

<p>Academic Senate February 24, 2015</p> <p>Present: Broadwater, Carroll, Colnic, Crayton, Dorsey, Edwards, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Gerson, Ghuman, Guichard, Hoover, Hauselt, Johnson, Littlewood, Mulder, Nagel, Olivant, Park, Peterson, Petros, Petrosky, Provost Strong, Regalado, Salameh, Silverman, Stone, Strahm, Thompson, Tzu-Man-Huang, and Wood.</p> <p>Excused: Advanced Studies, Nancy Burroughs, Dana Taylor, Lee Bettencourt, Barbara Manrique, and Noelle Won.</p> <p>Proxies: William Foreman for Andrew Dorsey, Koni Stone for Chad Stessman, Jeff Bernard for Brent Powell, John Garcia for Kilolo Brodie, Ann Strahm for Paul O'Brien, and Mariam Salameh for Wisniewski.</p> <p>Guests: The following guests were welcomed: John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, Brian Duggan, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, John Sarraille, Lauren Byerly and James Tuedio. Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First Reading of 4/AS/15/SEC Policy for Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students. Will return as a second reading item.</p> <p>First and Second Reading of 5/AS-15/SEC Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy On Academic Freedom (Sense of the Senate) Passed.</p> <p>First Reading of 6/AS/15/FAC/SEC Article VI. Section 3.1 & 3.2 Leaves & Awards Charge. Will return as a second reading item.</p> <p>Second Reading of 3/AS/15/FAC-- Charge for the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised 33/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC- Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89/FAC). Passed.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 24, 2015 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Koni Stone. Clerk</p>
--	--

1. Call to order
2:02PM

2. Approval of Agenda
Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 24, 2015 (distributed electronically)
Approved.

4. Introductions

The following guests were welcomed: John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, Brian Duggan, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, John Sarraille, Lauren Byerly and James Tuedio.

Provost Strong noted that President Sheley received the final report from the WASC Commission. The WASC Commission has accepted the special visit team recommendations and findings. There have been substantial improvements in campus climate and trust. However, they noted the need for more attention to creating a new updated Strategic Plan. The Special Visit Team and the WASC Commission commended us for improved shared governance and trust. The Provost thanked everyone that was involved including the RPT Survey Committee, all members of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Committee, and the Strategic Planning Working Group. He is very happy that the interim report has been waived; this is very positive for the university.

Gerson noted that several first year faculty have been asking about RPT workshops and S.

Filling will host these soon. If you know any new Tenure Track faculty, put them on the alert so they can attend workshops to help them prepare their files in the fall. Stay tuned for future workshop announcements.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Petrosky asked about the academic calendar. Strahm has not received any further information from the President. Provost Strong said they accepted the recommendations of UEPC relative to the calendar. They sent the calendars to the CO and there is a process of approving the calendars. Thompson asked what is the notification process or approval at the system level. The Provost will check to see where they are with the process. Jaasma clarified that UEPC recommended moving Spring Break to earlier in the semester when Easter falls very late. The calendars have been published on the web at <https://www.csustan.edu/hr>

6. First Reading Items

a. 4/AS/15/SEC Policy for Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

Speaker Carroll moved the resolution and it was seconded by Thompson. The new CBA has a provision where campuses get a certain number of WTUs (15.2) to award faculty proposals that will provide exceptional service to students. In order to expedite the use of these funds this year, we quickly put a procedure in place and now we are seeking Senate approval to continue this procedure.

DRAFT POLICY: ASSIGNED TIME FOR EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE TO STUDENTS

1. Purpose

To provide a process for all unit 3 faculty to apply for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students that supports the priorities of the California State University (CSU) system. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees of the California State University designates the awarding of assigned time (in the form of Weighted Teaching Units, WTU) to Unit 3 faculty employees (including lecturers) “who are engaged in exceptional levels of service that support the CSU’s priorities, but who are not otherwise receiving an adjustment in workload to reflect their effort.” Awards are designated for workload beyond the requirements of regular faculty assignment in enhancing the student learning environment.

