

<p>Academic Senate March 26, 2013</p> <p>Present: Bice, Broadwater, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Eudey, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Littlewood, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Park, Peterson, Poole, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Nhu-Y Stessman, Strong, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Ed Hernandez for Al Petrosky, Betsy Eudey for Steve Filling, Dieter Renning for Barbara Manrique, Avwundiogba for Steve Arounsack and Taylor Marcell for Heather Deaner.</p> <p>Excused: Suzanne Espinoza, Renae Floyd, John Garcia, Lynn Johnson, Kathleen Hildalgo, Jeff Mulder, Panos Petratos, Shanice Jackson and Valerie Leyva.</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, John Sarraille, Megan Thomas, Caroline Mercier, Jason Winfree, Richard Weikart and Nancy Lewis.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second reading of 14/AS/12/UEPC Academic Calendar Policy passed.</p> <p>Second reading of 16/AS/13/UEPC-Policy for Academic Field Trips passed.</p> <p>Discussed 18/AS/13/UEPC General Education Goals and Outcomes. Returned to UEPC for revisions.</p> <p>First Reading of 27/13/AS/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Classes. Returned to FAC for revisions.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: April 16, 2013 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Cathlin Davis, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order

2:05pm

2. Approval of Agenda

President Sheley to be included as item a. under announcements. Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 12, 2013.

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, John Sarraille, Megan Thomas, Caroline Mercier, Jason Winfree, Richard Weikart and Nancy Lewis.

5. Announcements

a. President Sheley

President Sheley came to update the Senate on what's going on in the CSU system with budget planning. He'll send out a written update soon. He asked that senators serve as translators of the written update since nuances can't be fully captured in writing. He noted that he gave a budget presentation about two weeks ago to give some sense of what the CSU is grappling with in terms of the budget. Prop 30 meant we weren't going to take another fall down an elevator shaft, though we also suffered a one-time loss in returning the last increase in student tuition fees.

The president reminded senators that the Governor proposes a budget, then revises it in May -- the "May Revise." This is after he gets a sense of tax revenues and unanticipated costs such as the cost of the shifts of health care for the state. The Governor has to put those in the May revise. We expect the Prop 30 part of the 2013-14 proposed budget to remain the same within the May Revise. Not yet known is the fate of a second piece of the Governor's proposal, an augmentation of the CSU budget by \$125 million dollars, for 23 campuses and the Chancellor's Office. The CSU asked for more funds than the Governor has proposed, but it is clear that the Governor seems to understand the seriousness of our budget problems.

President Sheley explained that, to this point, no one knows how that \$125 million is going to be distributed. It was fairly certain that we had anticipated mandatory cost increases for health care, energy, space renovation etc. These expenses will take a big chunk of the \$125 million. In addition, the Governor pegged \$10 million to what was originally talked about as online courses and advising to help increase the graduation rate. Possible uses of the rest are unknown. That is \$60-\$65 million dollars that the Board of Trustees must grapple with. That is, what are we going to do if we end up with this budget proposal (which still has to get through the legislature)?

The president noted further that, at the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor's office rolled out its proposal to the Board. In addition to the \$10 million for online initiatives and \$48 million for mandatory cost increases, they proposed \$38 million for a compensation pool. That averages out to 1.2 percent for everyone in the system. If it remains, it will be subject to collective bargaining processes for all the units. There was \$21-\$22 million dedicated to access, meaning increasing enrollment in CSU by 6000 students. It's symbolically a major tip of the hat to what we do. It's not a lot of fun telling students there's no place for them at the CSU. It wasn't clear who would get a big bump in enrollment. What we ended up with was that the 7 or 8 smaller campuses will get a bigger bump up percentage wise. We'll have 2.4 percent increases in FTES on our campus. We fought hard for this as we thought it was important. We have the capacity, and this would add 162 new faces to our campus. This means more money coming in and we can do more things. It signals also that the Chancellor, who came from the UC system, does not assume that we have to do the same thing at each campus. Finally, the proposal also includes around \$7-\$8 million proposed for student success, increasing the graduation rate, etc. Again, there are no guarantees from the Governor. The Board also hasn't committed to the Chancellor's Office proposal.

