

<p>Academic Senate April 16, 2013</p> <p>Present: Bice, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hildalgo, Jackson, Jasek-Rysdahl, Johnson, Leyva, Littlewood, Manrique, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Strong, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: John Sarraille for Robert Silverman, Bret Carroll for Sam Regalado, and John Mayer for Eric Broadwater.</p> <p>Excused: Chris Lore, Steve Arounsack, Chris Vang, Nhu-Y Stessman and Renae Floyd.</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Linda Nowak, Annie Hor Marge Jaasma, John Sarraille, Scott Davis, Brian Duggan, Martyn Gunn, Roger Pugh, Russ Giambelluca Jim Tuedio and Tammy Giannani.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First and second reading of 28/AS/13/SEC Resolution Urging Amendments to California SB 520, Steinberg (D-Sacramento) Creating the "California online Student Platform" Sense of the Senate. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>First reading of 29/AS/13/UEPC General Education Program Mission Statement. UEPC withdrew this resolution and it will not return as a second reading.</p> <p>Second reading of 27/13/AS/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Classes. Passed.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: May 14, 2013 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p>
---	--

1. Call to order

2:04 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 26, 2013.

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Linda Nowak, Annie Hor Marge Jaasma, John Sarraille, Scott Davis, Brian Duggan, Martyn Gunn, Roger Pugh, Russ Giambelluca, Jim Tuedio and Tammy Giannini.

5. Announcements

There will be a Library Book Sale on Wednesday, May 1st.

Mayer announced that Macbeth will be performed in the Amphitheatre April 30-May 5. It is a free show due to a benefactor of the university. A professional actor is playing the title role.

Manrique announced that the retiree group has increased the amount of its scholarship, from \$1,000 to \$1,200 each.

Eudey distributed flyers for upcoming FDC events. Marina Gerson will be giving a talk on effective grading and rubrics. Mary Rose O'Reilley will discuss Teaching and the Art of Self-

Renewal: Let the Beauty We Love Be What We Do” on Thursday, May 9th. Following this will be a talk by Stephanie Paterson (the 2011/12 Outstanding Professor Award recipient from the Department of English). Dr. Paterson will take up Mary Rose O’Reilley’s question and offer a few snapshots from the classroom.

Eudey also distributed a flyer from Ashour Badal regarding summer school. This coming summer students are eligible for financial aid at 3 units, not 6 units as in previous summers. Please announce this to your students in you classrooms.

UEPC has been considering the structure, infrastructure, and support of GE. Our current structure has been in place since there was an Associate Dean in ASL. The GE subcommittee could meet once a month, as there were no assessment expectations then. We want to have conversations about the general structure, how we can support the GE program, and if the current structure of our curriculum is something that we are happy with. UEPC is co-hosting a summit with the office of the AVP for Academic Affairs on May 2nd from noon to 4pm with a lunch included. All who are interested in GE should come and engage in the discussion.

Thompson encouraged people to read the ad hoc committee report on UBAC. It is a thoughtful set of recommendations.

Jackson announced that the ASI Board of Directors will have a candidate forum tomorrow from 12:00-1:30pm in the Main Dining Room.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

None.

7. Information Items

a. 2:10 Time Certain for Russ Giambelluca and Provost Strong – Economic impact of the change in the academic calendar

Giambelluca said that he approached this analysis from the standpoint of taking a very conservative approach. It required creating a virtual winter term to make an actual comparison. He was helped by Roger Pugh, who had experience while the winter term was going on, in creating this virtual winter term. What the Senate will see in this letter is that methodology. Senators should also have a spread sheet with actual numbers which were distributed.

Giambelluca noted that they used a conservative approach, using a 2 year average. They didn’t do anything in any way to change fees to favor or not favor the analysis. They used official census enrollment data. The data shows that in the projections that he made, they were looking at \$6-7,000 dollars a year. This indicates that they were reasonably accurate in some cases. He’s happy to go over specifics. Roger Pugh’s help in this was critical in finding a way to construct this to make sense. The analysis was much better because of it. Overall, not having winter term has increased the revenue to the campus substantially.

The floor opened for questions.

Bret Carroll noted that the original rationale was in terms of cost savings, and it's a little disappointing that the memo says you can't calculate cost savings.