California State University, Stanislaus will follow the following criteria and procedures for the distribution of the workload.

2. Accountability and Expenditures

2.1. CSU-Stanislaus shall expend all funds allocated to the campus under this program.

2.2. CSU-Stanislaus shall provide an accounting of expenditures and carryovers for this program for the prior fiscal year by no later than the first day of instruction of the subsequent year to the Academic Senate.

2.3. Any unused funds shall carry over for use in the following academic year for the 2014/2015 academic year and the 2015/2016 academic year. All funds must be expended by the close of the 2016/2017 academic year.

2.4. For accounting purposes, costs of assigned time shall be calculated based on the minimum salary for assistant professor

3. Eligibility and restrictions

3.1. Eligibility

3.1.1. All unit 3 faculty employees are eligible to submit a proposal to request assigned time up to 3 WTUs for exceptional levels of service to students.

3.1.2. Faculty who have previously received assigned time under this program and have not filed a final report on their activities are not eligible to apply again until their final report has been received.

3.1.3. Faculty members already receiving assigned time for a particular activity shall not be eligible for support from this program for the same activity; they may apply for support for a different activity.

3.2. Restrictions

Assigned time can only be utilized during the academic year (August-May) during which the activity is performed with the exception of assigned time granted in the 2014/ 2015 academic which may be utilized in the 2015/2016 academic year.

4. Application process and materials

4.1. Application process

4.1.1. Faculty will submit applications to the university Leaves and Awards Committee (LAC).

4.1.2. For activities in the 2014/ 2015 academic year, applications will be due, and awards announced, at dates to be determined by LAC. Awards shall consist of WTUs and may be banked for use in the 2015/16 academic year.

4.1.3. For activities planned for the 2015/2016 academic year, applications will be due, and awards announced, at dates to be determined by LAC.

4.1.4. For activities planned for the 2016/2017 academic year, applications will be due, and awards announced, at dates to be determined by LAC.

4.2. Application materials

4.2.1. An application for assigned time to support exceptional levels of service to students shall consist of: 1) a narrative proposal, not to exceed two pages, describing how the service activities meet the criteria outlined in section 5 below; 2) a current curriculum vitae (CV), limited to two pages; and 3) an acknowledgment from the department chair and the dean indicating they are

aware of the proposal and that the applicant is not currently receiving assigned time for the same activity (see section 3.1.3). Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.

5. Review criteria

Applications will be reviewed and ranked as to the impact the faculty member's additional workload will have on the quality of students' educational experience. In general activities may include, but are not limited to: course and curricular redesign (including new modalities and service learning), especially for large class size; scholarly and creative activities with students; developing and operating internship programs; developing more effective advising procedures (aiding in retention, timely graduation, etc.); or assessment and accreditation activities, and activities supporting underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students. Per the CBA, these awards are to aid faculty who take on additional work load beyond their normal assignment for improving the student learning environment.

6. Conditions of Assigned Time

A faculty unit employee granted assigned time under this program shall provide a final report to the Office of the Provost no later than the end of the semester following the award of assigned time; the provost will share this information with the Leaves and Award Committee. The report shall demonstrate that the proposed activities were completed and that the impact on the students was as claimed in the original application. Faculty are ineligible to receive further assigned time from this program until their report is received.

7. Appeals

7.1. Appeals Committee

If needed, the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) shall serve as the Appeals Committee.

7.2. Timeline and Notification of Decisions

Appeals shall be made, in writing, to the FAC chair and shall be filed no later than ten working days after the date on which applicants are notified of decisions. The FAC shall complete their review in no more than thirty working days after receipt of the appeal. The FAC shall send the appellant and the LAC chair notification of its decision. Decisions made by the FAC shall be final and binding and are not subject to the grievance procedures of the CBA.

7.3. Appeals Funding

Per the CBA, "awards granted after appeal in 2014/15 and 2015/16 shall be funded from the pool allocated for this program in the subsequent fiscal year and shall not exceed 10% of the annual pool. Any unused funds from this program in 2014/15 or 2015/16 shall roll over for use in the following Academic Year. Appeals in 2016/17 must

be funded from the available funds for 2016/17, including any rollover from previous years.”