The president pointed out that a big issue right now is that we need to be very smart in our response to the online proposal. There are about 15 bills on the floor of the legislature that push us in some direction of on-line. They are using their legislative muscle to get the CSU to grapple with online. The questions are not always necessarily well-informed, but we want to be careful about dismissing them. We need to deal with the issues, and explain why it's sometimes more complicated than it seems. The Governor, some board members, and members of the legislature, for example, can't figure out why we have bottleneck courses and why we haven't responded to

them with the technology we have available. That often is easier said than done, but we need to be engaging folks in this conversation. Students and parents complain to the legislature and the Governor and the complaint is reasonable even if the solution is complicated. At the next Board meeting in May, there will be a lot of conversation about this. We need a solid, honest explanation and approach.

President Sheley stated that he hopes that we are diplomatic in our responses. Treat all questions as legitimate and give the answers to them, whether we like the question or not. Don't appear to be just digging in our heels. Expect those conversations and please have these conversations. Let's see how we can work with people and show respect to the folks asking the questions.

The floor opened for questions

Sarraille asked if President Sheley knew how heavily the legislature is being lobbied by those who sell online courses. President Sheley said that he is not on the inside but assumes it is somewhat there. Some of those folks have something to sell and some are true believers. San Jose State uses Udacity. He doesn't think that was simply a cynical attempt by Udacity. The legislators in general try to look for issues that make sense to the public and there are students who are hitting bottlenecks. In most universities, you get these complaints but don't always know how valid they are. At Sacramento State, for example, there are some very large majors with multiple required courses with caps of 30 or less and you're talking about a real bottleneck. It's not bogus. If you put those three things together the online-bottleneck issue gets put on the table for consideration. We need to sound like we know what we're talking about, not just drawing a line in the sand.

Regalado asked about the discussions the President has been hearing. It's a popular topic and he can see it as a panacea for higher education. Is there included any talk about the resources it takes to accomplish this, including hiring more faculty. You still have more students and you still need more faculty.

President Sheley said that we need to ask if they have considered that. That doesn't mean we can't solve this. They're asking, for example, why you can't offer other courses on-line to free up faculty to teach the bottleneck courses. He hears Chancellor White saying "you don't just put a course on line with a teacher and 1000 people take it". Someone does have to design the course, monitor it and you need skilled people behind it to make sure you're doing it correctly. Folks aren't quite there yet. If we say what you just said, in a respectful way, we'll eventually get through. We also need to get a better sense of what the bottlenecks really are and how to solve them.

McGhee said that based on what the President just said we also need to make it clear that faculty aren't interchangeable. A lot of people don't realize faculty have specialties and we can't just move stuff around.

President Sheley agreed that we're not interchangeable. But we need to be careful about general education and the liberal arts. We need to say that we have a range. They need to understand how we are educated in graduate school and how we drift towards a specialty, but also that we're not stuck with only 3 courses we can teach. We need to get them to understand what we do, so that when others say "here's what you have to do" we can explain why it's more difficult than they realize.

Eudey said that the definition of bottleneck courses can mean different things. It can be due to students who fail courses and have to retake them or students who can't enroll. The solutions to those two problems are different. When we try to address this bottleneck issue, we have to keep questioning which definition we're using. We really have to push on it.

President Sheley said that we need to get on this one and know where we want to stand on the withdrawals, repeats, etc. This creates students who are just in the door who need these courses and are registering last and competing with students repeating courses. We ought to talk about ways to do this better. This is a healthy conversation to have.

Thompson asked if these conversations have been focused on completely on-line, large courses.

President Sheley noted that they're usually talking about fully online courses. But they can understand things like hybrids. If we lead the conversation to fix the bottlenecks, we can talk about hybrids and other solutions. You can't put just anything online, and most of those bottlenecks have a reason. Most are not large classes, most are labor intensive and need hands on from the professor.

