1. **Call to order**
   2:07pm

2. **Approval of Agenda**
   Adjournment will be at 3:30pm for those wanting to attend the open forum with Chancellor White in the Event Center.

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 8, 2016** (distributed electronically)
   Approved.

4. **Introductions**
Guests: Helene Caudill, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, David Lindsay, Betsy Eudey, Maryann Hight, Julie Johnson, John Tillman, Scott Davis, ASI Director CJ Sonico, and Bao Lao.

5. **Announcements**
   a. **Special/Selected Topics Form**
Speaker: UEPC is discussing a specific form for selected/special topics. He wanted to announce this at SEC and Senate as in past we've had discussions on modifications of course forms and that was mostly about modifications of enrollments. Refer to the form that this does not have those optimum and maximum course enrollment numbers. It does have SFR and in discussions it became clear that whenever you have one of these when you move a Selected Topic to a regular course that grid for enrollment max is on that form and you can always go back to the regular course proposal form. Information will be there for faculty to refer to. This is at UEPC now.

Hight announced that there will be an information session for an Open Educational Resources incentive grant program on 8 April from, 11 to 1pm, and drop-ins are welcome.
More information about the incentive program is available at the COOL4Ed website:
http://www.cool4ed.org/, including a Toolkit with ideas for planning the project:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/17Kf11FcUXBdcNWIsBh-rpja6py9KLmXPWwz5_OaY0Nk/edit?pref=2&pli=1

Rodriguez reminded the senate of the Library Development meeting Thursday 24 March, 1:00-3:30pm, Library second floor. Department chairs and library representatives are all invited to learn more about library initiatives regarding budgets, electronic resources. Rodriguez appealed for assistance to have most responsive collection we can.

Petrosky wished all a lovely spring break.

Larson deferred to the ASI Director Sonico, who read the following statement: "ASI has written a resolution supporting early registration for student athletes. Volunteers have worked tirelessly to educate the student population and gather over 1500 petition signature of non-student athletes who support this. Our ASI bylaws state that our ASI representatives on the Academic Senate need to bring issues that are backed by petition through all the shared governance channels and essentially do all we can to ensure the students wants are heard and met. As a biology major, I've had my fair share of difficulties when registering for my classes, but I've been fortunate enough to enroll in the classes I needed. However, while the same cannot be said for everyone else, it could not be truer for our student athletes, those of whom dedicate just as much time into practice and competition as those who work and fulfill various commitments. We will be looking for Academic Senate's support before the end of the academic year."

Alvim announced meeting of the Latin-American Studies Reading Group Thursday 24 March 3:30-4:30. Alvim distributed the flyer. The text, in English translation, for that meeting was "The Hen," a short story by Brazilian writer, Clarice Lispector. For more information on the group, contact Alvim at 667-3216 or Emy Barsley.

Strahm reminded the senate of the open forum with the Chancellor at 3:30pm, and added that it would be great if those interested remind the chancellor about the Fight for 5.

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

FAC (Sims): FAC has not added anything new. Most of last meeting they discussed preparing a ballot of the proposed amendments to the constitution and preparing a packet that will hopefully go out to faculty this week.

FBAC (Peterson): Finished the CEGE data discussion and costs for continuing the program. They discussed status of psychological counselors and decided to ask the Provost to request additional information and update from S. Espinoza. They discussed the cost of increasing the density of T/TT faculty to the 75% level called for by ACR 73. Finally, they discussed problems that science faculty have due to insufficient startup funds for research, and the resulting loss of some good potential science faculty.

GC (Ringstad): GC reviewed and finalized their input into the draft position description for a graduate director, and on the revised APR timeline and course proposal forms. They continue to discuss revisions to guidelines for graduate fellowships and the culminating experience guidelines as well as consideration of co-authorship for culminating experiences.

SWAS (Strahm): No report.

UEPC (Stone): UEPC has two resolutions on the agenda as first reading items. They continue to work on the course modules policy and modifications to the APR timeline. APR timeline has been sent to the college deans to get input from committees in the colleges that work on APRs. Under new business, UEPC began discussion of changing the grade option for so-called "golden four" courses. CO has proposed that to receive GE credit, students must earn C or better in those courses. The options are to continue a policy that C- or D still passes but students receive no GE credit, or to change to a policy that creates a C vs. not passing option.