Giambelluca responded that his analysis and presentations to the committees was always about revenue. He never really spoke to cost savings. When he did his original analysis, it was strictly on the revenue side. You have to take into consideration everything that's happened in the three years since.

Thompson wholeheartedly agreed with what Carroll said. This was not trumpeted as a way to increase student fee revenue but as savings. In Giambelluca's response this was presented as revenue savings, but Thompson would like clarity about the sources of the money. Is it really the fee revenue analysis that shows us that we collected more fees from students? If so, how much have the fees increased?

Provost Strong said that the bottom line issue here is the savings and revenue increases and perhaps they get mixed together when folks talk about this. The cold analysis shows that revenue increased. On the bottom of pg. 2, it shows that actual revenue increased. This may be because 40% of our students weren't taking winter session and winter was 5% of our annualized fees. 40% weren't taking 5% of what we budgeted. We weren't capturing that revenue. A lot of students weren't taking that session if we didn't have winter term in those years. They didn't get into the area of calculating cost savings because it would be time consuming and complex. He thought that the charge was to look at the revenue.

Eudey appreciates having some data to look at even if we can't know things with certainty. Even though there is more revenue, there is far less savings and revenue that we were told we would see. This is one of several instances where the projections from faculty committees were accurate and the numbers coming from other avenues were overstated. Several times in the past, the projections from faculty governance were very close to the actual budget numbers such as the cost of separating to six colleges. As discussed in SEC, this may not be a helpful use of time but what is clear is that when we have another major endeavor we need to have much better budget analysis before going forward. The other thing that she would like to see, which Senate did not ask for, is an analysis of the increased cost to students. She pointed out that we don't know if students are taking more classes or if instead they are taking the same number of classes but paying more. It would be helpful to look at that same period and see if students have adjusted their course taking practices or if what we're doing is generating more revenue without students taking more courses.

Giambelluca noted that he only made one or two projections about winter term. His projections were that revenue change would be approximately \$600,000 and progressed upwards. He wants to be clear about any projections that he made, and that this data is very close to those projections. He doesn't know who else was making projections. He noted that what Eudey asks about in regard to the students is very important. This revenue is not a result of fee increases. This is a result of students registering for classes and paying tuition. They did consider whether they were taking more courses.

Pugh noted that they took the average number of credit hours over 3 sessions vs. 2 sessions. Then they averaged the number of head counts from fall to spring. Basically, we are not generating exactly the same number. In 2006-7 the average was 25.93 under the 4-1-4 structure. He noted that we should keep in mind that some students didn't take any courses over winter. In 2007/2008, it was 26.03, 25.9, also under 4-1-4. In 2011-12, the numbers were 25.34, 25.79, 25.05.

Eudey asked if those numbers include winter intersession. No, this is only pertaining to state support, per Pugh.

Peterson noted that multiple committees were put together to review the winter term. One was from UEPC that recommended keeping the winter term and the other was put together by President Shirvani. She noted that we should keep in mind that if the only benefit was increased revenue that's just a transfer. The idea put forward by the present committee was that we would literally save money. It was said that it was much more difficult for the staff and in addition there would be energy costs savings. UEPC found that we weren't likely to benefit that way. All this is covering how much more money we got out of students, which is not a true social gain. In theory our aim was to save money.

Panos stated that if it's about saving money, it's a couple 1000 students. On page 3 is the average student enrollment, and full time students. How is it that the gross revenue for 4019 students is the same?

The Provost thinks that when we broke the fee base for the winter session that was at a lower rate for what we use for winter intersession for UEE.

Colnic noted that we're dealing with absolute numbers, and we should keep in mind that the actual amount of student fees increased as well.

The Provost said that the tables on the bottom of page 2 were calculated with what the fees were for the winter session and compared to when we had winter session. When we allocated our budget from the state and what we expect as projected enrollment, 40% of students weren't taking courses and we weren't getting 40% of the 5% fee increase revenue. \$307K is not a significant sum of money. We weren't charging students higher fees; we were simply getting better attendance for two sessions and meeting our budgeted projections. Pugh used whatever the CSU fees were at the time. That explains the big jump in percentage terms.

