

Rodriguez mentioned an online workshop on open educational resources, scheduled for Friday 12 February.

Regalado reminded of the Dr. Karlos Hill lecture the night of 9 February titled “21st-Century Lynching? Meditation on Police Shootings of Unarmed Black Men.” Hill is author of two books.

Provost Strong distributed a list of high-impact practices and allocated funds associated with each. He explained that this was in response to discussion of the \$10k allocation for high-impact practices in the Student Success Initiative plan, and that the list of activities that have high impact practices was intended to show what the administration are doing to support high impact practices and why they proposed a modest amount additional in the Student Success plan. They received feedback from Senate and other groups and will be putting together an operational plan soon.

Sarraillé announced the CFA plan for strike activity to occur from 13-15 and 18-19 April if a settlement is not reached by that time. CFA was to hold a lunch on Monday 15 February 11am-1 pm as an opportunity for members to ask questions about the plan.

Guichard reported that a few of her students asked about the impact of the possible strike. She’s teaching at the time of the luncheon meeting and asked if there will be minutes or an FAQ. Sarraillé referred her to the website www.calfac.org. It should have links to faculty FAQ and student FAQ. CFA will distribute hard copies at the meeting on Monday.

Tuedio distributed materials pertaining to the Equity and Diversity events during Black History Month. He expressed the hope to get our students there to hear different kinds of voices and begin to appreciate alliances and to share concerns.

a. 29 Days of Equity & Diversity (Dennis Shimek, Kilolo Brodie, & Peggy Hauselt)

Hauselt, as a member of the Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee, explained that they were charged by the president to create a program of 29 Days of Diversity. These events were supported by President Sheley. Hauselt encouraged faculty to attend and to encourage students to attend. She mentioned events for that week.

Soodjinda said to locate the website for flyers through Google searching Affirmative Action CSU Stanislaus and the first result will take you to the website. All events are updated daily.

Shimek thanked members of the committee and Tuedio for their efforts, and also President Sheley for full and complete support. He asked senators to bring paperwork back to your departments and encourage colleagues to make time to attend and participate in some of these events. This is not the last, but first event of this kind, and he hoped that this sets the stage for the kind of activity we need on the campus.

Filling asked about the high impact practices allocation information provided by the Provost, how the activities listed on the bottom relate to the program and the budget lines listed on top. It looked like two separate reports.

The Provost replied that the list on the bottom is a summary of activities. The line items list the budgeted funds.

Jaasma noted the 1 unit added as part of First Year Experience in English 1006. The actual budget amount was not known at the time that unit was added.

Tuedio replied to what he believed Filling asked, that the list below was of activities that supplemented the list of budget items on the top. The list on top seems to be more recent investments.

Filling replied that the problem was that the list stated that the university was allocating dollars without saying what the outcomes were or what the activities actually were. The lists provided do not connect.

Provost replied that the question raised in senate was why more dollars from the BoT initiative had not been dedicated to high impact practices. At that time they said they didn't invest more in that plan because they already invested a lot on high impact practices. This is a further elaboration to show that there are those dollars spent already on high impact practices.

Strahm asked what the list will look like in 2016-17, given that CEGE and PACE will both be gone. She is glad that we are working on the STEM Grant but does not hear much about how the practices in PACE would be continued.

Thompson noted that the PACE work group recommendations were expected by midterm, and there is a budget to attach to those recommendations.

Provost said that was correct, and noted that the group was waiting for PACE students to select their representations. Recommendations will get to the president by mid semester.

Larson announced the open forum for presidential search is Wednesday 17 February from 1-3pm in Snider Hall. This is an opportunity for anyone in community to come and articulate the qualities you want in a president, to the search committee.

Thompson announced that the memo on recommendations on the Student Success Initiatives Plan was in the senate packet and was sent out that morning. The memo consists of recommendations sent to the Provost and VP Espinoza, that had been discussed a couple of times in Senate and in SEC.

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)

FAC (Sims): They have a draft of a policy statement based on EO 1096 but are holding off as we are expecting a revision from the CO. They expect to send a memo to the Provost to request review of college organizational structures, especially related to program chairs, directors, and coordinators and their respective duties.

FAC sent a note to VP Shimek regarding timelines and procedures for contracts for consultants, paid guests, etc., and Shimek has begun a formal review. If you have feedback from your departments please share with Sims as more information is always helpful, for instance, if your department is trying to pay someone or get a venue and having difficulties. FAC are hoping to define problems as comprehensively as possible, and end up with a process that works for all and is streamlined. The university also indicated they were looking into hiring a consultant.

Shimek confirmed this.

Tuedio added we should recognize that processes we regard as frustrating and not working also do work as well. We don't want to throw staff people under the bus.