Rationale:

Pursuant to the CBA, the CSU has agreed to provide resources to each campus for assigned time for exceptional service to students based on the number of full-time equivalent students at that campus.

Nagel: As per the CBA, assessment and accreditation activities should not be included, but service to department, college, etc. should be included. Reconsider adding “service” and consider removing assessment and accreditation activities. Also, the policy limits the awards to 3 WTU, (3.1.1 states “up to 3”); he suggested that “3” should not be a ceiling. It could be difficult for some faculty’s schedules if they only teach 4 WTU classes.

Gerson: As this comes very late in the year, LAC has questions for this year. LAC needs their job to be easier. She suggested a change to section 4.2.1: “apply with a narrative that is limited to 2 pages”, needs to clarify line spacing, margins and font types. Filling is not in favor of adding font size, margins etc. Thompson suggested giving a word count.

Gerson: LAC will establish the timeline and they appreciate that. Under the review criteria, LAC does not like the word “rank”. Depending on how many proposals will be submitted, this could make a lot of extra work. Primarily, the concern is that in the CBA it notes that the denial shall specify the reason. She prefers the word “evaluated” instead of rank. Also, on #6 rephrase to clarify that the report reflecting the use of assigned time will be submitted after the assigned time has been used.

Foreman: Upon looking at the allocation pool, the numbers are not equitable; most of the schools used the same formula, except for the quarter schools.

Regalado: The policy requests a report at the end of the process to say what they did. How will we provide strong evidence that students’ learning environment has been improved? What are the consequences if the activity did not improve the student learning? Speaker Carroll said that there are no consequences built into the policy. Johnson added that the report should describe the impact on students and whether the impact had the desired effect. Silverman suggested that if there is a method that does not work, it should be publicized. Then the rest of us will know to avoid it. His students report the mistakes they make and he said that is so other students learn from these reported mistakes.

Gerson: When she saw the policy she was worried about Assistant Professors. She would not apply if she was an assistant professor, as it seems like they would be saying, “I can’t handle my workload, please help me.”

This item will return to SEC to consider any revisions and it will return as a second reading item.

b. 5/AS-15/SEC Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy On Academic Freedom (Sense of the Senate)

Speaker Carroll moved the resolution and it was seconded by Strahm. Our existing policy goes back to 1971, so it needs to be updated. We would be endorsing the System Academic Senate resolution. That resolutions urges the CO to revise the policy. Filling: moved to second reading, Petrosky seconded. Filling stated that this is time sensitive, SWAS meets next week and not again till mid-May. The Chancellor agreed to establish a task force, but legal counsel has proposed that nothing be done until the new Vice Chancellor arrives in July. System Senate would like this to start now.

Results of the vote to move to 2nd reading: 35 Yes, 4 No, and 1 abstained.

Foreman called the question, Strahm seconded. 35 Yes, 1 No, and 3 abstained. The resolution passed and **will be distributed**.

c. 6/AS/15/FAC/SEC Article VI. Section 3.1 & 3.2 Leaves & Awards Charge

Johnson moved, seconded by Carroll. LAC has added duties to include review for Emeritus status for faculty that have not been here for over 15 years. They also added language about faculty recusing themselves for conflict of interest during the semester of the conflict.

Gerson is in favor of the resolution; it clarifies what they are already doing. Will return to senate for second reading and then goes to GF vote.

7. Second Reading Items

- a. 3/AS/15/FAC-- Charge for the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised 33/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC- Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89/FAC)

Johnson said that FAC modified this resolution to be more inclusive so it will include all faculty unit employees that teach. Changed from “RPT” to “teaching effectiveness for periodic evaluation”. Changed committee membership to include non-tenure track teaching faculty with a three year appointment. The CBA requires evaluation of 100% of courses, unless the President approves a lower number; this task force will investigate whether our policy requiring 50% of courses to be evaluated is effective. There was some discussion at our last meeting about whether IDEA is the ideal instrument, but this is not part of this resolution. Speaker Carroll noted that it could be that the work of this committee may support a need for new instrument.

