and updating University websites: SF State Web Template Guidelines
- For SF State branding guidelines related to proper use of University name and image: Identity System Guidelines
  For editorial style guidelines to help maintain in-house consistency in writing/editing: Editorial Style Guide
  For SF State photos available for for general communication use (print or online): SF State Flickr account.
- To schedule a free faculty head shot: Academic Technology

**Approved:** December 2018
Workplace Culture Policy

Preamble

The CHSS strives to create a culture of collegiality and civility that supports all of its members, fosters a positive work environment, and models this behavior for students. Collegiality and civility need to be infused across everything we do at the college. Universities engage in dialogue, debate, and disagreement on many topics/issues that may be considered sensitive or controversial to some. The need to address social justice and equity issues sometimes put staff and faculty members at odds with each other, or with administration, staff, or students. Universities also have unequal distributions of power that embolden some to behave unprofessionally with others lower in rank, although inappropriate behaviors can occur by subordinates toward those in authority as well. This policy addresses collegiality, civility, and bullying.

The CHSS believes in promoting a culture of civility in the workplace where staff, students, faculty and administrators are treated respectfully, collegially, and courteously. CHSS also recognizes that the structure of power within a university may be such that staff, in particular, could be reluctant to voice their needs. Further, staff are often beholden to demands and requests from a range of constituencies, all of whom often exercise power, both formally and informally, over that staff person. Departmental staff, for instance, are subject to demands from several constituencies: students, faculty, chair/director, college office, university offices, and external parties, to name a few. CHSS recognizes that these power relationships shape the workplace and especially disadvantage staff. This policy also compels CHSS leadership and faculty to actively work towards creating a workplace culture that recognizes the inherent power relations, works to mitigate their impact on creating productive work environments, and values staff as integral and capable members of the team.

This policy was created through the collaborative work of department and college staff and leadership. As a result of this work, four major areas of concern related to workplace culture emerged: (1) creating a culture of civility; (2) increasing and maintaining open communication; (3) creating a balanced workload; and (4) ensuring personal safety while working. The policy below addresses each of these with sample practices that demonstrate the principles and intent of the CHSS Workplace Culture Policy. This policy applies to face-to-face verbal communications as well as email, texts, phone calls, and other electronic messaging, and to non-verbal behavior in meetings, informal workplace encounters, in all types of peer review (e.g., RTP, teaching observations), staff evaluations, and in the classroom.

Definitions

Collegiality is defined as a spirit of generosity and equity in sharing vital functions of the academy such as collaboration and constructive cooperation in the development of curricula, coordination of coursework in a program, and equitable distribution of committee and other program/departamental service related to the life of the institution. Staff and faculty members who are not collegial put undue burden on other members of their communities and may affect student success as well as create a demoralizing departmental climate.
A component of collegiality is **civility**. In the CHSS, we highly value social justice and equity, and require that staff and faculty members conduct themselves in a manner that advances this mission; that is, civility is defined as respect, non-violent intervention, deep listening, openness to hearing opposing viewpoints, and willingness to collaborate on projects central to the running of the department, college, or university. Incivility, or disrespectful conduct, can manifest as behaviors such as sarcasm, talking over others, being late to or leaving early from meetings to discuss these issues, use of profanity, humiliating or embarrassing others, threats of retribution, or flagrantly not engaging with a topic, when these behaviors are targeted at an individual or group of people and create a negative work climate.

**Bullying** is defined as a severe form of incivility. California state legislation (Assembly Bill 2053) defines abusive conduct as:

> Conduct of an employer or employee in the workplace, with malice, that a reasonable person would find hostile, offensive, and unrelated to an employer’s legitimate business interests. Abusive conduct may include repeated infliction of verbal abuse, such as the use of derogatory remarks, insults, and epithets, verbal or physical conduct that a reasonable person would find threatening, intimidating, or humiliating, or the gratuitous sabotage or undermining of a person’s work performance. A single act shall not constitute abusive conduct, unless especially severe and egregious.

Workplace bullying does not include reasonable action taken by management to direct and control how work is done, to monitor workflow and give feedback on workplace performance. The exercise of legitimate authority, administered in a professional and constructive manner, cannot be classified as bullying. For example, a “demanding” supervisor who sets high standards and provides the resources needed to meet them is not a bully. Workplace bullying often involves an abuse or misuse of power. However, many bullying situations involve employees bullying their peers, while other instances can involve making a request of an employee who one does not directly supervise.

**Policy**

Work environments are at their most productive and collegial when communication is frequent, inclusive, and oriented towards valuing the people we work with. This includes developing mechanisms to ensure appropriate channels and processes where concerns can be voiced. CHSS believes that work environments should be created in ways that ensure people’s safety.

