

<p>Academic Senate February 26, 2013</p> <p>Present: Bice, Broadwater, Burroughs, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Eudey, Espinoza, Filling, R. Floyd Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Johnson, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Leyva, Littlewood, Manrique, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: John Sarraille for Robert Silverman and Sari Miller-Antonio for Steve Arounsack.</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Marge Jaasma, James Tuedio, Brian Duggan, and Jennifer Grigoriou.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Deferred the Second Reading of 16/AS/13/UEPC-Policy for Academic Field Trips to a future Senate meeting.</p> <p>Deferred the First Reading of 18/AS/13/UEPC General Education Goals and Outcomes to a future Senate meeting.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 12, 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

Deferred items 7 and 8 to a future meeting as UEPC needs more time to respond to feedback. Revised agenda approved.

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

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Marge Jaasma, James Tuedio, and Brian Duggan.

Renae Floyd introduced Dr. Jennifer Grigoriou. Jennifer is completing her post-doctoral supervision hours at Psychological Counseling Services. She is working full-time and functioning as a member of the professional staff. Jennifer received a doctorate in Psychology from the California School of Professional Psychology. She completed some of her pre-doctoral hours in New York. She has ten years of clinical experience, which is welcome at PCS due to recent staffing constraints.

5. Announcements

The Speaker reminded everyone to address the Speaker when speaking. Please wait to be acknowledged and given the floor.

Lauren Byerly distributed flyers for the Modesto Symphony Orchestra. Carmina Burana will be performed from May 10-11th at the Gallo Center for the Arts at 8pm.

Leyva announced that the CSU Stanislaus MSW student, Lupita Serrano, was awarded the Jannette Alexander Foundation Scholarship, by the California Society for Clinical Social Work. Her bio and professional picture will appear in the April issue of *Clinical Update*. This is a competitive state-wide scholarship open to students enrolled in the 21 Master of Social Work programs in California.

Filling announced that the Business college accreditation went very well. This was the best visit the accreditation team has had in several years.

Jackson announced that ASI and the University Student Union will be hiring a permanent Executive Director at end of this week.

Eudey announced that the CSU Chancellor's office Affordable Learning Solutions website has information on rental textbooks, digital textbooks, low-cost books, and wholly online resources. A new federal law states that we have to make our textbook choices transparent to students when they register for classes. The law will be enforced starting in July 2013. We need to get our books ordered as soon as possible in order to comply with the federal law. More information is available at <http://asl.csuprojects.org>

McGhee asked for clarification. Is it when the schedule goes on line that we have to have the books available? Eudey said that by the day students start registering for classes we are supposed to have the textbooks ordered and posted so students will know what is being assigned and can look into costs and formats. If an instructor hasn't been assigned to a course, the book order might be "to be announced," but should be updated as soon as possible.

Speaker Grobner said that the schedule goes live in April and registration begins in May. Eudey said that the federal law doesn't necessarily address all of the nuances of text selection in a particular discipline. If it's not possible to identify texts by the deadline date, faculty should inform the bookstore of the timing for making a selection so there is something on record and students can get that information.

There's also a new scholarly journal published by SAGE available. The journal is "Student Learning through Mentored Scholarship" and is co-edited by CSU faculty members. The journal will publish articles addressing mentored learning experience in and outside of classes, as a component of faculty-student research projects, service learning projects, internships, and related activities. Works co-authored with students are encouraged. More information is available from Betsy Eudey.

Eudey reminded us that on Tuesday, March 5, from 4-5pm there will be a meet and greet with Dr. Martyn Dunn. This is a chance for the campus community to get to know him and find out more about his goals for ARC. In addition there are be two upcoming faculty presentations – On Thursday March 7 from 1-2pm in FDC 118 Dr. Steve Arounsack (Anthropology) will present the talk "Technology in the Classroom: The intersection of Innovation and Accessibility" and on Thursday March 14 from 3-4pm Dr. Bret Carroll will present "Worlds in Space: Religious Pluralism in the U.S."

