

<p><b>Academic Senate</b>  <b>January 26, 2016</b>  <b>Present:</b> Alvim, Azevedo, Bell, Bettencourt, Crayton, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Garcia, Regalado, Gerson, Gonzales, Guichard, Hauselt, Huang, Larson, Loza, McCulley, Nagel, Odeh Oluwarotimi, Park, Petratos, Peterson, Petrosky, Ringstad, Sims, Strangfeld, Provost Strong, Stone, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wood, .</p> <p><b>Excused:</b> Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Filling, Hoover, Manrique, Strickland, and Zhang.</p> <p><b>Proxies:</b> Elaine Peterson for Gerard Wellman, John Sarraille for Robert Silverman.</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> John Tillman, Doug Dawes, Glenn Pillsbury, Stan Trevena, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriquez, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Ron Noble, Martyn Gunn, Dennis Shimek, Jennifer Cooper, and Lauren Byerly.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce. Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second Reading Item:  14/AS/15/FAC – Statement on Professional Ethics  16/AS/15/FBAC – Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of Senate) Passed unanimously.</p> <p>Second Reading Item:  16/AS/15/FBAC- Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of the Senate) Passed.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:  February 9, 2016  2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Chris Nagel Clerk</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**1. Call to order**

2:04pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 8, 2015** (distributed electronically)

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

John Tillman, Doug Dawes, Glenn Pillsbury, Stan Trevena, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Janelle Culjis, Ron Rodriquez, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Ron Noble, Martyn Gunn, Dennis Shimek, Jennifer Cooper, and Lauren Byerly.

**5. Announcements**

Gerson announced FCETL roundtable discussions of RPT Survey Report Recommendation #3 in FDC 114. She distributed a flyer with the following dates/times: Wed. 3 Feb., 4-5pm, Fri. 5 Feb., 1-2pm, Tues. 9 Feb., 4-5pm, Fri. 12 Feb., 2-3pm, Mon. 15 Feb., 1-2pm, and Thurs. 18 Feb., 9-10am.

The usual faculty center events are occurring such as the Instructional Institute Day Wednesday 27 January titled “Student Engagement: It’s Not Just A Buzz Phrase,” presented by Prof. Rob Jenkins from Georgia Perimeter College. The event was in FDC 118 from 8:30am – 3:30pm.

The Fiction and Non-Fiction book clubs meetings are scheduled for spring semester and the meditation practice continues to meet in the FDC on Mondays and Thursdays from 12:15 – 12:45pm. Stop by and see Emy Barsley for more information.

Espinoza provided an enrollment update: Projected at 7510 FTEs annualized 1.014% above target. The target was 7406. This counts resident students only.

Lindsay announced the International Warrior Welcome reception for new international students immediately after the Senate meeting in the Student Services Building Rm. 145.

Byerly invited all to the Modesto Symphony Orchestra and Chorus performance at the Gallo Center Friday & Saturday, 5-6 February. The program will feature Baroque music, including Bach's Cantata #4, which includes Stanislaus' Chamber Singers.

Speaker Thompson announced that the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) sent out an informational page. The search for the new campus president is about to begin. A campus forum will be held 17 February to gather information about what the campus community wants in a new president. A search firm is videotaping, analyzing and interpreting the information, so it is very important that folks turn out for that forum.

**a. AVP Stan Trevena to discuss Classroom Technology**

Trevena announced a grant of \$1.2 million for campus-wide equipment and technology upgrades. VP Doug Dawes sent out an email asking for lists for equipment that would be desirable. It can be anything that benefits the students and the classroom, upgrades to the technology, projectors, document cameras, etc. Last year we lost the campus classroom technician; a new hire was recently brought on from East Bay, where he did some innovative classroom setups. OIT will provide a survey and he hopes that faculty will take the time to fill it out. Instead of responding to random emails reporting problems, OIT hopes the survey will help to prioritize upgrades.

Nagel asked, could resurfacing or replacing chalkboards count under this grant?

Dawes replied that the lists will come to the VPs and will be prioritized and nothing is off the table.

Trevena reported receiving many inquiries about the size of the desk tops, which are too small to hold laptops. The survey is an open slate.

Bettencourt inquired whether technology for the library would be considered. Trevena replied that it would, provided it was for students.