Workload and employee duties are defined by direct supervisors; at the department level, the direct supervisor of faculty and staff is the chair or director. Conditions of employee workload should be determined collaboratively between the employee and their direct supervisor as indicated by human resources/job classification. Though faculty are often in a position to ask departmental staff for services, in the majority of instances, faculty are not the direct supervisors of office staff. If another person other than the direct supervisor should be supervising a staff member, this is made explicit in the job description and can be assigned through HR.
CHSS respects the right of faculty and staff to maintain an appropriate workload to improve job satisfaction. The CBA regulates hours of work, absences due to illness or injury, and vacation requests and CHSS supervisors are encouraged to familiarize themselves with union contracts upon assuming a leadership position. Even with the protections of a union contract, the university environment often produces unexpected demands and increasingly asks all constituents to do more with less resources. This includes departmental staff whose jobs have become increasingly complex with every innovation at the university but are not provided additional resources to complete their responsibilities.

CHSS believes that despite the ongoing and seemingly never-ending demands on employees, supervisors should strive to create work environments that ensure a balanced workload. Further, supervisors should be attentive to the demands placed on employees and moderate requests when possible. Requests of colleagues should be mindful of their current duties and supervisors can place limits on demands of their employees. Demands, position descriptions and timeframes given for completion should be realistic and make sure to take into account necessary times for completion by external bodies. Departments, schools and other units should set clear expectations for requests of employees by non-supervisory people (i.e. departmental faculty, students, etc.).

It is the duty of the chair or supervisor of the department or office to empower staff in order for the work environment to benefit all parties. Supervisors should take care to ensure that staff and faculty rights established by the Collective Bargaining Agreements are followed. If an employee member believes this CHSS policy is in violation, they have recourse through their supervisor, the AOC Council and the Dean and Associate Dean of CHSS. When employees have a dispute about working conditions that does not rise to the level of a formal grievance, they should contact their supervisor. If employees are concerned about bringing an issue forward, they can also work through the AOC Council or the Dean and Associate Dean of CHSS, which can work to mediate the issue and bring the issue from the body to the appropriate authorities. Employees also have the right to consult with the Associate Dean or Dean of CHSS when good faith attempts to resolve disputes within a department or office have been unsuccessful. The Associate Dean or Dean of CHSS will work to mediate all processes.

**Practices**

*Below are some example practices that reflect this policy. Not all practices contained herein are necessarily ones that should be adopted across departments; rather, they demonstrate some of the practices that staff report contributed to positive workplace cultures:*

**Theme 1: Culture of Civility**

- When mistakes are made, the person acknowledges it and apologizes. The person on the receiving end of the mistake does not respond in a punitive or derogatory manner.
- Honor the expertise of all employees and recognize that everyone has a stake in student success and contributes to the workplace environment.
- When witnessing bullying, actively address it by asking the person or persons not to use derogatory remarks or threatening, intimidating or humiliating behavior.
• Recognize power differentials amongst employees and actively work to ensure that those power differentials do not affect how one treats another person.

Theme 2: Communication

• Departments/schools and other work units should schedule regular administrative team meetings to discuss expectations, boundaries and develop plans for meeting challenges and completing tasks.
• Review communication to ensure it is undertaken in a polite and courteous tone. Email communication, for instance, is often misinterpreted as the tone intended is often mistaken by readers and thus writers should take care to ensure the politeness of electronic communication. For example, some people interpret “ALL CAPS” in email as yelling, demanding, and/or belittling.
• Communicate new policies or share information that could affect employee workload in a timely and expansive manner. Allow for work based on previous policy to be grandfathered in when appropriate.

Theme 3: Balanced Workload

• Prioritize people when making expenditure decisions.
• Supervisors, including chairs/directors, should encourage staff to take accumulated leave and be open to the need for vacation, personal and sick leave time, especially during times where work is particularly stressful.
• Requests for days off—sick, personal time, or vacation—should generally be granted if requested with the appropriate amount of notice (often requests for time off are urgent—i.e. sick, or bereavement—and this should not result in denial). CSUEU CBA section 15.7 states that “An employee shall not normally be required to provide such a statement or verification [licensed health care provider’s statement or other appropriate verification] for an absence of five (5) consecutive days or less.” APC Union 4 CBA contract also provides for a 5-or-more-day absence prior to requiring verification. If a supervisor or director believes it is appropriate to ask for verification for a sick leave-related absence, they should consult with HR prior to doing so.
• Working while out of the office should not be expected for those classified as non-exempt employees.
• When possible, plan for coverage of assigned duties when departmental staff are on leave.
• Work hours should be clear and fall within the normally expected 40-hour-work week (i.e. not on weekends or nights unless that is the normal work hours or in mutually agreed upon exceptions). Non-exempt workers should not be expected to labor beyond a 40-hour-work week.
• Faculty are responsible for preparing and submitting their own paperwork, including course materials, reimbursement, and travel requests, and departmental staff should not be expected (but can if they so desire) to perform these duties on their behalf.
Theme 4: Safety

- CHSS staff and faculty have access to trainings related to campus security.
- CHSS maintains its own network of security mechanisms and works with university police to ensure adequate patrols and surveillance mechanisms on campus.
- Ensure unit staff have access to security mechanisms, including doors with keypads, automatic locking doors, camera surveillance and adequate emergency preparedness and evacuation training.
- Permit closure of office doors after regular working hours and during university breaks when the number of people on campus dwindles considerably.