Gerson announced that the Faculty in Residence Committee will be sending a job position announcement calling for applications for this position at the end of March. This position includes housing in the dorms in a 2 bedroom apartment and money for meals. The faculty member must engage students in activities and will be provided a budget to fund outings, etc. This is a great alternative for a faculty member who is looking for housing arrangements.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Provost Strong was asked about the winter intersession and the monetary savings of the elimination of the winter term and winter intersession. He noted that they are working on that right now and making good progress. He expects that there will be a report and VP Giambelluca will be in the Senate soon to make that report.

O'Brien asked if the information about the UEE left over funding could also be included. Speaker Grobner thinks that we had that information at a prior Senate meeting and the information is available in the minutes.

Regalado has a question for the Speaker. In a recent news report our former president is spreading his good cheer. This makes Regalado think of the issue of shared governance. He'd like to know if there is a statement from the administration on shared governance. If it doesn't exist, when will it exist? Please forward his request to the interim president.

Provost Strong noted that Provost Dauwalder wrote a document in 2003 about shared governance. He believes that he wrote something following up on that and we've got those documents. There is a CSU system wide policy and maybe another policy. He can make those policies available to the Senate. Shared governance is on the agenda for WASC self-study team.

Thompson noted that this came up a couple of years ago. He did see Provost's Dauwalder's memo several times, and he'd like to clarify that the Dauwalder memo was not an endorsement of the totality of the Senate statement on shared governance. It was a response that he wrote as part of a negotiation that ultimately failed. Thompson was not aware that a Provost's memoranda creates university policy. He thought the policy would be approved by the President. Unless we have something that was approved by the president, he would question if we have campus policy.

Provost Strong did not mean to imply that what he wrote was policy. What he was responding to was statements by the administration. He pointed out that there have been documents by the administration on this topic. It's also an agenda item for the WASC self-study team.

Thompson said that he read those documents from Provost Strong and much of the information was taken mainly from the minutes of the Senate meetings and excerpts from Dauwalder's memoranda. It appears though that Provost Strong's writings were not informed by discussion with the faculty who were actually involved in the exchange with then-Provost Dauwalder. He thinks that is a lack.

7. Second Reading Item

a. 16/AS/13/UEPC- Policy for Academic Field Trips

Deferred to a future Senate meeting.

8. First Reading Item
a. 18/AS/13/UEPC General Education Goals and Outcomes

Deferred to a future Senate meeting.

9. Discussion Item
a. FAC Recommendation on Article 15.15 Process for Student Evaluation of Teaching

Littlewood said that with the new contract, there is new language about the evaluation of classes. We had a mandatory 2 classes required per year and the new language has a requirement that all classes need to be evaluated. The President can reduce that number if a valid argument is made. That is the result of the FAC recommendation memo he shared with the Senate.

Shimek has been communicating with the FAC and the result is the memo you have. Please read through and give us your feedback. The only question here is the number of classes that get evaluated. This has nothing to do with how they are evaluated. IDEA will still be the default. Departments can still replace it with other options, with approval from URPTC.

Sarraille has a question about this. In reading about the matter being up for discussion he found the phrase “compelling reason”. This phrase has a certain cache in the Social Work circles. It’s usually used to refer to something which shall be unless there’s a really good reason to change it. He wonders why and how that phrase found its way into this statement. The claim is that that contract says “all classes shall be evaluated” and there is no mention of a “compelling reason.” He would not characterize the language of the contract in that way. His reading of the contract is that the default is to evaluate all classes unless in consultation with the President we decide to do something different. We’re free to do what we think is best.

Littlewood responded that we’ve already agreed to this by ratifying the contract. The phrase “compelling reason” comes from the administration. The fact that we would like to do something different isn’t enough.

Nagel agreed that the language does not appear in the contract which reads as follows:
15.15 Written or electronic student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. All classes taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s).

It says nothing about a compelling reason. He would also caution faculty to make a very clear line between people who go through the RPT process and those who are permanently temporary faculty. Evaluations collected include part-time faculty. Any description of process should make clear a line of separation between people in the RPT process vs. those that are permanently temporary faculty. Nagel also asked what a compelling case means operationally to demonstrate that evaluating all classes doesn’t lead to improved faculty review.

Sarraille agrees that we’ve already agreed to the contract and so did the administration. The contract does say that the President has the final say, but it also says that the President consults with the appropriate committees. If we have agreement, we can do it the way we want to do it.