FBAC (Peterson): FBAC had not met since prior senate meeting.

GC (Ringsted): GC had not met since prior senate meeting.

SWAS (Filling/Strahm): Filling noted that in November SWAS asked the CO to suspend the background policy and they declined. SWAS continues to work with the CO and CFA on Academic Freedom policy.

Filling reported that he spent the day in Sacramento where the legislature is working on a policy on conflict of interest such as people that write textbooks and then assign those as course texts. The legislature was also discussing legislation to guarantee four-year graduation to students, and the ASI's objection to access fees for publishers' websites.

UEPC (Stone): On 4 February all received a copy of the 2019/20 academic calendar. They did their best to avoid a class day on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, but were not able to do so. They did put the spring break in the middle of the semester and include Reading Day on 11 Dec. 11

The other item, included in the senate packet, is the policy for Individual Study. The policy does not match the form that students use to get approval for IS. At one time the dean's signature was required for summer only, but this was a relic of YRO summer sessions. That has been replaced with "if required by colleges." UEPC would like to know which colleges require the dean's signature for IS, and why, so they can adapt the policy to be consistent with the form. The policy we have does not require a dean's signature on an IS but at some point the form was changed to indicate that colleges could require it.

The UEPC continues to work on class scheduling modules and it will be brought to Senate in two weeks.

7. Information/Discussion Items:

a. Definition of “Faculty” & Voting Rights (Stuart Sims, FAC)

Sims introduced the item. Since beginning of the year we’ve been discussing status of faculty. This was prompted by SWAS resolution January 2015 encouraging campuses to examine this issue. FAC has been gathering information and they are considering recommending 3 changes to constitution and voting rights on campus. First, amend the constitution so that the definition of faculty is in line with CBA and there is no distinction between faculty and “associate” faculty. Second is to change faculty voting rights, so they would be in line with the first change defined in Article III, Section 1.0 of the constitution. The third would be changing the title of the constitution to “Constitution of the Faculty,” removing the word *general*.

Then there is item B, as follows: should there be any restrictions on voting right for faculty? Three potential options were presented: no restrictions (one faculty member, one vote); restrictions based on time in service (e.g., two years); or restrictions based on time base (e.g., 0.4 FTEF—erroneously stated as 0.4 WTU in distributed documents).

Thompson called attention to the first part of the distributed document that indicated the work that has been done. SWAS was the prod to do this, but FAC was asked to look at this to make it a broader conversation on campus. There has been a lot of work done on this already, including discussions in all standing committees and in the senate, survey of part-time faculty. They have fulfilled what SEC asked them to do last year.

Sarraillé said, regarding the list on page 3, the last 2 items on that list refer to FMIs which are no longer extant. FAC can remove these. Also, keep in mind that some of the people we are talking about enfranchising are not required to take part in governance, and do not have any contractual responsibility to participate in committees etc.

Sims replied that that was an excellent point. One survey of standing committees led to thoughtful conversations about whether they should change membership to make it open to more faculty. For the time being those have been made secondary, for some of the reasons Sarraillé’s point concerns: would this lead to an expectation to do unpaid work in committees, etc.? These are secondary to the definition of faculty.

Nagel said he was asked to point out that this is the tip of the iceberg. Real enfranchisement of all faculty would mean full participation in deliberations all the way down the structures of governance.

Wagner added that there are some departments with majority part-time faculty.

Regalado asked whether enfranchising all PT faculty, to have voting rights on issues involving curriculum, is basically the enfranchisement of people that don’t participate on committees and

don't have the working knowledge needed to make decisions that may affect the curriculum for many years to come. What is the rationale to allow such members to participate?

Nagel asked whether every department assures that all faculty members, including probationary, have committee experience before they participate in those decisions.

Regalado replied that the history department certainly tries to temper the amount of committee work they participate in, and by the second year they are familiar and by the third and fourth year very familiar with department processes.

Nagel said he would think that in the same way a TT faculty member experiences this campus from day to day would create working knowledge, that experience would lead any faculty member to accrue similar working knowledge. The difference is that some of us are officially barred from different kinds of participation that are open to others.

Sarraillé noted that this was a difficult thing to pin down entirely. We all can think of examples of TT faculty that haven't made contributions to decision-making and governance in ways that we would have hoped they would. We all know examples of temp faculty that have made valuable contributions. In a democracy we let all people vote, and not all of them are equally well informed. With few exceptions, faculty have advanced degrees and great deal of exposure, and on average we can expect them to perform admirably.