Approved: July 17, 2018

Revised: September 10, 2019

Note: This policy started out as two separate statements, one focusing on faculty and one on staff/faculty relations. These two policies were blended into one based on recommendations from the faculty who reviewed the policy manual in spring 2019. Since there were no substantive comments except that the two policies overlapped too much, this policy was not sent out for a new review.
ENFORCEMENT OF POLICIES
This section outlines the steps that will be taken for violation of any university, college, or departmental policy. To begin, the College will distribute the policy manual annually to all personnel to ensure that everyone is aware of the expectations for professional conduct in our College and the sanctions for violating the policies. Most policy violations will be handled at the most local level possible, but when that is not possible, the steps outlined below will be followed. Violations of a severe and/or legal nature (such as sexual harassment or any type of violence) may need to be reported immediately to a higher authority outside of the college. In most cases however, the following steps will be followed.

**Information Gathering and Local Resolution Steps**

1. Upon the first occurrence of an incident that may indicate a violation in a policy, typically this will be addressed at the department level. In the case of an alleged policy violation by a staff or faculty member, a meeting with the chair will be scheduled to discuss the policy and seek resolution. The incident should be outlined in writing (an email is sufficient) in terms of when, where, and how the policy was violated. The alleged violator of the policy may provide documentation if they believe that the accusation is in error. If a department chair or administrator is in violation of a policy, a staff or faculty member may take the issue to the next higher level (typically the Associate Dean of the College) and the same initial process will be used with the Associate Dean facilitating the meetings and overseeing the documentation. Any written documentation from this initial process will stay at the level of the department or Associate Dean’s office unless further intervention is needed.

2. If the initial processes toward resolution are not satisfactory, the University Ombudsperson office or similar person/office may be brought in for mediation.

3. If the behavior cannot be resolved at the department level with or without mediation, and continues to disrupt the workings of a program or department, progressive discipline may be initiated. The first step is to contact the Dean’s office, where a fact-finding process will begin. This may involve meetings with the parties involved to outline the issues and identify steps toward resolution. Any written documentation from the previous steps are shared with the Dean, and new information may be gathered. If the Dean finds that the policy violation has occurred, a Performance Agreement Letter (see Appendix 3) will be generated that outlines the steps needed to come into compliance with the policy, and a timeline and deliverables to show that the person has come into compliance. This letter is filed in the Dean’s office.

4. Follow-up meetings will be scheduled to monitor progress on the plan outlined in the PAL with the appropriate parties. If the Dean determines that satisfactory progress is not being made, the Dean may choose to proceed to disciplinary steps.

**Disciplinary Steps**

Progressive disciplinary actions may be taken in the following cases when there is ample evidence that a policy violation did occur: 1) cases when university policy mandates reporting to
a higher authority; 2) a serious problem is identified that significantly disrupts the workings of a program or department or potentially harms students, staff, or faculty members and that was not resolved at the department level; 3) repeated violations of policies that have not been resolved at the informal level or via the steps outlined in the Performance Agreement Letter. Disciplinary steps are initiated only by the College Dean’s office. There are several options for initiating discipline depending on the severity of the policy violation and the Dean is authorized to use discretion to determine what steps to take.

1. Meeting of Counseling. This meeting is scheduled with the person who has been accused of violating the policy, the Chair of the department and the Dean to discuss issues of misconduct allegations. The staff or faculty member in violation of the policy may bring a CFA representative to these meetings.

2. Memo of Counseling. This is written documentation of the concern and a recommendation or plan for rectifying the problem, using the template for the Performance Agreement Letter. This letter will be placed in the personnel file in Human Resources. It will typically follow a meeting of counseling, or may have been generated earlier in the process and will be updated after the meeting of counseling.

3. Follow-up. According to the timetable established in the PAL, meetings will be scheduled to determine whether the policy violator has come into compliance. If deadlines are not met, then the next step is a letter of reprimand.

4. Letter of reprimand. If evidence of harm is clearly identified, the Dean may opt to go immediately to a letter of reprimand. In cases of less egregious behavior, a letter of reprimand may be issued only if the faculty member does not comply with the conditions outlined in the Memo of Counseling. This letter is placed in the personnel file. Article 18 of the CBA discusses letters of reprimand.

5. Suspension without pay is the next step if the faculty or staff member continues to not comply with recommendations. See Article 19 of CBA.

6. Continued non-compliance may result in demotion or termination. Suspensions, demotions, or terminations are done only in consultation with Faculty Affairs and Human Resources.