President Sheley noted that if senators are having discussions in their departments they should share ideas with him to allow him some time to think some things through that he might be missing.

b. Ed Mills, Dissertation Study (Survey provided to Senators)

Ed Mills was introduced by Speaker Grobner. Mills said that he's looking at the leadership and shared governance process as this is a relevant topic in California at this moment. He's asking people to share their thoughts with him. His hope is that the Senators either complete this survey on paper or via email. If someone prefers to use email, they will need to type and save the survey and then send it to him at emills@saclink.csus.edu This is an anonymous survey so if it's done through email it he will print out the survey then delete the email. He will aggregate the sample for the faculty and administrative leadership. The survey is titled *Culture and Leadership in a Public University Setting: Implications for Shared Governance and Change*. It was developed at the University of Michigan and used mostly in private business and health care and very seldom in higher education. He would like to see how members of senate would rate their culture. Sims hopes that faculty will take a few minutes to complete the survey.

Nagel announced that CFA is holding a workshop on lecturer evaluation procedures on Thursday, March 28th from 1-2:30pm in the South Dining Room.

Salameh announced that if anybody is looking for a student representative for committees, they should contact her at ASVicePresident@csustan.edu Please spread the word to all students on campus that the ASI elections applications are due this week.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Regalado asked if there was an update on Giambelluca's return to the Senate to answer our questions, given that there are only a few Senate meetings left.

Provost Strong replied that the analysis is done and the plan is for Giambelluca to come to the next Senate meeting.

Thompson requested that, as the analysis has been completed, the Senate get the information ahead of time. The Provost indicated that would be done.

7. Consent Item

a. CSU Stanislaus Sponsored Programs Administration Policy (Editorial amendments require Senate approval)

Nancy Lewis said that the Grants used to be under the Auxiliary and are now under Business and Finance so they removed any language that was outdated.

No objections and the Senate consents these editorial changes.

8. First Reading Item

a. 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Classes

Littlewood moved the resolution, seconded by McGhee.

27/AS/13/FAC RESOLUTION ON INCREASED STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSES

WHEREAS: Article 15 of the CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement requires in section 15.15, "Written or electronic student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All courses taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer courses after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s)"; and

WHEREAS: The President of the California State University Stanislaus has requested a large consultative discussion why fewer than all courses should be evaluated.

WHEREAS: Student evaluations are not the only form of assessment of teaching effectiveness; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University Stanislaus recommends that faculty be required to conduct student evaluations in no less than 50% of all courses, at least one class per semester. and be it further

RESOLVED: This policy should serve as a pilot program whose efficacy is to be evaluated by an ad hoc joint committee of faculty and administrators who will make recommendations after 2 years as to long-term student course evaluation policy; and be it further

RESOLVED: The recommendations of this committee shall be brought to the President and to the

Academic Senate of the California State University Stanislaus, so that a long-term student course evaluation policy of maximum efficiency and efficacy may be decided upon.

RATIONALE:

Our objective is to strike a balance between collecting reliable student input of teaching effectiveness and the burden that this places on faculty, students, and staff, and resources. In doing so we have not addressed the issue of how courses should be evaluated; only the increase in the number that are to be evaluated.

- There is a significant cost associated with increasing the number of courses being evaluated. The cost for processing the IDEA forms is estimated to increase from \$12K per year to approximately \$36K per year. In addition extra staff will be needed to handle the increased workload. The administration has indicated that these costs can be covered, but it should also be borne in mind that these funds, if not spent on IDEA forms, could be made available for other budget items, such as extra class sections.
- If faculty evaluate all their courses then that also implies that students will have to complete evaluation forms in all of their courses. The concern is that at the same time that the evaluations become more numerous they would also become less thoughtful, and consequently less useful. The student representatives on the Academic Senate stated that increasing the number of courses being evaluated would be burdensome for students.
- The evaluation of all courses could suppress innovation in teaching if a faculty member is concerned that it might result in a poor evaluation.
- There are some courses whose enrollment is low, for a variety of reasons. Evaluation of these courses can lead to results which are statistically unreliable. However, some faculty teach a number of these low enrolled courses, and would need the option of evaluating at least some of them. Such a case might arise, for example, when an instructor teaches in a small program, whose major courses frequently have small enrollments.
- There are some courses which are associated with a larger course for example laboratory class sections which are associated with a lecture. Evaluations in a lab of a faculty member who also teaches the lecture would seem to be redundant.
- While the number of student evaluations will increase this should be taken to lead to a greater reliability of the student evaluations, and not as increased weight given to those evaluations in the RPT process for tenured and tenure-track faculty or in the periodic evaluations of temporary faculty.