3/AS/15/FAC -- Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised the 33/AS/13/FAC--Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC--Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89 FAC)

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus recommends that an Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses be established, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the charge and membership of the committee will be as follows:
The ad hoc committee will assess the impact of 27/AS/13/FAC on the periodic evaluation of all faculty unit employees who teach. Specifically, the committee will gather, summarize, and evaluate data relevant to the following questions:

1. Did the change in policy provide a better assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness for periodic evaluation of faculty members?
2. Did faculty find that the change in policy increased their ability to evaluate the effectiveness of their pedagogy and implement course improvements?
3. If so, does the incremental benefit obtained outweigh the cost of administering the revised policy?
4. If so, does the additional benefit suggest that the percent of courses evaluated each year should be increased above 50%?

The Ad Hoc Committee will determine the criteria for judging the effectiveness of 27/AS/13/FAC, the relevant data to be gathered, and the methodology to be used in the study. The committee should consider gathering information from those associated with the RPT and evaluation processes including the Provost, current and past members of the University RPT Committee, College Deans, Department Chairs, members of departmental RPT committees, and faculty members who have recently gone through an RPT review.

Committee Membership: Vice-President of Faculty Affairs/Human Resources and three faculty members appointed by the Committee on Committees, one of which should be a non-tenure-track teaching faculty member with a three-year appointment. At least one faculty member should have expertise in statistical analysis, including expertise in developing and analyzing survey instruments.

RATIONALE: 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses established a pilot program whose efficacy is to be evaluated by an ad hoc joint committee of faculty and administrators after two years. This resolution establishes the requisite committee.

Approved at FAC on 3/4/15

Regalado noted that his comments more commentary and he would endorse decrease in the percentage of courses to be evaluated.

Greg Morris: How will the committee determine if the change in policy provided a better assessment?

Johnson: That is up for the committee to determine. Sarraille: There is a linkage between the consideration to do more IDEA and what we mean by doing more evaluations. We are not evaluating teaching effectiveness, IDEA is not appropriate for judging people for retention; a thorough evaluation is a high climb for people who work in this institution. He does not have a solution. We need to consider the linkages, when we consider how many IDEA evaluations to do.

Ghuman is concerned about the word “better”. Will the committee publicize their definition of “better”; can the senate discuss what “better” means? Speaker Carroll said that maybe a synonym for “better” will be suggested.

Regalado expressed a concern about coming up with an evaluation system for their own department; departments cannot get rid of IDEA. In the spirit of getting a better evaluation, his department has a better system, but cannot dump IDEA. The process is worse than the Catholic Church as far as getting anything changed.

Johnson: this review is required because of a resolution that was passed two years ago to review whether or not the 50% is appropriate.

Thompson agreed with Regalado, there needs to be a movement to produce a path towards getting an alternate evaluation system. Committee would be asking the department RPT committees if the change provided a “better” level of assessment.

Filling reframed Thompson’s question: evaluating 50% of courses provides more data; does it also provide more information?

Nagel moved an amendment, seconded by Strahm to strike the first line of the charge to read as follows: “How did the change in policy affect assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness for periodic evaluation of faculty members?” Morris objected to the removal of “better”. Moving from 2 evaluations to 50% provides more data; does the 50% show the same results as the 2 evaluations? Ghuman also asked: does the data provide more valuable information?

Johnson moved to offer an amendment to the amendment, seconded by Filling. “Did the change in policy increase the ability to assess faculty teaching effectiveness” for periodic evaluation of faculty members.

Carroll suggested “did the change in policy provide a more useful basis to assess faculty teaching effectiveness?”

Nagel did not accept Johnson's amendment as friendly. Speaker Carroll's suggestion could not be further discussed until Johnson's amendment to the amendment was voted upon.

Thompson did not support the amendment to the amendment. He supported the original language in the resolution. FAC spent a long time discussing this and the current language will not restrict the ad hoc committee. Did the change in policy provide a better assessment? There is enough latitude in the language of the resolution.