Approved: August 16, 2018
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: The Development of the Workplace Culture Policy

Some policies require more input than can be gained through the Chairs Council alone. When reports of incivility, hostile workplaces, conflicts between CHSS members, and declarations of unfair or unequal workloads began to increase in our College, we decided to embark on a process of developing policy to address civility and collegiality. This policy has undergone more rigorous review than any other in the policy manual, and we wish to provide every member of the CHSS with the background information and documentation that went into creating this policy. Because this policy has perhaps the greatest potential to shift the culture in our College to one that best aligns with our values and mission, and creates a greater climate of respect and equity, we spent more than six months on development of this policy. Efforts that went into the development of this policy included reviewing academic literature and professional organizations statements on civility and collegiality, examining policies at other universities, considering Academic Senate and CSU resolutions; consulting California law; having extended discussions in Chair’s Council of the pros and cons of such a policy and the need to stay flexible to avoid restraining individual rights and freedom of speech as well as academic freedom; and finally, seeking input from CHSS faculty members via an anonymous online survey.

All of this information informed the final policy wording, so we summarize each of these data sources below. Although we started with a policy that addressed only the concepts of collegiality and civility, we soon learned that we needed to specifically call out bullying behavior as part of the policy (see survey findings below). Subsequently, we refer to the policy that includes components of civility, collegiality, and bullying as a workplace climate policy. Simultaneously, a workgroup consisting of AOCs and Department Chairs worked on a workplace culture policy that focuses on the needs of AOCs. Together, these two policy statements work toward a more respectful, equitable workplace with more effective communication and boundaries.

Academic Literature and National Education Organization Statements

The first task is to define the components that make up a workplace climate. According to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB):

Climate = the atmosphere or ambience of an organization as perceived by its members. An organization’s climate is reflected in its structures, policies, and practices; the demographics of its membership; the attitudes and values of its members and leaders; and the quality of personal interactions.

Campus Safety = the right of individuals to be safe from physical, verbal, or emotional harm or harassment if they express a different opinion than others. Freedom of expression is highly valued in the academy, and safety does not prevent others from expressing ideas, beliefs or experiences that may be uncomfortable to some.

Sexual harassment is also a component of the workplace climate, and is a major problem at universities, which are second only to the military in rates of workplace sexual harassment: 69% of military employees and 58% of academic employees have experienced sexual harassment (National Academics of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). However, SF State has a
well-developed policy, annual training, and clear procedures for addressing sexual harassment so no college policy is necessary. This policy is listed in the manual so that all CHSS members will be familiar with it, but will not be addressed further here. When the workplace climate is one of sexual or gender harassment, it must be reported to the Title IX coordinator. The CHSS policy deals with other forms of harassment on the workplace: incivility, lack of collegiality, and bullying.

**Civility**

Connelly (2009) defined civility as the way one conducts oneself in expressing opinions, beliefs, and experiences and reacting to the expressions of others. He notes that civility is a learned behavior that values living as part of a diverse community and the value of a common good that predominates over pure self-interest. To be part of a community means that sometimes compromise is necessary, and that interactions between members of the community need to be conducted with respect, adaptability, flexibility, and recognition of social norms. Incivility can exist among all combinations of stakeholders at a university, but the most often studied are student incivility to faculty, faculty incivility to students, and faculty incivility to peers. Incivility can be passive, such as ignoring the target (Schilpzand et al. 2015) or active such as making demeaning comments (Alt & Itzkovich, 2017). One respondent in a study of workplace incivility described it as “joy stealing” (Heinrich, 2006), reflecting how incivility can reduce job satisfaction.

**Student Incivility to Faculty.** Much of the literature on civility in colleges and universities has focused on student behaviors, finding that faculty members reported problems from their students such as:

- Bullying, sarcasm, and arguing (Alkandari, 2011; Seganish & Holter, 2013),
- Unwillingness to participate in the learning process (Morrissette, 2001),
- Talking while the professor is teaching (Alexander et al, 2009; Connelly, 2009),
- Doing other activities in class (using cell phone, surfing internet, reading newspaper) (Connelly, 2009; Feldman, 2001; Nordstrom et al., 2009),
- Sending inappropriate emails (Connelly 2009).

In one study of nursing faculty, 53% reported that a student had yelled at them in class (Lashley & de Meneses, 2001). In general, there is wide agreement among students that these behaviors are unacceptable (Alexander, Mundryke, & Brown, 2009). Women, ethnic minority faculty and those with less experience and credentials experience more incivility and bullying from students (Johnson-Bailey, 2015; Lampman, et al., 2009; Chamberlin, 2010). In one study (Lampman, 2012), 63% of women compared to 50% of men reported a serious incident of student incivility during their careers.

It has been noted that “if we expect students to demonstrate civility when they graduate, then a clear definition of civility should be crafted and a plan to understand, apply and demonstrate civil behavior should be embedded through-out the curriculum” (Ward & Yates, 2014, p. 168). Who better to model civil behavior than their professors? To discover the same level of incivility initiated by faculty is disheartening.
Faculty Incivility to Students. Among the most common forms of incivility of faculty toward students is making demeaning or belittling comments in class or in writing. These comments often produce anger, fear, powerlessness, and a decrease in satisfaction with one’s education (Rawlins, 2017). In addition, feeling intimidated can result in an unsafe learning environment, where students avoid the disrespectful faculty member and do not seek help when they need it. They disengage emotionally from the class, which may further harm them if they are graded on active participation. Many students believe that respect must be earned, and if they do not feel respected by faculty, they may lash out. Rawlins (2017) noted that poor and ineffective communication was an underlying factor in much faculty-student incivility, including the use of condescending remarks, unclear communication, and poor online etiquette, such as all caps, slang, and unprofessional language in emails or posts. Rawlins found that incivility breeds incivility—a belittling comment by a faculty member results in a harsh response from the student, and if communications do not improve, the situation may escalate. Another factor that students consider uncivil behavior among faculty is to provide a negative evaluation on a test or paper without providing feedback about why the grade was assigned. In addition, being unresponsive to emails and playing favorites are common complaints of students, who feel disrespected and dismissed by such behaviors.