Finally, since we do accept the principle that all faculty, regardless of rank or permanence, be treated equally we recommend that the same proportion of courses to be evaluated be applied to all faculty.

Approved by FAC on 3/13/13

Littlewood reminded the Senate that this was a discussion item two Senate meetings ago. FAC took comments from the Senate including a request that we bring it back as a resolution. The issue comes up as a result of the new contract which calls for all classes to be evaluated, unless President Sheley accepts that we evaluate a smaller number. FAC thinks that there are good reasons why we shouldn't evaluate all, so we are recommending that we evaluate 50% of the classes we teach. FAC also recommends that the policy be in place for a minimum of 1 year of taking in evaluations and one year of using the results for RPT; at that point the appropriateness of evaluating 50% of courses will be evaluated.

Regalado had a query on the resolved that states no less than 50% of all courses, and whether that is per semester or academic year.

Littlewood said that assuming someone is teaching the whole year, it's 50% per semester. There is the possibility that someone will have an odd number of classes. A full time lecturer might have 10 classes, so 2 in the fall, 2 in the spring, and the 5th at their discretion.

Sarraille suggested that this might have to be word smithed a bit. For example there will be faculty who will not teach at all in a given semester. Littlewood replied that if someone is not teaching in that semester that clause does not apply.

Regalado noted that the resolution indicates that faculty will conduct student evaluations, and asked if this includes departmental evaluation forms, or just the IDEA evaluations. Littlewood replied that this does not change that policy. This is simply a matter of the number of classes that get evaluated.

Nagel referred to the resolved clause relating to the two year pilot. Since this is a response to the provision of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the agreement expires before this two year period, he asked what happens if the new collective bargaining agreement doesn't have any provision about the evaluation of all classes, and what happens if the President isn't given this authority in the renewed contract. He also noted that according to the CBA we can't treat people differently. Everyone has to be evaluated in the same proportion already.

Littlewood said that we are aware of some campuses where they have treated others differently. FAC has that clause there to say we're not going to violate the contract. For the 2 year pilot, we're assuming what is in the contract will continue. That's the best that we can do.

Colnic asked for clarity on the first resolved. He'd like to suggest some wording changes: "all courses per academic year, at least one class per semester, in which the faculty member teaches" and asked if that would be consistent with what FAC.

McGhee pointed out that the other reason why this is a two year program is because that's the fastest in which we can evaluate the 50% with the RPT process.

Thompson asked if anyone has any more general information regarding interfacing with the administration on this issue. He also asked what the basis was for having this in the contract, and if it something CFA wanted or something the administration wanted.

Littlewood, in response to the first part of Thompson's question, said that this first came to FAC in the November meeting. Dennis Shimek has been in the meetings and participated in the discussions. These conversations included collegiality and compromise. Shimek has not objected to anything that we've said.

Sarraille said, in response to the second part of Thompson's question, that the contractual provision for all courses to be evaluated was not something that CFA was trying to get. The administration wanted it and CFA conceded on it.

Salameh asked, regarding the selections of the courses, if it is this done by the faculty or the department. Littlewood said that the rule right now is faculty pick two courses with consultation with department chair and that rule would continue, except each would pick half when there's a disagreement.

Salameh asked if there is a difference between tenured and not tenured. No per Littlewood.

McGhee noted that Dennis Shimek at no point put forth a policy that the administration wanted us to adopt. He stated repeatedly that the administration did not have an agenda that they wanted to see done. He was there to give feedback but not to lead to a predetermined output.

Thompson asked what the problem is that we're trying to resolve. What he's concerned about is the study itself. In the second resolved, he'd like to know what is going to be evaluated, and what it's compared to. How are we going to judge the effect of this program? Those two things together, what is the problem that we're trying to attack and how is the program going to demonstrate the effect?