There's nothing that biases it strongly in that favor. It just makes all classes the default unless we decide to do something else with the approval of the President.

Regalado noted that on page 2 item 1, FAC mentions that if a significant issue arises that it should be resolved through shared governance but there seems to be a lack of clarity of what shared governance means.

Littlewood responded to Nagel first about the temporary faculty. That is a good point, and we will definitely include that. In response to Regalado, that statement is meant to be vague. Some language in the current statement needs to be straightened out. We were rushing to get something before you and those discussions are still going on. We will bring more information to the Senate.

Shimek noted that the term in the contract talks about a recommendation, and that the term "compelling reason" should be taken out.

Thompson noted that this looks like it's a done deal for next year, and maybe after next year it will be different. It sounds more like the actual statement is that the campus President has leeway on how to deal with the situation. He questions if this should come from FAC or from the faculty as a Senate resolution.

Littlewood said that the language said consultation with appropriate faculty committees. If the Senate would like this as a resolution FAC would be happy to craft one.

Eudey said that after this contract came through she asked for information from other campuses across the country. They varied from department to department and campus to campus. Recognizing that for us this evaluation is for personnel purposes is very important. If we only had people evaluating two courses yearly there is a selection bias. That is mediated a little bit by those of us who do voluntary evaluations. We have a skewed high average on campus. The research indicates that we have to figure out those questions. When a course is first taught on line, evaluations go down. Finally, a reminder that students are not the best evaluator of teaching effectiveness and are just one component of it. They give us more depth of information. We have to also use peer evaluations and other means to assess overall teaching effectiveness.

Shimek noted that he has met with FAC and the administration is open to a recommendation and have an open mind. They're looking forward to a recommendation from FAC or other mechanism.

McGhee said that while we currently have had a selection bias, we could just as easily change to a random selection to remove a selection bias. There are different alternatives. We could randomly choose or eliminate a particular class. The biggest issue for him is whether or not we have a legitimate justification for evaluating less than all. He thinks the justification can be made.

Garcia said that this somewhat reminds him of where shared governance may not be working on this campus. When he listens to the reasons for why we shouldn't evaluate all, it sounds like we're trying to get out of something. It would be helpful to know why the administration thinks

we should not be evaluating all classes, as opposed to one group doing all the work and one group waiting on the other.

O'Brien asked whether the cost was spoken about.

Littlewood said yes and that it will require more help in Academic Senate office.

Isabel Pierce said that the current materials cost for IDEA evaluations is approximately \$12,000 and will triple to approximately \$36,000.

Sarraille thinks that someone should ask the students what they think of this.

Salameh noted that from hearing the discussion, she thinks that the current structure now is effective. It's also more cost-effective. She asked how many courses are being evaluated currently.

Littlewood said that the previous contract said two classes per year were required in consultation with the faculty member and the dept. chair.

Salameh said that when it comes to students, if you give them a bunch of evaluations to be filled out it may be less effective because of burn out.

Littlewood said that this is listed as one of the issues that need to be addressed.

Floyd would like to respond to Dr. Garcia in terms of shared governance. Her intuition tells her that administration desires to evaluate all classes. One reason is that there is no concern about the additional cost. At the same time she's appreciative that the administration has said they have an open mind. It is important for us to process this and come up with what we want to do.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that there are different reasons to do evaluation. One is for the instructor improve or get successful enough in that course. We may want to evaluate a course we teach for the first time, but not necessarily want that in our personnel file. Some courses are evaluated for different reasons.

Littlewood thinks that's partly noted in the memo. There was this idea that if you are teaching a class for a first time that you could elect to not have it evaluated as mandated.

Salameh asked if there is a way of conducting the evaluations electronically on Blackboard and whether or not that has been considered.

Littlewood said that this is done for on line classes and that's not part of this issue. The concern is how many courses to evaluate.

Mercier noted that this was subjecting a whole campus to something that seems like a pilot program. What would be the goal and the objective?

Littlewood reiterated what Eudey said, to get a broader base evaluation of how the faculty are teaching.

Mercier asked if we have tested this out as a pilot program to see if it works. She asked for clarification that FAC is suggesting that we try to implement this for one year. Perhaps this is a big endeavor to try out as a pilot.