Peterson likes Nagel's amendment as it is the most unbiased way to ask the question.

Nagel noted that using the word "affect" would include an increase or decrease or no change. That is why he was suggesting the language. Johnson withdrew her amendment to his amendment.

Johnson added that the proposed amendment will require the rest of the resolution to be reworded as questions 2, 3 and 4 are based on the word "better" in question 1. FAC would like to know if the added evaluations provide a better assessment. If not, then we can consider returning to our previous practice of evaluating two courses a year. Does the benefit of the additional information outweigh the cost? How will we reword the rest of the charge? (If "better" is removed"). We have enough time to reword everything today.

Petratos suggested that other universities are using other ways to assess teaching effectiveness. There may be other sources of information.

Thompson did not support the amendment; he advocated keeping the original FAC language. This language will not control the committee; they will be able to find out what changes the faculty observed. Hoover stated that since all of the other questions follow the first question, he is also speaking against the amendment.

Strahm spoke in favor of the amendment proposed by Nagel. The original wording can be answered with a Yes or No; the proposed changes require the committee to find out how. She was not sure how the amendment negatively impacts the other questions. She didn't think items 2-4 would need rewording.

Strahm called the question: Results of the vote on Nagel's amendment 12 Yes, 20 No, and 6 Abstained. Amendment did not pass and we have the original resolution.

Colnic is comfortable with #1 as is but #4 he proposes a friendly amendment to change the wording to "increased above or below 50%". Johnson preferred that Colnic's suggestion be included in #3. This is a report that is coming back to the Senate and Senate and administration will decide what to do with that report. Colnic withdrew his amendment.

Wood suggested another friendly amendment under committee membership, 3rd line: replace “should” with “shall”, make it mandatory to have a non-tenure/tenure track faculty member on this committee. There were no objections from the Senate, so Johnson accepted this amendment as friendly.

Peterson raised the questions that if someone is non-tenure track how will they be compensated? Nagel asked what if no tenured faculty wants to be on the committee? Peterson was concerned that committee work is part of the workload for tenured/tenure track faculty, but it is not part of the workload for non-tenure track faculty. Strahm said that the seat would remain unfilled if COC was unable to find someone to serve. Carroll: will there be non-tenured faculty who will want to serve? Yes, per Nagel. Question was called by Colnic.

Colnic called the question. Result of the vote 34 Yes, 1 No and 4 abstained. Resolution passed.

8. Open Forum

Strahm: At the University of Oregon the FERPA law was used to access student counselling records for a woman who sued the university when her rape investigation was bungled. This offends her so deeply that a public institution would take medical records and use the law to turn on students. She’s promised her students that nothing they say in a counseling session would be accessed by other people. Does our university have a policy about students’ privacy? Should the university have a policy that we will not undermine the integrity of our students for litigation? Shimek and Espinoza have both left the meeting and were not available to comment.

Regalado: It is possible that this might fall under title IX. Strahm: The department of Ed: the health records may be released if the records are needed for the University to defend itself. Maybe our university should have a policy to prevent this. Urges our institution to comply with privacy rules.

Park: Library of the Future survey outcomes will be discussed on March 19th in the South Dining at 1:30pm.

Morris: Tomorrow is faculty appreciation day for Women’s softball, at 4 pm at the baseball field.

Silverman: Silverman: Rape is the ultimate form of harassment, and most universities do not have the skills and training to deal with this.

Harvard Law School faculty protested how their university was handling sexual harassment on their campus. Ann's Alma Mata, other universities, or our own university, are not prepared, not able, and do not have the skills to investigate allegations of rape, harassment and similar issues.

Regalado: The University of Oklahoma fraternity protest-official statement has led to the extermination of the fraternity and the two of the students have been expelled. Do we have a policy on campus that addresses that? Possibly the student conduct code addresses this:

<https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/JudicialAffairs/documents/StudentConductCodev2008.pdf>

9. Adjournment

3:30pm