Faculty Incivility to Faculty/Staff. A study of nursing faculty found that 68% rated incivility among their coworkers as a moderate to severe problem (Clark, 2013). These events are often related to the imbalance of power and overwhelmingly the main perpetrators of incivility are tenured, senior faculty (Peters & King, 2017). One useful definition of incivility in the faculty context is “low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of norms for mutual respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999, p. 457). Bullying is a higher intensity activity with a more defined target described below. Namie (2003) listed eight types of faculty incivility including: the silent treatment, micro-managing, ongoing criticism, gossip, exclusion, patronizing, belittling another’s academic work, and taking credit for the work of others. Other forms of incivility include failing to share the workload of a department or program, using cell phones or laptops during meetings, constant interruptions in meetings, and challenging the expertise of another (Clark, Olender, Kenski, & Cardoni, 2013). In one study (Porath & Pearson, 2013), 98% of faculty members reported experiencing incivility, and half of those reported that it occurred at least once a week.

Some of the underlying causes of workplace incivility have been suggested including professional jealousy, unclear or overwhelming workloads, increased demand for research productivity, and competition for advancement (Clark, 2013). Academic institutions are hierarchical, and the current process of peer assessment for retention, tenure, and promotion make the system ripe for power imbalances that can result in bullying and incivility (King & Piotrowski, 2015). But most incivility does not emanate from the top, the administration, but rather from senior tenured faculty against untenured faculty (Beckman, Cannela, & Wantland, 2013; Raineri, Frear, & Edmonds, 2011). In one study, bullying by senior faculty was two to four times more common than bullying by administrators (Beckman et al, 2013); however, the CHSS workplace policy applies equally to faculty, staff, students, and administrators, who all should be held to standards of civility and collegiality.
Sometimes faculty use a rationale of academic freedom to support their bullying behavior, however, the AAUP condemns behaviors that create a hostile working environment, and notes that civility does not interfere with academic freedom. AAUP does caution against but using collegiality or civility measures for retention, tenure, and promotion guidelines. They also warn that policies cannot mandate things like “enthusiasm” or “dedication” to one’s departmental activities. However, civility is a core value of the AAUP.

**Workplace Bullying.** Sometimes the workplace incivility becomes more severe and lapses into bullying. See the definitions of workplace bullying in Appendices 2 and 3, the CSU and SF State statements on bullying. The majority of faculty members in higher education settings (62%) have experienced workplace bullying in the past 18 months (Shematek, 2012), with the consequences of bullying including taking more time off for illness, isolation, and work disengagement. Research has shown that women tend to have less power in academic settings—a review of 9000 discrimination and harassment cases at universities showed that women are at a distinct disadvantage in the workplace (McDonald & Dear, 2008) with gender-based cases including both sexual harassment and non-sexual types of bullying (Yamada, 2000). Hollis (2015) found that 71% of women and 50% of men in academics had experienced bullying, and Juanita Johnson-Bailey (2015) noted “when you introduce race and gender, bullying and incivility can occur regardless of rank” (p. 43). That is, even senior level women and people of color experience incivility and bullying from colleagues, even those of lower rank. Some studies find that this bullying by colleagues is more damaging than painful experiences with management or students and has more negative impact on career advancement (Fraziet, 2011; Keashly & Neuman, 2010, Twale & DeLuca, 2008).

In conclusion, the academic literature points to the high prevalence of incivility and bullying in academic settings and suggests that they are associated with negative health outcomes such as anxiety, depression, sleep problems, loss of morale, and burnout (Rawlins, 2017). These behaviors also disrupt the teaching/learning environment by taking time and energy away from one’s academic pursuits (Peters & King, 2017). Productivity is reduced when faculty and students feel the stress and powerlessness of being targets or witnesses to incivility. Finally, if not checked immediately, incivility and bullying can escalate. CHSS is committed to reducing incivility in all forms, but to reduce incivility in students, faculty must demonstrate civility themselves in all contexts and set conditions for respect in their classrooms.

**The California Context: State Laws and other University Policies**

California state legislation (Assembly Bill 2053) defines abusive workplace conduct as:

> **Conduct of an employer or employee in the workplace, with malice, that a reasonable person would find hostile, offensive, and unrelated to an employer’s legitimate business interests. Abusive conduct may include repeated infliction of verbal abuse, such as the use of derogatory remarks, insults, and epithets, verbal or physical conduct that a reasonable person would find threatening, intimidating, or humiliating, or the gratuitous sabotage or undermining of a person’s work performance. A single act shall not constitute abusive conduct, unless especially severe and egregious.**
**CSU Statement of Workplace Bullying**

This statement, adopted by the CSU in 2016, urges all campuses to develop policy and promote inclusive workplaces that do not tolerate bullying. See Appendix 2.