Thompson said that the idea of rooms full of people with advanced degrees having confusion between increased fee revenue and savings is surprising to him. He asked if that is a CSU system phenomenon or local. If the trustees decided to increase the rate for student fees would they sell that in the press as a savings?

Littlewood wanted to set the record straight. Giambelluca said that this was all about the extra fee revenue. There were four sections in the original proposal. One was the extra revenue. There were three other sections, and one was a roughly equivalent amount from not having part time

faculty to teach in winter. There were smaller savings in staff salaries than expected. UEPC didn't think that would occur and somehow the extra financial aid savings in staffing didn't occur either. The net projection was almost \$2 million dollars and we only realized \$700,000 in savings. The \$2 million number was pie in the sky.

Giambelluca thinks that he told the committee that when we did the boxes at the bottom those were done by interviewing people. He stood by the revenue because that was what he did. Students are receiving their full financial aid. It's not clear if they would have taken winter term or not. He noted that we've gone through \$9 million in budget reductions and it's difficult to calculate this. Any cost savings may have been given back to the system in terms of budget cuts. He does remember that conversation. He thinks the things we can find should be an assumption. There were things that changed the environment. Having something else in place helped us in this period to get our enrollments to where they need to be. Going back to calculate all that would probably be more complex than this analysis.

Sarraille said that one of the points that were trumpeted on the front end was the ease in work load for staff. He asked if we have any anecdotal evidence of this.

Giambelluca said, no. There's still pressure on our staff, but the work that has to be done is getting done and there are some real concerns. Payroll is still functioning along with financial aid and clearly it's a much simpler process.

Petrosky noted that after having spoken to hundreds of students, he has seen that the time to obtain a degree is increasing. The 15 unit registration cap and the limited access to certain types of courses that could have been taught in winter may be causing this. He asked if there are any costs that can be directly attributable to this.

Provost Strong said that would be difficult to calculate. Winter Term was a low enrolled session that took overhead to operate. On that basis he assumes that costs would be lower.

Carroll noted that apparently a lot of work went into the report. He would express a retroactive wish that this would have gone into calculating how much was saved. He thinks if Regalado were here, he would say our question still hasn't been answered.

Littlewood noted that Financial Aid never disputed the fact that students would get financial aid. This is not a benefit to the University and the students shouldn't be double counted. Someone asked about the cost of the changeover. The departments had to add a lot more labs and there were additional costs for extra equipment and supplies which was never counted.

Panos said that it seems we have 10 times less enrollment in winter and fewer students are paying 10 times as much. So there is a loss and no savings.

b. Mandatory Advising (Dr. Martyn Gunn, Director of Retention Services, Advising and Judicial Officer) (4/AS/13/UEPC- Mandatory Advising for Undeclared Students resolution sent electronically)

Gunn began by giving an idea of the numbers of students involved. Each year about 250 freshmen and 600-650 continuing students are undeclared. For pre nursing students, we have approximately 230 freshmen and 600-650 continuing students. All together it's about 1200 students. These comprise 40% of undergraduates. At the same time ARC must provide advising to EOP students. This is a considerable number of students who require advising each semester. With overlap of these groups there are around 1400 students who must be advised. Also there is policy that all students must declare a major by 60 units.

ARC is working with the School of Nursing in reducing the number of students in pre-nursing. There are students who have little chance of matriculating into the nursing program. They will identify these students and advise them to choose another major. There will be an ad-hoc advising committee. The plan is to do group advising. As much as we would like to advise all of the students on an individual basis; they don't see how it can be done in a timely manner. They are looking at group advising before each registration session. They will start at new student orientation, with the idea of modifying student behavior by starting with the freshmen without seeming to penalize the continuing students. They will be informed that they must declare an academic major before 60 units. ARC will talk to the students about advising and choosing a major. Continuing students will be communicated with via email and other ways. By fall of 2014 the plan is to have the full process in place.

The floor opened for questions.

Sarraille asked if Gunn can give us some idea of the content of the advising to undeclared students. Gunn said that they talk about the GE courses students must take. They talk to them about what major they think they're suited for. If a student thinks they are a science major but they are doing poorly in the introductory courses, they might want to select a different major.