Littlewood said that everybody has to be treated equally. If we did it as a subset we would run into problems. FAC suggested trying it out for a limited time period of one year.

Thompson asked if there are problems caused by the current method we are using. He wonders if there is anything local that is the compelling reason for the President to decide to follow that option in the contract. He suggested that we not just look at it as a default, but as a question that has been posed. He asked if there is a stash of local compelling data and history that can give us guidance.

Nagel said that it's not as though faculty or the local administration has decided to mess around with how faculty are evaluated. It's in the new contract. This was in the context of bargaining a point at which CFA had to give a concession. so what faculty is dealing with is not more evaluation. It's whether or not we can come up with rationale to reduce the number of evaluations.

Duggan said that every class on Blackboard can have evaluations done through blackboard rather than on paper.

Eudey shared that the current IDEA processing cost is the same if done on paper or online. We have a significantly lower response rate for on-line evaluations. We should value the student feedback. The reason there is concern about it is because we have concern over how people evaluate the evaluation. Going from 2 to 8 or 2 to 10 is a huge shift especially because we are uncomfortable with how administration has placed weight on IDEA scores. There is a lot of danger to us to have more data unless we can remind ourselves that this is only a third of the puzzle. Her belief is that when we look at the other means of evaluating teaching effectiveness, we can evaluate more courses. We can demonstrate over the years that we have used more information. There is a lot of assessment going on, and lots of other data that helps us out. We don't need that one component to get larger.

Sarraille is trying to address Garcia's question. He doesn't think that we have an official reason why we are being asked to evaluate all classes. If there is something then there should be a document that outlines this. We just have to consider the question of whether to do it or not and decide what our own reasons are. As Nagel pointed out, the contract says it's the default thing we have to do and it was negotiated by two adversaries. It's not clear why that's the draw that they came to. He'd like to comment on on-line IDEA evaluations. He doesn't remember being told about that. He finds it somewhat disturbing as you don't get good compliance with evaluations on line. Shouldn't this have been approved by Academic Senate and be official policy? For most classes, because you don't tend to get good participation online, you get the extremists. He's not sure we should be approving that.

McGhee has two points. One is that a pilot program may be a poor point. FAC was trying to find a point of reference to see if looking at all classes would give us a better evaluation process. The only way you can evaluate how well it's gone, is to do something differently. We need to figure out whatever method we're going to use. The problem is that some faculty always get good

evaluations and some always get bad evaluations. With our current selection bias, we might see more good. Is this going to improve the result of the process which is to evaluate? Whatever the purpose is, the question is whether it is going to give us a better measure.

Colnic thinks that Eudey and Jasek-Rysdahl made valuable statements about wanting to improve our teaching and student learning, but there's also another function which is personnel issues. The IDEA evaluation instrument has advantages over other methods. There's nothing in here that precludes us as individuals to evaluate our courses to improve student learning. We can ask the students did you understand this text, did you read this text, what else would you like to do. He doesn't see any of that precluded by our current method.

Regalado said that Department of History evaluates every class every year, but he can see some reason why we wouldn't want to have some classes reviewed because we learn anything from those, especially freshmen and sophomores. He's not gotten anything constructive from those. Perhaps faculty might consider how those compelling reasons will be shared with the President. He would like to see what is meant by compelling reasons and how it will be spelled out.

Duggan clarified (in response to Sarraille) that the IDEA evaluations are voluntary and are optional to be on Blackboard. There's no compunction.

Johnson wondered if the Faculty Affairs Committee considers this a pilot for comparative purposes. She asked how we will know if we have better information.

Littlewood noted that there were a number of people who have brought up good points about on-line vs. face to face evaluations but none of that is an issue here. The question Regalado asked regarding what would have to be done is still very much under discussion. If we get clarification he will bring it back to the Senate. Currently, we have a set of two courses per year sitting in Faculty Affairs in personnel files which we can use to compare. We have the potential to compare, but how that will be done is not yet known.

Littlewood asked if the Senate would like this brought back to the Senate as a resolution for the Senate to vote or should FAC represent the faculty. Per a show of hands, a clear majority would like this brought back as resolution to Senate. FAC is meeting tomorrow and welcomes your comments.

10. Open Forum

11. Adjournment

3:15pm