**SF State Resolution on Bullying**

This Academic Senate resolution addresses the need for a bullying policy for this institution. See the text of the resolution in Appendix 3.

**Academic Freedom Principles**

None of the CHSS policies threaten academic freedom. The AGB (2016) declared that having a workplace civility policy does not violate the tenets of academic freedom, which focus more on the rights to conduct research and teach in a manner that follows the professional judgment of the faculty member. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has recommended the same principles since they were first adopted in 1940, as follows:

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

**CHSS Faculty Survey Findings**

In the early spring of 2018, we launched an anonymous online survey to all teaching faculty in the CHSS to determine whether there was general agreement for the need for such a policy, to gather data on the types of situations that were affecting faculty members, and to get input on the scope and wording of the policy. In all, 38 individuals responded to the survey, providing rich, detailed commentary and helpful critique and suggestions. Three quantitative questions asked for how important respondents thought it was for the college to 1) have a civility policy; 2) have a collegiality policy; and 3) to set the tone for workplace climate for the entire college. Table 1 shows that there was overwhelming agreement that these policies and the role of the college in setting the tone, were critical interventions. Only one person opposed the creation of these policies.
Table 1. Importance of Policies and College’s Role in Setting the Tone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral/Don’t Know</th>
<th>Not very Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civility Policy</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality Policy</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Sets the Tone</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other quantitative comments addressed the general sense of approval of the draft policies that were provided in the survey. In all, 79% approved of having a statement that CHSS supports a culture of collegiality and civility; 78% approved of the language of the draft civility policy; and 76% approved of the language of the draft collegiality policy. Many provided helpful suggestions on the specific wording and scope of the policies, and in these qualitative comments, a major theme was the need to include separate wording on bullying. This is detailed in the analysis of the qualitative comments below.

**Examples of Incivility.** The first question asked:

Have you encountered situations where a civility policy would have been helpful? If yes, please summarize the situation without revealing department, names or other details that might identify individuals.

Of the 33 respondents who answered this question, seven said that they had not encountered any instances of incivility in their departments or other interactions within the university. The remaining 68% reported situations with colleagues that they had found distressing. By far the most common form that incivility took was within electronic communications; emails or listserv correspondence where rude or hostile comments were directed at specific individuals in a public manner. Other situations that were reported included malicious gossip, inappropriate comments or questions to faculty candidates, small groups communicating behind the scenes to disrupt faculty meetings, and passive-aggressive behaviors. A common dynamic that was reported was that some senior faculty members used their power or privilege to intimidate or manipulate those with less power. Words like “disrespect,” “bullying,” “intimidation,” and “abuse of power” were used to describe these situations. Although the majority felt it would be helpful to have a policy on civility, many thought that a policy alone would not be enough to shift the culture and called for training and sanctions for incivility. Many felt that those with the loudest voices and inappropriate behaviors were rewarded for this behavior by being excused from the real work of their departments, and the burden of service work then fell on junior faculty who feared negative repercussions on retention, tenure, and promotion decisions from those senior faculty members. These comments showed the overlap between civility and collegiality, as many thought that incivility was the vehicle by which some faculty shirked their service responsibilities in a department. Some examples of respondent comments include:
• My departmental colleagues make critical and judgmental comments about our department to those outside the department or to students.
• I have colleagues who have bullied others and are rude to the chair and other faculty.
• The toxic and hostile persons are rewarded but good citizens are not. The badmouthing and malicious rumors are tolerated.
• Senior faculty have engaged in intimidation and bullying of associate and assistant professors.
• When a colleague…has to point fingers, assign blame, and engage in name-calling.
• There are situations where one faculty may think they are being “assertive” or “appropriately argumentative” where the other faculty members believe this person is being a bully and/or engaging in harassment.
• I have encountered multiple situations where the “leader”…was/is condescending to faculty, disrespectful of faculty time, constantly sending emails, and…creating a very unpleasant work environment. I have also encountered situations where a “gang” of faculty would bully another to force a particular teaching schedule.
• One faculty member will send emails that come across as negative, accusatory, and condescending.
• I have witnessed a full [professor] faculty member send rude, hostile, personal emails to two different non-full faculty members on faculty listservs; such emails also intimidated other members of the listserv from speaking up.
• On a nearly daily basis, situations include personal insults in person and via email, unprofessional conduct in meetings and on committees.

**Examples of Lack of Collegiality.** The next open-ended question asked:

Have you encountered situations where there has been a lack of collegiality that affected the quality of your work life or the workings of a program or department? If yes, please describe without identifying any individuals or departments.