Nagel asked if there is a plan in place to survey students who have undergone group advising and maybe look at some information about retention data. Gunn said that part of his goal is to assess advising. We have no data on retention for group advising. We have data on retention. It would be difficult to tease out whether group advising made a difference compared to other interventions.

Sarraille asked by what mechanism the students will be distributed over the course offerings. He asked how ARC will get 300 students in the room and not steer them all to the same course. Gunn said that one thing being considered is dividing the students into advising sessions directed to students interested in science, business, etc., and tailor the advice to the students.

It was asked who will do advising. The staff in ARC, per Gunn. They have 8 people on staff, 3 currently in temporary appointments.

Carolyn Martin said that last semester 570 nursing students were given 5 separate opportunities for group advising and only 100 students showed up. Gunn said that was not mandatory. ARC has been told to do mandatory advising and is placing holds on registration.

Eudey noted that the temporary staff needs to become permanent staff. She asked (reluctantly) to what degree PeopleSoft could help ease up some of those issues

Gunn doesn't know if there are computer programs available with PeopleSoft to assist students with advising, but doesn't think so. He noted that a lot of the time it's difficult to replace the human face. ARC is modifying the website and putting up a more visual representation of the GE program with links to the course descriptions.

The Provost said that the Chancellor's Office is accepting proposals to request RFP to deal with bottlenecks, due May 1. Advising is one of four categories for which the Chancellor's Office wants to identify best practices in the CSU. We have a programmer working on preparing a grant proposal.

Salameh said that some undeclared students need a lot of guidance. She asked if, during group advising would there be an assessment to help students figure out what they're interested in.

Gunn replied that that is one of the things they are trying to avoid. He noted that ARC is open 12 months a year to give counseling on all sort of careers and tests that would help them. There are tests on line. The advising that would take place before students register is to get their advising hold removed, and it's not necessarily to help them figure out what they're going to do. We don't want them wasting time. He noted that one of the problems ARC is faced with is how to give advice to this large number of students in a timely fashion. The only way to do it is in group sessions. One idea is have them do a pre-assessment. He noted that sometimes it's very difficult to change a student's mind set.

McGhee noted that in recent years we have been more concerned with getting students out the door. It used to be that the college was where people came to find out what they wanted to do. There's a lot out there to learn from. If we force people in and say they have to choose and stick with it, we are doing them a disservice. Folks like him found their niche way down the line. We have to be careful about this. That's not necessarily what's best for the students and their long term success. He agrees that what a student scores on an assessment does not change their mindset.

c. Newly revised Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee Charge

Johnson noted that when the charge last came forward there were some comments and concerns raised about it, which were taken back to UEPC. This is what UEPC finally decided on. They deleted the 5th item and wanted to make sure they addressed the concerns that assessment of programs was upon request and was not trying to be mandatorily evaluative.

**Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee
of the University Educational Policies Committee**

Subcommittee Membership and Charge

Membership and Term of Office. The Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee shall be composed of seven voting members. The chair of the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee shall be elected by its membership each year. Members with two-year terms, staggered by lot, are specified as follows: one faculty member from each college, two faculty members-at-large, and one student representative appointed by the President of Associated Students, Inc. The Committee on Committees will give preference to candidates with prior experience with program assessment and, to the extent possible, provide a balance of tenured and non-tenured faculty. The Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Charge. The Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee provides guidance on the extent and type of academic assessment initiatives. The specific responsibilities of the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, as formulated by the UEPC, are as follows:

1. Develop policies and procedures related to assessment of student learning to be submitted to UEPC for review and approval.
2. As requested by academic programs, review and make recommendations regarding the mission and scope of assessment plans to promote and improve student learning and the implementation of those plans within the University's academic programs.
3. Establish meeting dates by semester, to be published to the campus community. Submit agendas and meeting minutes to the Recording Secretary of the UEPC and transmit all agendas and meeting minutes to the campus community via electronic networks.
4. Submit an annual year-end report to the UEPC, to include a summary of the year's events and recommendations for follow up actions.
5. ~~Periodically review annual assessment program reports providing feedback and recommendations as deemed appropriate.~~

Approved by UEPC 3/08/01

Amended and Approved UEPC:rl 10/11/07

Amended and Approved UEPC:rl 3/13/08

Amended and Approved UEPC:rl 11/29/12

8. First Reading Item

a. 28/AS/13/SEC Resolution Urging Amendments to California SB 520, Steinberg (D-Sacramento) Creating the "California online Student Platform" Sense of the Senate

Moved by Filling, seconded by Eudey. Filling requested a waiver of the first reading, seconded by McGhee. The need for a waiver is that the bill comes to the committee on the April 24th. We have been unsuccessful with getting the Senator to add amendments to the bill. It seems to make a difference that each campus is speaking to it.