Provost Strong asked if the survey would be the primary way for faculty to provide feedback.

Trevena replied that it would, and added that in addition, technology that some faculty may not be aware of will be on the survey. At East Bay, there are software controllers hooked up through the campus network to control equipment in classrooms, including responding to problems over the network. For that, a demo will be set up in the training center for faculty to try out. Trevena

opined that wireless projectors would be a high priority, as well as the capacity for multiple computers to take turns projecting onto screens. The intent is to put in the classroom what you want, not what they think you need, and to benefit the students and instructions. Another example of possible new technology is the ability to have work spaces with 8 people at a table and all able to connect and flip screens to project. There's a lot of technology that we don't have. This is a great opportunity to bring us up to current technology.

Strahm reported finding that iOS or OS can no longer stream Netflix videos, and asked if that was an issue with classroom technology that could be fixed.

Trevena said that in his experience it is a matter of the technology not supporting the devices. Trevena also noted possibilities such as replacing projectors with monitors.

Provost Strong asked when OIT may start buying equipment. Trevena replied that the timeline for responding to the VPs was in March, and following that it depends on how long it takes to make purchases.

Trevena said that among the goals are to streamline use of classroom technology and make it simple to use, so faculty don't have to fumble with the technology. It should be possible to simply walk into the classroom and click something on your device to connect. The most current technology is in Science 1.

Strahm asked if they would start in Bizzini, and Trevena replied that it would indeed be a logical place to begin.

Trevena announced that the campus is getting a site license, through the CO, for Zoom, a video conferencing system. The license will be campus-wide, and include students. Several conference rooms will be available with capacity of several hundred persons for video conferences. This will be available as soon as the license goes through.

Speaker Thompson if Zoom was something you can run from your own computers. Trevena replied that it can be run from computer, iPad, even a smartphone.

Larson asked about outreach to students regarding the system and its availability to students. Trevena answered that OIT's outreach was targeted mainly toward faculty, but is open to possibilities to try to reach out to the students. Larson will partner up and get feedback to Trevena.

Culjis asked if the Stockton campus was included. Trevena replied that Stockton campus is part of this. Upgrades on the main campus will also come to the Stockton center. Upgrade to network on campus was a year or two early, because the campus converted to a VOIP phone system, and all phones will be replaced on campus. Emergency phones will have backup land lines. Stockton campus has been redesigned to stand on its own, to be fault-tolerant.

Trevena also announced the launch of the university's mobile app, noting the posters on campus. Our previous mobile app was not very good, but was designed for free. The new one is on a cloud based platform used by many CSUs. This is only version 1, and the app has an icon to tap for suggesting new features. It knows what campus you're at by the GPS connection on your phone. The GO fence was only 50 feet from the Stockton campus but they have extended that so if you go off campus it will still recognize you as being in Stockton.

Regalado asked if there was discussion of how new technology could be used to communicate in the event of an unfortunate incident on campus.

Trevena responded that after the Merced incident, they added a red banner to the screen and your mobile app will show what is going on. Toward the bottom of the mobile app you can report a crime that is not an immediate emergency. There will also be a button for reporting a technology problem. There is a reporting system for sending facilities information about problems on campus physical plant. You can take a photo and send it via the application to Facilities.

Provost Strong followed up on emergency notifications. We have Stan Alert, but for it to be effective, you have to add your cell phone number to the system. Currently less than 50% have done this. He encourages all to include their cell number.

Dorsey asked how to get the mobile app. Trevena replied that the app would be found on appropriate app stores for the phone platform. Mobile app is under <https://my.csustan.edu/> For people that have a cell phone on an unsupported OS, they're working on that.

Tuedio distributed a calendar of events for the month of February to address diversity and inclusion, many of which have been developed by the campus diversity committee. The events include evening events and daytime events. He encouraged senators to alert faculty in departments about the events. This will also be sent out electronically. They need to secure agreements with some of the presenters and will communicate when they have. There are series of events to pick and choose and attend as many as you can. Aisha Fukushima will be performing on Thurs. 11 Feb., in Snider Hall at 7pm. Hugh Vasquez, Senior Associate with the National Equity Project in Oakland, CA and a speaker and educator on social justice issues will be here on 15 Feb. in Snider Hall at 7pm. Vasquez will hold a student engagement session on 15 Feb. and the morning of 16 Feb. Tuedio thanked the president for approving these.