Littlewood is not sure he would call this a problem, but might refer to it as an issue. The contract says we will evaluate all courses. If we did nothing faculty would evaluate every course they teach. We thought that there were some courses where faculty would have good reason to not want to evaluate. For example, if a faculty member were being innovative the experiment might fail. We wouldn't want the teacher to not be innovative because they're worried about receiving bad evaluations. Also, students might get burned out filling out all evaluations for every class. The question then becomes do we want to evaluate fewer than all to accommodate issues that might arise.

How to judge the effectiveness of evaluating 50% of courses is left the committee that looks at it later on. They can decide if the classes being evaluated led to better information for the RPT process. They can get input from Deans, Department Chairs, the Provost and candidates and particularly from those who have experienced both ways of evaluating.

Regalado would appreciate some clarification on the first resolved that it's not necessarily only the IDEA format. You might be able to add written clarity to say "sanctioned evaluations." Littlewood said that two meetings ago, that was present in the preamble. FAC will look at that.

Hartman suggested that FAC bullet the items with titles. The items that can be emphasized, and added to the beginning of bullet points to emphasize reasons might be: cost, survey fatigue, suppress innovation, skewed results, redundancy.

McGhee clarified what was meant by difficult assignments. A lot of us may say we give difficult assignments but that's not a reason to not evaluate. Teaching a course for a first time. These

evaluations go in RPT file and a lot of faculty may be hesitant to offer a new course or redesign a course. This is just a justification to not do every class. We're afraid that people are not going to be willing to take the risk. Also, small classes of 9-10 students are not a good basis for doing evaluations. Going from two required classes to every class will create a lot of fear and anxiety, especially for junior faculty.

Littlewood said that there's also the case in which a faculty member has been teaching a class for a long time but now is changing it. They might have a class where they've always done lecture and maybe want to make it a service learning class, which they've never done before. In the last bullet, let's assume the dept. does 50% IDEA and 50% classroom evaluations. This says that next year, it still should be a 50/50 split. It's saying we haven't got more data, we just have more reliable data.

Eudey noted two things. The third bullet point needs to be "pedagogical practices" for clarity. The first bullet point is all correct and cost is a good descriptor. What's missing is a recognition that when we increase the evaluations, there's also a lot of additional workload to dept. staff. There are costs and workload issues which aren't reflected in the document. The extra money for workload is more centralized and we need to think about that impact.

Littlewood said that it's in the third sentence which mentions "extra staff." Eudey said that may mean just extra staff in Academic Senate office. Littlewood said that it's intended to be a general statement and he will consider clarifying this. This resolution will be discussed at tomorrow's FAC meeting.

9. Second Reading Action Items

a. 14/AS/12/UEPC – Academic Calendar Policy (Tabled to March 26, 2013 Senate meeting)

Speaker Grobner said that this policy was brought to the Senate to add 3 days for OIT to the calendar so faculty would know when OIT was doing maintenance. The credit hour policy was removed because it's taken care of elsewhere.

Nagel reminded the Senate that this got tabled to today because of an objection to aligning our spring break to Turlock schools not because of pedagogical reasons but because of alignment with a religious holiday.

Littlewood said that this decision is based on a survey done with faculty a few years ago. The clear preference was to align with the Turlock schools because we have a lot of faculty, staff, and students who have children in the district and would like to be off at the same time. He rejects that this is a backdoor allowance for religion. This was simply for the convenience of faculty. If someone thinks it's an issue, they should talk to the Turlock School District. We don't have Good Friday off, and Turlock does. Religion was not part of the discussion.

Gerson agrees with Petrosky but when she took the survey she kept in mind that we consider ourselves a family friendly campus. Needing to be at work when children are not in school creates a child care issue.

Marcell recently joined UEPC and noted that they had a discussion about this. The original survey and discussion came down to convenience.

Moved to a vote. Results of the vote 27 yes, 2 no, and 2 abstained. The resolution passed.

b. 16/AS/13/UEPC – Policy on Academic Field Trips

Marcell noted that UEPC made changes in the emergency response plan. It should be clear now that, for example, if a faculty member is in Yosemite with a class, once the injured student is in the ambulance, the faculty member gives up control.