Eudey reminded the Senators that they've seen copies of resolutions from other campuses.

Results of the vote on moving to a second reading, 36 for, 1 against, 1 abstention. The resolution moved to a second reading.

The Provost asked why it reads “CSU Stan.” Filling responded that we can’t use CSUS as an abbreviation because Sacramento claims it.

Petrosky asked if there was something missing from the last paragraph of the rationale. Yes, per Filling part of sentence is missing and will be added. Petrosky also noted that at the very end it should say 2013, instead of 2012. Correct per Filling and accepted as a friendly amendment.

The Senators voted on the slightly amended version of the resolution. Results of the vote: 37 for, 1 abstention. Resolution passed unanimously.

**California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate
Resolution Urging Amendments to California SB 520, Steinberg (D-Sacramento) Creating the
“California Online Student Access Platform”**

Resolved: That the California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate affirm the principle that the State of California established under the California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) that “academic and professional matters” be determined by “faculty shared governance mechanisms” (Sec. 3561) rather than legislatively or administratively; and be it further

Resolved: That the California State University, Stanislaus (CSUStan) Academic Senate welcome California State Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg’s commitment to fostering innovation in teaching and access to courses in California public higher education; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSUStan Academic Senate endorse the findings in the April 4, 2013 letter from The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU to Senator Steinberg, which provides useful analysis of the problems in the existing draft of SB 520; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSUStan Academic Senate urge Senator Steinberg and all interested stakeholders to come together to modify SB 520 to achieve its worthy goals without sacrificing the principle of faculty control of the curriculum established in HEERA; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSUStan Academic Senate maintain that SB 520 and any similar legislation should abide by principles linked to existing academic and professional standards, among which are:

1. All classes offered for credit in California public higher education should be taught by faculty-of-record who have been hired and evaluated according to professional standards established by the three segments’ shared governance should and originate in accredited institutions of higher education; and
2. All classes offered for credit in California public higher education should be approved by the offering campus according to the curricular standards established by the shared governance bodies on that campus.
3. All classes accepted for transfer in California public higher education should originate in or be formally approved through established curricular review processes in accredited institutions of higher education.
4. In order to maintain the quality of coursework used to satisfy degree requirements, students wishing to substitute coursework from non-accredited institutions/entities for requirements in California’s institutions of public higher education should be advised to use existing mechanisms for credit by exam (or an institution’s alternative) to demonstrate satisfactory attainment of course/program learning objectives.

Resolved: That copies of this resolution be distributed to Senator Darrell Steinberg, all members of the California State Legislature, the Academic Senates and systemwide administrations of all

institutions of California Public Higher Education, the California Faculty Association, and to the press (Modesto Bee, Merced Sun-Star, Stockton Record, Turlock Journal, San Francisco Chronicle, Los Angeles Times, New York Times, Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Ed).

Rationale

Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg (D, Sacramento) has introduced SB 520 with the laudable goal of creating a “quality-first, faculty-led framework” for online education targeted toward “rapidly developing innovation in online delivery models” (SB 520, Sec. 1 d and e). This bill would establish the California Online Student Access Platform under the administration of the California Open Education Resources Council, (a group of nine faculty originally established under SB 1052 to solicit, review and approve requests for proposal for open access textbooks for 50 of the most in-demand courses in public higher education in the state). The bill would require the platform, among other things, to provide an efficient statewide mechanism for online course providers to offer transferable courses for credit and to create a pool of these online courses. The bill does not restrict the definition of online course providers to accredited institutions of higher education. The bill would require the council, among other things, to develop a list of the 50 most impacted lower division courses at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges that are deemed necessary for program completion or fulfilling transfer requirements, or deemed satisfactory for meeting general education requirements. The bill would establish the California Student Access Pool, through which students could access online courses, and would require the online courses approved by the council under the bill to be placed in this pool. The bill would require that students taking online courses available in the pool and achieving a passing score on course examinations be awarded full academic credit for the comparable course at the University of California, the California State University, or the California Community Colleges. (From Legislative Counsel’s Digest)