Strahm stated that she has concerns about the following email from Julie Johnson dated Jan. 25, 2016.

Recent federal legislation requires campuses to better promote gender equity and campus safety; a summary of these changes can be found on the [American Council on Education's website](#). Continuing changes to state and federal laws and in California State University policies reinvigorate our obligation both to reduce sex and gender discrimination, including sexual harassment and sexual violence, and promote a safer, more inclusive climate for all students, faculty and staff.

To fulfill California State University's mandated training requirements as detailed in Executive Orders 1095 and 1096 Revised June 23, 2015 and as recommended by the California State Auditor Report Recommendations (AB 2053), all employees must complete the following training courses on CSU policies to prevent discrimination, harassment, sexual misconduct and retaliation:

1. EDU: Eliminate Campus Sexual Violence (completion due March 15, 2016), and
2. CSU: Preventing Discrimination and Harassment (completion due May 15, 2016)

The training programs are online training modules hosted by Skillsoft.

In the next few days, you will receive links to the training programs from this email address: [trainingnotifications@calstate.edu](mailto:trainingnotifications@calstate.edu). You may also access the training program from the Stanislaus State Human Resources website.

To access the programs:

1. Log in to Skillsoft from the HR home page (<https://www.csustan.edu/hr>) or the training notifications email.
2. Click on the Skillsoft hyperlink.
3. Use your Stanislaus State username and password when prompted to log in.
4. Click the "View My Plan" link. The courses will appear as a link.
5. Click on the title hyperlink to begin the program.

You can stop the program when needed and return to where you left off the next time you log in. The programs take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

Skillsoft can be accessed and viewed via your mobile devices; view the attached instructional guide for details.

I appreciate your cooperation. The Chancellor's Office is tracking campus completion rates. Please help us show our commitment to student and employee well-being by completing the training program in the next few weeks. The deadline for completion of the EDU course: Eliminate Campus Sexual Violence is March 15, 2016. The deadline for the CSU course: Preventing Discrimination and Harassment is May 15, 2016.

For employees who are also students, including student assistants, these training programs do not replace the mandatory student program, Not Anymore.

If you have questions about this training requirement, please contact Training Manager Meg Lewis at [mlewis9@csustan.edu](mailto:mlewis9@csustan.edu) or 209-667-3640.

Strahm did not dismiss the importance of these issues, but related to our job this appears to be an unfunded mandate. Are we to be doing this at home as unpaid labor, or at work? What duties should we not be doing when we are doing these trainings?

Provost Strong reported the announcement that the university recently hired Dr. Faimous Harrison as Dean of the Stockton Center effective 1 Feb. Dr. Harrison has more than 24 years of experience in higher education, including 20 years of student service experience. He has most recently served as the regional director for the Central Washington University Branch Campus in Lynnwood, where he undertook a broad spectrum of duties.

Regalado announced that the History Department is hosting Carlos Hill an esteemed historian of the civil rights movement, who has written on “modern day lynching.” Hill will be speaking 9 February. For more information contact department of history.

Stone spoke in support of the diversity events schedule, and to encourage people to attend the unconscious bias workshop.

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

**FAC (Sims):** The FAC will be sending recommendations to SEC on the status of faculty issue. Coming to SEC and Senate in the next month will be a proposed resolution based on EO 1096. FAC continue to review university organizational structure, especially regarding the roles and responsibilities of Department Chairs and Program Directors/Coordinators. A new agenda item is a review of the payment process, procedures, timelines, and signature authority for guest speakers, artists, and other paid guests of the university. FAC have heard a variety of complaints from a variety of places about this.

**FBAC (Peterson):** FBAC last met 9 Dec. and will meet 9 Feb. They discussed the resolution brought to you at the last Senate meeting, and which is a second reading today, on faculty budget priorities. FBAC thought about the comments from the Senate but ultimately they decided they didn't want to prioritize the priorities. They should be looked at simultaneously. Some of the budget priorities actually bring in money. One of the points of having these resolutions is that as funds are increased to the university we want folks to be aware of these priorities. FBAC is also reviewing budget data provided to them by Michelle Legg.