Eudey said that she thinks the policy is trying to create fairness and justice. Maybe other systems and processes at the university are not in line with this. Perhaps many, including probationary faculty, are not knowledgeable of who is running for office or other information needed for full participation. It is amazing that we have elections with only names and no description of what candidates do on campus that qualifies them. We may need to be better about providing information about these matters to help all faculty understand matters like how curriculum fits policy, etc. This change could also be a call to reform how we inform all faculty about matters before governance.

Davis explained that the English department changed their bylaws to allow all unit 3 faculty to vote. So there has been no insurrection. They have a standing item under peer review, which they are trying to define. Grounded experience, in the classroom, appear necessary for responsible decision making.

Regalado said that he would not associate this issue with justice. Most departments keep their part time faculty well informed particularly in the areas that relate to their positions. That should be the responsibility of the department, but it's not necessarily a case of justice. This doesn't add up to a right to vote, especially when you have many PT faculty looking for permanent positions in other areas and who won't have a stake in the long term stability of their departments.

Eudey noted that based on her experience as FCETL director, there are many part-time faculty who are not given much information and are actively excluded from conversations.

Strahm appreciated Regalado's statement that it would be a hope that departments share information. Full participation would insure that all departments do right by the faculty and insures that we have a fair and equitable level of say about the goings-on of this university. If you want to have a decent democracy, you need to have some level of investment. If you feel you belong, you would be invested. Instead of hoping that departments share information, this would lead to needing to. Prefers that we have something that ensures that we have something available.

Regalado said that not all who live in the US have the right to vote.

Sims said this discussion was interesting, but the question before the senate had nothing to do with department level processes and procedures. The current constitution and handbook are silent on this. While this is a fraught and exciting area of conversation, this is not the set of questions FAC is asking the senate to address. FAC has had some interesting conversations about the standing of FAC or senate to impose any such policy on departments. Before even addressing this, FAC wants to advance what they believe does have broad support. The next phase would be to address how it is realized in departments. It was eluded to that department processes aren't necessarily documented or prescribed. It has become fractured and individual.

Thompson added two things. First, that from the beginning, the administration has been asked to be involved in this process. SEC has received a memo from the president and has had discussions with the Provost. Now that this is moving toward action, this will be brought up with the president again. Second, there are restrictions on probationary faculty service in governance as well. Talking about the uninformed voter made him flash back to his first AS meeting... Something about writing came up and Ron Vandermolen asked if the senator from English was there. We need uninformed people to participate in order to become informed and learn about the university. Lastly, a central part of this has to do with identity, and how we identify people who teach on the campus.

Sims corrected an earlier point. Two things would change in department processes: it would allow all faculty to vote for senate rep, and to vote for representative in committees where this isn't restricted elsewhere.

Strangfeld stated that one difference between probationary and NTT faculty members is that for probationary faculty, there will be time in your service when you're expected to serve on some committees. With NTT faculty there isn't any such expectation. Retaining a restriction creates a situation where NTT faculty can be here forever and not be allowed to serve on governance committees.

Petrosky told the story that there was once a land with an evil king who imposed his will on who can be hired as part-time faculty. This would allow the evil king thus to impose his will on the way that department worked.

Strahm said she believed there should be no voting restrictions for any faculty. Eliminating restrictions would demonstrate that we're invested in everyone that comes here as a faculty member and make sure that people know they belong and have a voice.

Thompson added that what FAC has listed does not countenance partial votes. All are about one-person-one-vote. The term of service limitation would apply to all faculty. This is not an idea that flew out of FAC. One starting place was an AAUP document that stated that institutions may wish to consider voting restrictions based on time in service.

Wood asked, if you're going to treat all faculty as equals, why not make it one faculty member, one vote? How are you going to verify that everyone that is voting has the time in service or meets some other qualification? How are you going to enforce it?

Thompson noted that he is not advocating for anything but explained that if the restriction were based on 0.4 FTEF time base, one could use the list of people that are eligible for benefits.

Huang expressed concern that this would change expectations in evaluations of faculty, that it would add participation in governance as an expectation.

Thompson replied that contractually there can't be any expectation of service.

Petrosky said that his department and college often revisit expectations of scholarship. Most temporary faculty have practical backgrounds, not academic backgrounds. Will they have a say in that kind of matter?

Sims replied that this is why FAC would not recommend change in section 2 regarding RPT elaboration or committees.

Davis said that in English there is often a disparity in the number of people hired in fall and spring semesters. A vote in October might be different from a vote in April.

Strong noted the documents brought to senate specified a qualification of 0.4 WTU, and asked if FAC intended this. Sims replied it was a typo, and what was meant was 0.4 FTEF.

Thompson explained that FAC will review this discussion, and possibly bring a resolution before the next senate meeting. Send your comments to Isabel Pierce.

Sarraillé said he didn't notice if there was anything recommended about who can hold office.