Some provisions of SB 520 intrude on areas best left to academic and professional personnel and mechanisms as envisioned by HEERA. The April 4, 2013 Academic Senate CSU letter to Senator Steinberg provides useful analysis of the problems with the current language in the bill. The CSUStan Academic Senate is particularly concerned that the bill would allow for the possibility that courses offered by unaccredited providers of educational content could be used in satisfaction of degree requirements. In addition, the mechanism SB 520 establishes to approve online courses for satisfaction of degree requirements does not ensure that discipline faculty with the appropriate expertise will be responsible for course review and approval. Faculty in the California State University are already demonstrating their willingness to experiment with innovative pedagogy and technology, when that pedagogy and technology are implemented by discipline faculty and subjected to rigorous assessment and evaluation to assure quality and results. Prime examples of that innovation are the current San Jose State University – Udacity pilot program and CSU Fresno's SPOT program for online writing instruction. CSU faculty welcome Legislative support and resources to foster innovation and technology in teaching, provided that the support respects our professional and curricular standards. The CSUStan Academic Senate looks forward to working with Senator Steinberg and his colleagues as we move forward to provide our students with access to a high quality education in the State of California.

Sources

SB520: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_0501-0550/sb_520_bill_20130401_amended_sen_v98.html

California Higher Education Employee Relations Act <http://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/heera.asp>

Academic Senate CSU April 4, 2012 Letter to Senator Darrell Steinberg

b. 29/AS/13/UEPC General Education Program Mission Statement

The resolution was moved by Johnson, seconded by Carolyn Martin. Johnson said that a few sessions ago UEPC brought forward some proposed GE goals and objectives and a new mission statement, and then received a letter requesting that we remove them from the agenda.

UEPC thought it would be easier for the Senate if they were brought forward separately. This mission statement is the one that was approved in the APR for GE in 2009-10. That mission statement never came forward to the Senate. When UEPC looked at the concerns that were sent forward, two of the concerns related to the mission, including that it appeared the new mission statement deemphasized the mission of the liberal arts. In recognition of that, UEPC thought it would be appropriate to bring this forward as a statement to our campus. UEPC will be engaging in further discussions, including meeting with department chairs in order to better understand the concerns and be able to make the goals and objectives truly represent what the campus believes the GE program does. UEPC feels that the driving force behind the goals needs to be assessed. We're going to be engaging in the conversation.

Nagel noted that in the resolution the last sentence doesn't speak to the mission. It's stating how the GE program would achieve the mission. He's been asked to bring that forward and ask if that should be there. He thanked Johnson for stating that the mission statement came from the APR. The process of replacing that one with this one looked arbitrary but knowing where it came from will be helpful.

Johnson said that UEPC has intentionally included this mission statement inside of the resolution itself so that if any Senator would like to amend it from the floor they can.

Thompson asked whether commas would suffice in the last sentence. He suggested replacing semicolons with commas.

9. Second Reading Action Items

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

Littlewood noted that suggestions made on language and wording have been attended to. One bullet has been added as Regalado's suggestion. FAC also expanded the section on student evaluation and assessment of the pilot program and reformatted with a bulleted list for clarity.

Scheiwellier noted that when she looks at the rationale and sees her department struggle with their small operating budget, she can't reconcile the extra money. She's a junior faculty member and has to do the two mandatory evaluations. She can do voluntary evaluations and can have all her classes be evaluated. She tried to listen to all the arguments but she cannot reconcile them with all the budget concerns. This will also result in increased work for staff.

Littlewood said to keep in mind that the recommendation is not to increase the number but to decrease it. The contract says we have to evaluate all courses so this is a reduction, not an increase.

Colnic said that it is a reduction from the new contract language. He asked why we would go with this reduction rather than maintaining our long-standing practice, and what was broken from our previous system.