**GC (Ringstad):** GC last met 17 Dec., and went over several items regarding process on teaching assistants, employee fee waiver, and admissions status. They continue working on graduate learning goals. In spring, they're hoping to finalize graduate learning goals. GC are also hoping to finalize culminating experience guidelines. They will be discussing plans for staffing needs for graduate education. CEGE grant that was providing many of those services is ending, so they're looking at ways to meet some of these needs.

Speaker Thompson noted that discussion of learning goals is timely.

**SWAS (Strahm):** Among the resolutions that passed at Statewide Senate, the following were of pertinence to the campus. First, a resolution calling on the CSU to acknowledge California tax payers as university donors. Second, a resolution acknowledging the role of faculty in evaluation of courses for transfer. The resolution encourages campus senates to review the role of faculty in

forming and following policy on transferability of courses, and clear and transparent process for meeting degree requirements. This passed unanimously. Also passed unanimously was a resolution on the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in faculty orientation programs. They are advocating for lecturers to be invited to annual or semiannual orientation day events, and to include this as part of paid contractual work time. It also calls for making information available to all faculty about resources for teaching, and about rights and opportunities for non-tenure-track faculty. Another resolution requests the CSU administration and BoT to form a joint task force on tenure-track recruitments and increasing tenure density. A concern is that one way to increase tenure density is to eliminate a lot of part-time faculty and increase class size, so the resolution encourages the CSU to increase TT density while maintaining or reducing SFR. They also ask that faculty be on that task force. Finally, a resolution calling for restoring RSCA funds as a line item in the system's budget—which was eliminated as a line item during the Great Recession.

**UEPC (Stone):** UEPC met 10 Dec. and discussed course time modules and the 2019/20 calendar. They're discussing placement of spring break and reading day. They're trying to get the Wednesday before Thanksgiving set as a non-instructional day but it is not looking good. UEPC also discussed a new grading option for English and Math classes that correspond to transfer classes. Transfer courses coming in having to have a C or better to count; the proposal is to have C or F and nothing in between, for the corresponding courses in our catalog. Also discussed Individual Study forms, whether Dean approval is desired, and a discrepancy between the forms and policy. Next meeting is this Thursday.

Provost Strong announced that President Sheley approved the recommendations from the Committee to Prioritize and Implement the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan Workgroup will review the president's approval and will prepare for the next 2019 WASC visit. Will be working on that and possibly have recommendations to the campus community.

## **7. Second Reading Item:**

### **a. 14/AS/15/FAC – Statement on Professional Ethics**

Sims stated that as before this is an update to the Faculty Handbook to include the most current AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. The changes are small, but with important consequences. Results of the vote, 36 yes and 1 abstained so recorded as unanimous.

### **b. 16/AS/15/FBAC – Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of the Senate)**

Petersen recalled that the purpose of the resolution is to state goals the faculty believe are all important. Because there are trade-offs between them, FBAC did not prioritize them. The intent is that they should all be pursued at once. Prioritizing may have sent the incorrect message that one could be at the expense of another, whereas we want some of them to be accomplished together. Results of the vote, 34 yes, 2 no 1 abstained and the resolution passes.

## **8. Discussion Items:**

### **a. Student Success and Completion Initiatives Plan**

Speaker Thompson stated that this has been a discussion item before. Provost Strong asked if the plan of the senate was to provide feedback based on the minutes, or send the administration a memo, or has that not been decided? Thompson replied that his idea up to today was to take feedback from minutes and discuss further in SEC. Now, he said, he understood things better. What Thompson had asked the provost was, for example, regarding the tenure-track hiring, budgeted for \$320k this year, but we're not spending it this year on tenure track faculty hiring—in fact, not any of it. So that \$320k will be spent in some way, specifically for student success, but it will not be spent as it is listed in this category. This led Thompson to conclude that the feedback needs to focus on how money should be spent that is not going to be spent as listed in the plan. Of the total \$809k, a substantial amount will not be spent as currently listed in different categories. When provost and VP Espinoza said they wanted consultation, they meant it. Now, Thompson said, he is not sure what the right way to proceed is.