A total of 35 individuals responded to this question with five indicating that they had not encountered problems with collegiality. Some of the situations that were noted included: feeling unsupported in the RTP process; faculty going behind colleague’s backs to complain to the Chair or college administrators; refusal of some faculty to serve on important committees within their departments, putting undue burden on other faculty; behavior of one or a few faculty members that decreased morale in the entire department; behind the scenes meetings; and passive-aggressive behaviors. In several comments, senior faculty were called out as the main perpetrators of lack of collegiality. Junior faculty felt pressured to do more service work than those more powerful senior faculty, and felt unable to voice their concern to those faculty members who would be evaluating them for RTP. As noted above, there was significant overlap between incivility and lack of collegiality. Sample comments from respondents show the emotional repercussions of lack of collegiality and civility:
• Slackers and credit grabbers are rewarded with glory and spotlight. Hard workers are rewarded with just more work…Over the years I have heard many different types of lame excuses not to come to the campus, not to show up for meetings and never getting their share of work done…They pretty much advance themselves on other people’s expense…If these behaviors are tolerated by management, it is pervasive.
• It affected my research as well, since I had to devote more time to the hostile situation.
• There is one faculty member in our department who accuses everyone else of not being respectful but in an ironically disrespectful manner. This person is tenured so we feel stuck.
• Faculty have agreed to programmatic changes and then reneged, leaving students and other faculty with mixed, unclear messages. Faculty have been disrespectful by not showing up to an important set meeting, walking out of a meeting…refusing to communicate directly and honestly.
• Many situations where going to faculty meetings has become a dreaded experience.
• Beyond instances that are clearly rude, there is a pattern in my department where full faculty members disrespect the work, perspectives, and ideas of non-full members…I have witnessed the ideas and experiences of assistant professors being belittled or shot down by full professors…several full faculty members used bullying tactics to override (a volunteer) committee’s decisions at the last minute…I have not felt welcome in my own department.
• Although a plan was agreed upon by all faculty…the actual implementation is met with resistance and passive aggressive behaviors to resist the change, causing tension.
• Refusal to cede the floor in meetings, inability to make important departmental decisions due to personal agendas and vendettas, and refusing to acknowledge or abide by agreed upon policies and procedures.
• Junior colleagues who work at the pleasure of senior colleagues can suffer stressors and fear because speaking up about a lack of civility can lead to punishments.

A few comments outlined some concerns with having a collegiality policy, mainly because of concerns about how narrowly the policy might be defined, or whether/how the policy could be monitored and implemented. One person stated a broader concern about possible social justice ramifications:

I think such a policy feels dangerous for reasons I’m not sure I can articulate fully…it just feels really uncomfortable…It feels like an artificial set of rules on how we interact…Also, we need to be very careful about the ways that norms of “politeness” often reflect white supremacy cultures that avoid or punish particular types of conflict or communication. I think there are better ways to “set a tone” for collegiality and civility—such as through our structural conditions and shared mission/values, rather than by regulating behaviors beyond what university policy already covers.

The final policy addresses this by not including “politeness” per se in the policy or mandating any particular communication style, and by tying behaviors such as profanity, sarcasm, and
insults to situations where they are used to target a particular person or group of people. CHSS recognizes that stereotypes about some groups may include being perceived as “loud” or “angry” and respect that people express themselves in various ways. The policy targets behaviors that create a hostile climate, particularly for those with lesser degrees of power in the institution. Indeed, setting clear limits on how power and privilege can be exerted to the disadvantage of others is a social justice strategy.

The remaining open-ended questions asked for comments about the wording and scope of the policy statements. These very helpful comments lead to development of the final draft, which was approved by the Chair’s Council in April of 2018 and is included below in the policy section.

**Limitations of the Policy**

Although the policy statement offers some concrete examples of behaviors that can indicate civility and collegiality, these are concepts that are hard to define, and behaviors are interpreted by others in very different ways. A comment by a full professor that is dismissive of a decision made by a committee of untenured professors and lecturers may be perceived as “fair” by other tenured faculty, or as the person’s freedom of expression, but may feel threatening to junior faculty and lecturers. Another limitation is that creating a policy alone does not change the culture of a department or college. Therefore, the policy manual of CHSS includes a description of the process and nature of sanctions that may occur for violation of this, or any policy. Punishment is not the best way to change culture, and CHSS will embark on discussions about ways to improve the working environment for all of our employees in the near future. Senior leadership in the college will continue to discuss these concepts and receive training on best ways to manage conflicts and foster positive working climates at all levels.
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Appendix 2: CSU Statement on Bullying

ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
AS-3246-16/EX (Rev)
January 21-22, 2016

PREVENTING WORKPLACE BULLYING WITHIN THE CSU COMMUNITY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its commitment to the “states of mind” that “Differing perspectives must be tolerated and respected” and “All members of the university community must treat one another with respect and honesty.”