Littlewood said that this is a compromise between the two extremes.

C. Davis clarified that the reason for two courses required previously was because it was stated in the contract. We never had a reason beyond that for two courses being evaluated.

Sarraille asked if there was some kind of a negotiation, if someone on campus said they were in favor of doing all courses and this was compromise on that.

Littlewood referred back to the question of if the current system is broken. In one sense yes, as there have been comments from an RPT committee that didn't have enough data. This would improve that. He noted that there is a proposal on campus, from the contract, which says all courses must be evaluated. That's the way the President seems to be leaning.

McGhee said that it was never stated to FAC that this is what administration wants. FAC tried to come up with some sort of rational explanation for deviating from all courses being evaluated. FAC determined that they didn't want to see every class done because that will impede faculty from trying new courses. Why put yourself at risk of a bad evaluation if you want to try a new method or a new course? If they're all going into a faculty's RPT file, they will be looked at. It gives people an opportunity to try new things and not be penalized for it. This does not tie us up so much that we don't want to do anything. That is the compromise we were looking at.

Eudey noted that nationally the trend is to evaluate at least half if not all courses. The student evaluation of teaching is not as limited as in our previous contract. A national trend is for more. In some ways having more courses to compare gives faculty more information and can enhance the narrative one can create. It is clearly, according to national research, not necessary to evaluate all courses. New technology takes three iterations before a faculty member is comfortable with it. she also noted that if IDEA is not giving us good information, getting more data will not help. She noted that we need to create a policy that identifies the number of courses being evaluated. She doesn't think there is anything wrong with only doing 50% but not 100%. Within the CSU most of our campuses are defaulting to 100%. She thinks that we can easily defend the interim Presidents' decision to only evaluate 50% of our courses.

Nagel noted that the data quality depends on the instrument. He thinks the IDEA instrument is flawed. He doesn't believe in anonymous surveys, as that's not the only data involving people's careers. He thinks it's necessary for everyone to understand that part time faculty may be evaluated only by the anonymous forms though department chairs can decide to look at other things. He noted that if a senator doesn't like this proposal of 50%, and thinks that we should revert to the prior status quo, they should vote against this. If this doesn't pass, we would revert to the contract.

Littlewood reminded the senate, as he did when it came up as a discussion item, that this policy has nothing to do with how faculty are evaluated. This is simply the number. He agrees that the IDEA form has problems, but that is not part of this proposal here. This is simply about evaluating 50% of a faculty member's courses.

Thompson noted his thanks to FAC as it must be a difficult position to be in. It is important and good that we're having a discussion. He noted a spelling error on the word faculty in the Rationale. He also noted that the resolved clauses travel on their own, not with the rationale. This resolution itself wouldn't argue against separation of courses and labs for evaluations. What hasn't been discussed is why we assess. If we're focused on RPT just because this is in the evaluation section of the contract it does not mean we should not check to see how this improves our teaching. He believes that it's been proven very difficult to get an alternative instrument to replace IDEA, and that we should make that process easier, although it may cause other kinds of problems.

The Provost supports the resolution and appreciates the work of the committee. He also appreciates the separation of the resolution and the instrument being used.

Carroll noted that Regalado shared that he's okay with this. The consensus in the History department is not only is the instrument worthless but it is also manipulatable. Secondly, following up on what Thompson said about approving alternate instruments, the policy opens the door to getting other instruments in place.

Panos noted that the CSU should consider buying the instrument and make some money on this endeavor.

Filling would like to remind everybody that these instruments are there as a contractual mandate. We can use them to improve our teaching, but the primary use is evaluation of the faculty member teaching the course. Prior to that there was no stipulation that you provide nationally normed evaluative instruments. the medical profession dictate "at least do no harm" may apply here.

Sarraille said that in theory what's up for a vote is not an independent method of evaluation but they are linked. It's going to be a long hard road to change the evaluation instrument. He might add to what Filling said that, if we do go to a new instrument, one thing we'll have to do is establish some norming at least locally.

Result of the vote: 30 yes, 6 no, 2 abstained. The resolution was approved.