Provost Strong replied that this was a good summary. The items in the plan related to hiring personnel would be budgeted for the year, and the year is half over, so there would be salary savings in those categories. The administration has said all along that we need an operational plan to complement this more strategic, broader plan, specifically to account for the one time savings, and we need to execute that quickly. The senate will be the last stakeholder group to provide feedback, and then the admin will come up with an operational plan that may include the one-time savings from this plan. The admin needs to report to the CO by next October, so the feedback is needed quickly so the university can get started quickly. Each year the plan can be reviewed and changed.

Sarraillé asked, is the admin open to suggestions about the ways salary savings could be spent to help students in the meantime, before hiring faculty using that money?

Provost Strong replied that whatever funds not spent this year allocated from the \$809k would be used to support students, not to fix rooves or things like that. The one-time salary savings would be spent consistent with the allocation for student success, graduation, etc.

Sarraillé replied that he is suggesting that along with whatever else the senate may be doing; there should be an addendum that addresses how the salary savings will be spent. Off the top of his head he can think of a couple things that it could be used for, and others probably could as well.

Thompson interjected that, based on his lack of understanding; senators were not prepared to provide that kind of input. Thompson noted the relation to FBAC budget priorities and to Stan Trevena's discussion of the \$1.2 million for technology earlier in the meeting. If there is something that someone would like to suggest in the next couple of days, email that Isabel Pierce so SEC can review those suggestions.

Sarraillé said that, off the top of his head, hiring tutors or people to grade would be good uses of the funds.

Strahm said don't kill programs like PACE.

Stone noted that the category "high impact practices" is vague, and \$10k is a small amount of money. Things that she's aware of that are in this category are involving students in research, service learning, etc. and \$10k is a paltry amount for that category.

Espinoza said that when administration went through the plan, there was not an adequate amount to fund every area, and there was some overlap in the different sections of the plan. They were meeting along with the advising task force, and they wanted to reserve an adequate amount for their recommendations. This was not intended to be related to all the needs the campus has.

Thompson noted that this would be one-time, since next year the \$320k could actually be spent on tenure-track faculty hiring.

Regalado asked if there was anything that addressed possible funding for graduate students engaged in research, to take them for instance to archives.

Provost Strong replied that the intent of the grant initiative was for undergraduates and undergraduate retention and graduation rates. Provost noted also at the governor's recent speech he noted the importance of four-year graduation rates for the CSU.

Strahm made two comments. First, that the CSUs ought to fight back against the four-year graduation initiative program, because it is focused on traditional college students, not those who are currently coming to college. A different kind of person is coming to college now. Instead of the obsession with four-year graduation rates, the focus should be on the demographics of students who are here—first-generation, working, and historically marginalized students. In addition, the university has been decimated in its ability to provide for that. No tricks or "deliverology" can replace that funding. Instead, the response should be to address the students who are here. Second, she asked why there is \$90k budget to buy software for advising, when multiple people on multiple days have said that this is not needed, but what is needed is time for real people to sit down with students to provide advising. Couldn't that \$90k be used for something better?

Larson commented that the advising software would be useful for students to use to sign up for their classes. Other schools have software that allow you to predict your future schedule, and this is what this initiative would bring to students.

Strangfeld stated that an electronic version of advising would be good for some students, but that research shows that for first-generation students, separation from human beings is detrimental. First-generation students benefit from one-on-one interaction. Advising for those students in particular is more than just checking off which classes a student needs. If a student is getting

quality advising, it includes addressing concerns like how to talk to a faculty member whose class you are failing, or how to apply for graduate school despite a lower GPA, or what do people do with this degree, etc. Spending money on advising software will not address these questions. The advising software use would require more work by faculty, and detract from the time faculty have for one-on-one advising. It hard to justify why high impact practices includes only \$10k, but \$90k is allocated for software.

Petersen said that her favorite part of the plan is \$320k on tenure-track hiring. She agrees that advising one-to-one is important, and hiring tenure-track faculty is the way to achieve that. Given that this is a one-time re-allocation, Sarrailé's idea of hiring tutors is a good one, because it helps students, and gets those hired as tutors involved in teaching. And in the following year, the loss of those tutors would not be a harm because the new tenure-track faculty would be there, and the tutors, who would often be graduating seniors, would not be harmed by losing employment.

Larson asked for a clarification on whether the software would replace person-to-person advising. Provost Strong replied no.

Sims said that it's important not to avoid problems—for instance, if students feel they only have five minutes, or that they only see faculty advisers to check off boxes, how can we really deal with that? In addition to what we don't like in the plan, it's important to have feedback on what solutions there are.