McGhee doesn't think that it's stated in here. There should be a plan designated what to do with people who aren't injured. If it's along the road, that's when there will be the most confusion. Marcell said that they tried to respond to that in E3. You're on a road trip, you call 911, and at that point you are turning over the injured student to emergency personnel. At that point you stay with the class.

McGhee said that doesn't take into consideration that the faculty member is the one in the ambulance. Marcell said that's in point 5. One person is identified as that person. He noted that at some point we have to have a generic plan.

Colnic appreciates the work the committee did on the emergency response plan and clarifying vehicle accidents. He's still troubled by a few elements of this. In C, the definitions are not clear if we're talking about academic conferences. He's teaching graduate students who are his age. Even if it's not a lawsuit it could be a public relations disaster. It puts us on the hook. He agrees that we need to be reasonable.

Taylor said that item E4 says as soon as reasonably possible. There is a generic plan and going to a conference is not the same thing. This is only about field trips as specified item C.

Scheiwiller said that the Art Department is organizing a trip with a private company. They'll be on a tour with other students from other universities. She had a question about the reference to guests. The CSU participants will be on the bus together as CSU participants but the entire trip won't be CSU students only.

McGhee asked, in reference to 6c, if ADA overrides this if a person needs a family member to go with them. Speaker Grobner stated that this is an automatic override.

Colnic's understanding is that this is driven by the CSU executive order and other campuses have written similar policies. He asked if UEPC looked at other policies. It seems to have a perverse incentive to minimize field trips.

Speaker Grobner said that UEPC looked at other policies, and this is in line with what other campuses have done.

Salameh asked if, when family members sign release of liability, they become members of the university. That's covered under approved volunteers, per Grobner.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that we could have this come back to us every meeting and still not be completely happy with it. It says establishing minimum plans and he thinks that we should vote on this today.

Peterson asked if approved volunteers only applies to the faculty member, or if it would also apply to somebody who signs the form and agrees to help out on the field trip. Speaker Grobner said that if they fill out travel forms, they are considered to be an employee of the University.

Regalado, in looking at this overall policy, noted that Section C on definitions seems to indicate that everything faculty might do is a field trip.

Taylor said that UEPC did debate this. It has to be for educational purposes. If it's going to a conference and you give them an assignment to complete, it's a field trip. If you give extra credit, it's not a field trip.

Nagel called the question, seconded by Jasek-Rysdahl.

Results of the vote to call the question 25 yes, 7 no, 1 abstained.

Result of the vote on the resolution, 24 yes, 8 no, 1 abstained. The resolution passed.

10. Discussion Items

a. 18/AS/13/UEPC General Education Goals and Outcomes

Andy Young wanted to speak to the GE goals as they are written. He understands that people who have worked on these goals have put many good things in these goals, and he recognizes the difficulty of putting this together given the many competing pressures: our own goals, Title V GE areas, and EO1065 order to align our GE goals with the national LEAP goals. His concern is that the goals before the Academic Senate, as written, will not benefit our GE program. Specifically an important human dimension seems to be missing.

What's missing is something that addresses student concerns. He's afraid that the wording here treats students as objects rather than human beings. For instance, in goal 2, we have a series of verbs, such as *explain*, *identify*, but what's missing is the motivation for engaging in general educational and the transformative effect of general education. A second thing that is missing is the active and engaged dimension of LEAP goals 3 and 4: Personal and Social Responsibility & Integrative and Applied Learning.

The Leap Goals talk a lot about active and applied learning. In goal 3, we combine Leap outcomes. These talk about "integrative and applied" our goals says "integrate." Human inquiry itself doesn't seem to be a major goal. That's entirely missing from this document. What we're doing is cheating students who will be facing difficult, complex problems. For example, in the executive order, they have suggested a goal "*understand and apply the principles, methodologies, value systems, ethics, and thought processes employed in human inquiry;*" that would address the lack of deep questioning in the goals. That's the problem nationwide we're

facing. This also shows up in the rewritten mission statement. These are only a few brief examples, but I hope the Academic Senate will take time to carefully consider whether or not these goals help to address the common criticisms of GE, such as lack of meaningfulness and relevance, intention and coherence, or not, and if they adequately include a human dimension that would be engaging to students as human beings, because if they don't they might be setting our GE program back, rather than taking us forward.