Thompson said that there has been work in FAC on that issue, but there is a lot of complexity about it, so the decision was made to handle these big questions first.

b. Presidential Search

Thompson noted a correction: under Process, item 2, the date should be changed from 18 March to 18 April. He noted the timeline and the forum characterized by the Chancellor's office as "our opportunity to talk to the next president." The forum will be important because that will be the chance to provide input. The forum will be available via webcast. The search committee wants input.

Strahm asked if there is a way to ask the candidates if they're willing to come to visit and meet personally the constituents they would preside over. The closed search disgusted her, and suggested that the Chancellor viewed the CSU as if it were a bank. She'd like to ask these candidates if they are willing to come here and openly meet with us, and claimed it would tell us a lot about their character.

Thompson replied that if all three finalists agree to come to campus, that can happen. He's talked to other campuses that recently held searches under this policy, and at the end not all candidates agreed to come to campus, so it didn't happen. If many people came to the forum, and many asked about a campus visit, would that become a question posed to the candidates?

Davis thanked Mark Thompson, Nancy Burroughs and Koni Stone for serving as the faculty reps. He asked if the short list will be public information. No, per Thompson.

Guichard reported that at their last meeting Psych/CDEV faculty were frustrated. They are strongly in favor of mandatory visits to campus with opportunities for the stakeholders to meet with those candidates.

Petrosky agreed and said that any candidate unwilling to come to meet with the stakeholders is sending a message as they will be a conduit for whatever the Chancellor wants them to do.

Regalado echoed Davis' thanks and said we can't have better representatives. He asked if 18 April was not a strike day, meaning this date may be moot. He shared comments from department faculty regarding the unacceptability of a secret presidential search. How can you trust a president that won't come to the campus community to meet with departments? It is ironic that candidates for US president and Supreme Court nominees have to respond to bodies in a public setting but the CSU system does not have this. The BoT's scheme poisons the well at the outset and does no one a service—either faculty or administrators. He said he believes that when the BoT put together this scheme there was no faculty rep at the BoT, and asked Filling to confirm this. Filling did.

Tuedio reminded us that we did meet the "evil king" during the previous presidential search, before Sheley, and got very enthusiastic and brought him in with high expectations. Along the way things began surfacing through social media channels that should have come to our attention. The faculty on the committee need to be sensitive to that possibility.

Filling asked the senate to keep in mind the clear difference between process and individuals and outcomes. We went through an open process and ended up with not a good fit. We get a good

result more often than not with open process. Sociopaths and liars are good at what they do. He encouraged all to attend the open forum event and speak up. More people there makes a difference. Attempting to change the policy is difficult and takes time, and takes being able to stand before the Chancellor and say that 22 of 23 campuses want open searches. Note that the 23rd campus did not want to offend their new president.

Sarraillé reiterated Filling's comments. The suggestion that a closed process might be superior than an open one should be investigated further. The process we had was not open, it was semi-non-closed. When we were actually able to have conversations with candidates, we were only provided three options. Two of them were unremarkable, and the third was a really good talker and talked a good game. There was not a lot of help with tracking down the candidates' histories outside of what was in their resumes. There should be a very open process. This selection process is a travesty. He would like to see universities elect their president from among their faculty. He suggested lightheartedly that we may persuade candidates to appear on video conference with bags on their heads.

Eudey made two remarks. First, recognizing that claim to legitimate the private search is that many candidates would not want their campuses knowing that person is seeking the position, is it possible that the timeframe of the process makes it difficult or impossible for candidates to become available to take the presidential position five weeks after the decision? High quality candidates being secretive may have difficulty disengaging in five weeks. Second, absent opportunity to come to visit, she would encourage us to include specific campus related questions. Some candidates for various administrative positions have given very generic answers when asked what attracts them to Stanislaus, without demonstrating anything about our region and teaching focus. The questions we ask could probe to see if they've reviewed our curriculum, WASC reports, etc.

Martin asked, can we ask specific questions and at least get a written response from them?

Regalado asked members of the advisory committees present if, based on their experience, they believed they have any clout or leverage to make suggestions, or to make the BoT responsive to our concerns.

Stone expressed that she was not feeling very optimistic, was not impressed so far, and the structure is not favorable.

Thompson opined that it seems to be a well-oiled process that will run the way they intend. Others on other campuses thought that it was an inclusive process and that, in the end, there was consensus and they didn't feel that their voice was excluded. They felt that it was an authentic process in which they had input. Thompson added, if you are concerned about process, show up and say something about it. But also, things like improving our relationship with the external community, restoring and improving shared governance. Things have improved lately, and he wants that to continue. Thompson also urged the faculty to consider what is important to you to bring forward.

8. Open Forum

None.

9. Adjournment

3:43pm