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU commend the CSU Chancellor’s Office and campuses that have, through survey-based policy and/or practice, addressed the “intimidation, humiliation, and isolation” that workplace bullying creates for faculty, staff, students, and administrators; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge CSU campus senates and administration to develop and implement strategies to redress, remedy, and mediate workplace bullying and promote inclusive workplace environments throughout the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the following stakeholders: CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU campus Athletic Directors, CSU campus Human Resources, CSU campus Title IX Officers, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU Vice Presidents of Student Affairs, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State University Employees Union (CSUEU), Campus Public Safety Departments, CSU Human Resources, CSU Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation (DHR) Administrators, California State Student Association (CSSA) and CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA).

RATIONALE: When the ASCSU created a position paper in 1985 on Collegiality in the California State University System, one of their goals was to illuminate the distinction between shared governance as a “process” and a “state of mind” characterized by honesty, respect, and trust. This resolution seeks to reaffirm the ASCSU’s commitment to honesty, respect and trust within the workplace. It also seeks to ensure that workplace bullying, defined by American Association of University Professors (AAUP) spotlight author Clara Wajngurt, as actions intended “to threaten, to intimidate, to humiliate or isolate members of the working university environment” that impacts both reputation and job performance, is prevented within the California State University system. Further support for the relevance of this resolution can be seen in the rationale for the CSU Workplace Environment Survey and proactive campus-based policies and practices that attempt to reduce barriers to inclusivity and cultivate best practices for addressing the dishonesty, disrespect and mistrust that arises from faculty, student, and staff experiences with antagonism, bigotry, false accusations of mistakes, humiliation, intimidation, and misplaced codes of civility that reduce campus morale and marginalize CSU community members (please see below for links to policies, best practices, and model programs). These
proactive best practices have drawn upon the exemplary efforts and ideals of consultation, local expert partnerships, and raising of collective awareness that we, as the largest public university system in the United States, have cultivated overtime to promote the dignity of all.

References:

- https://newworkplace.wordpress.com/2014/05/26/aaup-spotlights-bullying-in-academe
- http://www.aaup.org/article/prevention-bullying-campus#.Vr1sRPEz

Campus & System Based Models:

- CSU Channel Islands
  http://www.csuci.edu/cme/cme-anti-bullyingsummit.htm
- Chico State
- CSU East Bay
- CSU Fullerton
  http://campusclimatesurvey.fullerton.edu/study-results
- CSU Northridge
  http://www.csun.edu/social-behavioralsciences/resources-academic-bullying
- Sacramento State University
  http://www.csus.edu/hr/docs/professional/workplace%20bullying.pdf
- San Francisco State
  http://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/anti-bullyingresolution
- San Jose State
  http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/SS-F13-6.pdf
- CSU Workplace Environment Survey
  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/M7RL6YW

Approved Unanimously: March 3-4, 2016

2 https://newworkplace.wordpress.com/2014/05/26/aaup-spotlights-bullying-in-academe
3 https://newworkplace.wordpress.com/2014/05/26/aaup-spotlights-bullying-in-academe
Appendix 3: SFSU Statement on Bullying

**Resolution Number:** RF15-337
November, 2015

Whereas:
The Academic Senate of San Francisco State University respects the rights and dignity of all faculty, staff, students, and visitors within our campus community; and

Whereas:
The Academic Senate of San Francisco State University acknowledges that according to the 2014 Workplace Bullying Institute (WBI) U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey found that 27% of Americans have suffered abusive conduct at work and 21% have witnessed abusive conduct; and

Whereas:
In May 1990, the SFSU Commission of Human Relations in its Principles of Conduct for a Multi-Cultural University Practice Directive P530D recommended, “Behaviors which are intolerant, insensitive or discriminatory are deemed unacceptable. As such, they shall be addressed openly, promptly and constructively by the University, its administrators, faculty, staff and students;” and

Whereas:
The SFSU Student Conduct Code states, “The University is committed to maintaining a safe and healthy living and learning environment for students, faculty, and staff. Each member of the campus community should choose behaviors that contribute toward this end. Students are expected to be good citizens and to engage in responsible behaviors that reflect well upon their university, to be civil to one another and to others in the campus community, and contribute positively to student and university life;” and

Whereas:
Dr. Olweus, a research professor of psychology (a pioneer researcher in the field of bullying prevention), states that bullying is comprised of three components: 1. Bullying is aggressive behavior that involves unwanted, negative actions. 2. Bullying involves a pattern of behavior repeated over time. 3. Bullying involves an imbalance of power or strength; and

Whereas:
The Academic Senate of San Francisco State University concludes that bullying can reduce productivity and morale, lead to higher absenteeism and dropout rates, is unethical and antithetical to the university mission, and may limit the success of faculty, staff, and students; therefore be it…

Resolved:
That the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University is committed to creating and maintaining a collegial learning environment that respects the dignity and rights of faculty, staff, and students; and be it further
Resolved:
That the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University is committed to ensuring that members of the campus community work in an equitable environment that expects all to assume accountability for non-collegial behavior; and be it further

Resolved:
That when bullying is experienced or observed, the Academic Senate of San Francisco State University encourages targets and bystanders to report such behavior. Faculty and staff should report to their supervisor or manager, labor relations representative, the AVP of Human Resources, or SFSU'S Resource Advocate, and students should report to the Dean of Students.