10. discussion item

a. FAC membership, ex-officio non-voting member

Littlewood said that a suggestion was being made to bring this to the Senate to see what the Senators think. Currently, FAC is the only governance committee that does not have a member from the administration. Dennis Shimek comes to most of the FAC meetings and participates. The suggestion was to make him an ex-officio, non-voting member. Perhaps the reason for not

having an administrator is because this is the one committee where more sensitive issues might be raised. If anyone has direct memory of why it was created this way, he asked that they share their memory.

Nagel urged faculty and the Senate to consider what the rationale is for excluding temporary faculty from committees, particularly temp faculty who do not have a voice on development of policies that affect them.

Sarraille has served as the speaker of the faculty senate. He would argue very strongly that it's a good idea to have some committees that don't have membership of administrators so faculty can have candid conversations on issues. If you look at this objectively, faculty are not brought into administrative groups very much to be there to influence administrators. He noted that there have been problems sometimes because of the presence of administrators.

McGhee suggested that there may be a middle ground to having a more broad inclusion. He assumes that a committee could be set up where the administrator, as a non-voting member, is there for part of it but not all of it. For general discussion the administrator is there to give input and there is an executive component where the administrator is not there.

Jasek-Rysdahl agrees with Sarraille that it's not a good idea. When they need to have an administrator there they can invite them. The provost is not a member of SEC, but he is there at the invitation of the SEC. If there is a need to bring in the VP of Faculty Affairs FAC can invite him to a meeting.

Thompson agrees that this would not be a well-considered view. He doesn't know the genesis of the structure of the FAC, but it has functioned this way and has been working effectively. We're not talking about adding Dennis, we're talking about adding a Vice President. He would want to go to faculty as it is configured as faculty. There's nothing that prohibits faculty from inviting people in for consultation. He doesn't see the need for the change in membership. Thompson read from the duties of the FAC:

2.2 The duties of the FAC shall be to:

a) Expedite the resolution of professional concerns of members of the General Faculty (including questions of academic freedom and professional ethics) when requested to do so by one or more of the individuals involved in or directly affected by the matter.

b) Address questions regarding faculty morale when requested to do so by the Academic Senate or by a committee of the General Faculty and submit for the General Faculty's approval policy recommendations in the best interest of general morale at California State University, Stanislaus.

The Provost supports adding the VP. It would enhance shared governance. That's what's been going on for some time. The ad hoc trust resolution had a section that talked about making sure various committees had appropriate representation. We were thinking about making sure faculty were on appropriate committees. He doesn't think that there's anything that would be discussed that would be problematic.

Filling thinks we should be aware that the VP has duties about what he reports. He could be coming across information the faculty would prefer he not share with the President and the Provost.

Johnson doesn't support administration on faculty committees. It's appropriate for administrators to have meetings that faculty are not engaged in. It's also appropriate for faculty to have venues where they can have similar conversations.

The Provost asked VP Shimek if he has come across information that has made him uncomfortable.

Shimek said that he's had a very effective professional relationship with the FAC. He communicates with the chair of FAC, and he'd like to think that they do have the kind of relationship that when he's needed he'll be invited. If there is a feeling that there are sensitive matters for which the presence of someone from the administration would have a chilling effect, he accepts that. He would suggest perhaps a relationship like the provost and SEC have. He has never heard anything at that meeting that has resulted in feeling that he needs to report it.

b. ASI politicking

Scott Davis asked if there was a policy about ASI politicking in classes. We recognize that faculty members have the ability to determine what goes on in their classrooms. Several students have asked to speak to his classes. He feels it is an undue burden to place on faculty to ask them to do that. This particular race seems to be very well contested. That suggests a strong interest among students in the outcome of it. Whatever we can do to support the outing of views would be a good step. He just doesn't think his class is the place for it.

Jackson said that as a candidate, she did reach out to some professors. She thanked those who responded. The students respect the faculty members' response and appreciate it.

Salameh noted that all professors have been respectful and that they can deny the request.

Eudey said that there is a challenge if some faculty aren't savvy about the elections and say yes to one person not knowing there are five. Often faculty are not aware of what's happening in the elections. Before we say yes to a request we should educate ourselves, and make sure we understand the context and set parameters. It's not a good idea to enter this uninformed.

11. Open Forum

12. Adjournment

4:05 pm