Espinoza addressed comments related to technology. The institution has made commitments to adopt different technology, to increase our ability to advise students online. Some have been provided by the CO to improve availability. The Smart Plan builds on the scheduler that they already have implemented. The system suggests different courses that meet students' schedules. The functionality and ability to plot ahead will be provided by the proposed technology that will add on to systems that allow students to go through the schedule more easily to find courses that meet their needs. This system would not be to provide students a way to get advice on their own, it was to find a system that allowed the university to sort through students and identify those that are struggling. It will save time for faculty members and is a better reporting mechanism. It will allow you to better use the time you have as a faculty member, to free that time up so you can advise your students.

Regalado replied to Sims that there is so much emphasis on what advisors do. But there are things that advisers are not: therapists, parents. Advisers have certain responsibilities related to curriculum, and going outside of those could lead to trouble. Some clarity of what an advisor is not supposed to do could be helpful.

Sims provided a suggestion: is there a need for greater resources and faculty training for advising?

Provost Strong replied that that had been in the plan, but it had to be scaled back. That could be something we could use one-time money for. We don't want to use one-time money for things that would be ongoing. We have already devoted a lot of funds to high-impact practices, and that is one reason why the augmentation in the plan is only \$10k. The idea of tutors and supplemental instruction are good ideas for one-time use. Advising software is supplemental. One exciting part of the new software is the early alert capability. We have a decentralized advising system, and the software could be an integrating mechanism that we sorely need to share information with everyone. Regarding Regalado's point, the system could include protocols and frequently asked questions, including technical questions. In no way is the intent to replace face-to-face advising, but to augment it. Many campuses seem to be in keeping with the current use of technology in society.

Sarraillé said that, in short, we are hearing intriguing ideas about what the software could do, but not sufficient detail about these things to really decide the value of adopting it. It would be helpful if those concerned could get better information about the software.

**b. Advising Task Force report**

Thompson noted that this has also been on the senate agenda before.

Strahm thanked those who were involved in this, and had one concern, on recommendation #12 ("12. Facilitate students' ability to enroll in courses required for normal and timely progress to degree by implementing the following actions"). These are great actions, but where, in that, is hiring more faculty to teach more classes? All the tricks and software you want, without the faculty to teach the classes, will not achieve timely completion of degree. If added to #12 was a (d) to hire more faculty and make more classes available that would help.

Petratos said he was thinking the same, about bottleneck courses. The one-time student success money could fund those.

Thompson commented that as Petratos has suggested, we should also look at this the same way we are at the student success monies.

**9. Open Forum**

Provost responded to concern raised about the governor's emphasis on four-year graduation rates and the CSU's response. The Chancellor responded that the CSU has made significant progress in six-year graduation rates. At the provost academic council meeting, they asked what the governor expects to see. The response was that they did not know, but the current CSU rate (19% or so) is not good enough. They asked where this is coming from. The governor has been focused on this, and there is a nationwide emphasis on four-year graduation rates. Various nonprofits are focusing on this. We have never recovered from the recession budget cuts, and it is a daunting challenge. We need to understand where this emphasis is coming from and need to dialogue with the Governor and legislature. He spoke to members of the assembly and senators and some were not concerned at all but the fact that the Governor is paying so much attention

warrants our attention. We did get \$809K for student success so this is something that is in our environment that we have to deal with.

Strahm re-raised the question of the “unfunded mandate” of the required harassment training. When, in her schedule, is she supposed to fit that in, or is she supposed to do it unpaid?

Shimek replied, first, thanking Strahm for her statement of support for the need for the training. He asked that faculty recognize that we’ve been dealing with this at the federal and state level. The system is requiring this of faculty, staff, administrators, and students. One way to respond to the workload issue is to make sure that the training permits you to go into it with whatever time you have available, and then return to it as time permits, so you don’t have to repeat the entire training.

Sarraillé asked if VP Shimek could provide a report on Time, Manner, and Place of Expression policy.

Shimek replied that since the last meeting, he has revised it, and circulated it back to Senate and to unions, and awaits comment. Thompson said that at the next SEC the draft will be referred to FAC, and this will return to AS through a resolution.

## **10. Adjournment**

3:50pm