Bill Foreman noted that he has been out of the process for 10 months, but wished to speak to the history of this. The executive order was passed in 2008. The first pass was sent back to GE subcommittee and we passed goals in 2011 out of a sense of exhaustion. GE requires broad consensus, and we did not believe we could achieve something better. It was the Senate's decision not to move on GE goals until we had a means of assessment. Now we're going to go back and talk about the goals. It's been approximately 5 years since the executive order. He questions how much better this will get with more work.

Caroline Mercier added that if people had more questions, they should please contact her. She noted that there are two Senate meetings left and it would be a great value if we could finish these goals.

Taylor noted that UEPC has discussed the goals. The new version that's coming back to Senate is from UEPC. The goals are not a policy. They're just establishing the goals so that we can write a policy for assessment. The first document is not a policy document; it's just the GE goals and objectives so that other things can be addressed. That is UEPC's position in his reading of it.

Jason Winfree said he was on the GE subcommittee about 7 years ago when the idea of GE assessment started. Still, as department chair, he was surprised to see the document containing new GE goals and a new mission statement. He stated that his input was solicited only after the document was finished. He met with GE sub to discuss some language in the document, the committee was receptive to the changes, but the new goals and mission statement remained largely intact.

Winfree thanked Foreman for the history he provided regarding the genesis of the goals, and said it is important to note that they were created under deadlines and stressed working conditions. Winfree said this shows in that the new goals have obviously been created in order to satisfy assessment practices, and that is problematic: assessment should serve the GE program, but the GE program is being recreated in order to serve assessment. In spite of all this, Winfree also said he doesn't want to be critical of what GE has done in the sense that open forums were held to discuss this. However, he emphasized that participation—including his own—was minimal in those forums. It is important that democratic practice involve real participation and not only the form of openness, which can function as protection of those writing policy against liability incurred from practices of exclusion.

Eudey stated she appreciates what Winfree is saying here. The GE subcommittee has brought these to the Senate. Everyone has not participated even though there were lots of opportunities to do so. She questioned if a lengthened process would get more participation or agreement. If she

were told to write GE goals, she wouldn't write these, but would instead adopt the LEAP goals. On the other hand, through process, decisions were made that don't reflect her exact view. She appreciates the process and thinks that we should adopt them and move forward. We have followed the process we should be reasonably expected to follow. If we delay this, we are continuing to delay a process we should be actively engaged in. Her greater concern is that the majority of this campus actively did not participate given three years of opportunity to do so. The committees did their due diligence.

Jasek-Rysdahl is concerned about these goals. They aren't policy but they will drive policy and practice. In terms of getting more active participation and discussion, he noted that the last three years have not been a good time on this campus. This will narrow things as it's about skill development and removes the love of learning. He doesn't have a suggestion of a process to get better than this.

Thompson would like to know what the status of the versions of the mission statements are, and if Senate can get them to refer to. He noted that this document has been everywhere and is now before the Senate. Maybe department chairs weren't consulted early or often enough, but Senators are authorized to act for faculty. He suggested that UEPC put the goals into the resolution and let us hash it out on the floor.

Winfrey said that given the last three years, it's not surprising that everybody who has a stake in this didn't make it to the meetings. Unprecedented budget crises, threats to close programs, and administrative-faculty strife took center stage. That's why we shouldn't be satisfied with the justification of the new goals on the basis of the fact that (unattended) forums were open for input. He also asked the Senators: "How many of you are happy with the idea of creating new GE goals in order to satisfy assessment requirements? I don't think that's how we want to build our GE program."

Megan Thomas said that two years ago, GE subcommittee brought the goals to the Senate that were written without considering assessment. The Senate told the GE subcommittee to re-write the goals and consider assessment. If the Senate is now rejecting this, the GE subcommittee is in a very awkward place. They wouldn't know where to go from there.

b. FAC Membership, ex-officio non-voting member

Deferred.

11. Open Forum

12. Adjournment

4:06pm