Wood asked what the "golden 4" courses encompass. Stone responded that they include Composition, Critical Thinking, Communications, and Math.

Regalado asked whether the aim of having the modification to the Individual Studies form as a first reading was to bypass bringing it to the senate as a discussion item, or whether that was the Speaker's plan.

The Speaker replied that this question had not come up in SEC. SEC's intent was to bring controversial items to the senate first as discussion or information items, before a first reading, but they didn't think this was controversial.

Garcia asked whether UEPC was working with GC at all on the course modules.

Stone replied the two committee chairs are discussing it.

Garcia said that graduate programs have different needs and it's important that graduate program faculty members take a look at the modules.

7. **Consent Item**
    a.   **4/AS/16/SEC AB 798 and the Open Educational Resources Adoption Incentive Program**

The Speaker explained briefly what a consent item is. This is an assemblage of presumably routine or non-controversial agenda items. They are scheduled early in the meeting so that they can be dispensed with quickly, i.e., without extensive discussion or debate. Items on the Consent Agenda that elicit objections will be shifted to the regular agenda as first reading items.

4/AS/16/SEC AB 798 and the Open Educational Resources Adoption Incentive Program

RESOLVED: that the California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate support efforts of the University Library, the Office of Information Technology, and the Campus Bookstore to promote the Affordable Learning Solutions initiative and encourage faculty to increase the use of high quality, low-cost or no-cost, accessible instructional materials alternatives.

Rationale: The high cost of textbooks has a substantial impact on students' ability to purchase required course materials and makes it difficult for many California State University, Stanislaus students to afford a quality education. The goal of California's *College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015* is to reduce the cost of course materials for California college students by encouraging faculty to accelerate the adoption of high quality, no-cost and low-cost materials, especially Open Educational Resources (OER). The CSU Affordable Learning Solutions (AL$) program is available to assist CSU faculty to choose and adopt such course content; educate faculty and students on issues related to textbook affordability; and enable the discovery of affordable, quality instructional content through OER repositories, libraries, and bookstore resources. An increasing number of quality, peer-reviewed digital materials are available for faculty to adopt as Affordable Learning Solutions, a subset of which are available as Open Educational Resources (OER). CSU Stanislaus supports and promotes Affordable Learning Solutions by providing workshops and support for faculty through the California State University, Stanislaus Affordable Learning Solutions team, led by the University Library in collaboration with the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. In order for Stanislaus State to request funding through the *College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015*, the Academic Senate must adopt a resolution of support for increased student access to high-quality OER to reduce the cost of textbooks and supplies for students.

Maryann Hight said this was the resolution supporting OER initiative. The senate bill requires that for campuses to qualify for the grant, they have to have the Academic Senate support to express that the faculty support the initiative. Hight said if there was any interest in pursuing the $50k grant, this was a necessary step.

Stone spoke in support. She is always looking for ways to save money for students and to keep things fresh. By supporting it, you are not obligated to ditch your $300 textbook in favor of less expensive options for students.

Strahm seconded what Stone said. Sometimes she gets frustrated about these kinds of things because the CO and state legislature put the onus on faculty to do something about the problem caused by textbook publishers. Faculty are innovative and can be a force for change when it comes to publishing as well, if enough of us do this sort of thing.

Larson added that one of their directors at large looked into the initiative, and their board is in full support. They're very excited about the opportunity for affordable access for students.

Hight attended meetings held by the CO and the OER Council in Los Angeles in order to learn about the grant and will hold a work shop for faculty who may be interested in applying for the grant. In addition to a Senate resolution, the Speaker must provide a memo with a campus plan for supporting this effort. Both the resolution and the memo must be included in the grant proposal, due by June 30, 2016. Hight recently provided SEC members with a copy of the part of the grant RFP, which can be found on the COOL4Ed site (California Open Online Library for Education, http://www.cool4ed.org/) detailing some of the requirements of the proposal and

how the money from the grant could be utilized. Dean Rodriquez is the designated ALS coordinator for our campus. Rodriquez and Hight had previously provided M. Thompson with a draft resolution for the Senate to consider so that faculty on our campus may qualify to apply for this grant. If there is no interest this year, it may be that additional money may be available next year and if the amendment is passed, then the requirement of Academic Senate support will be met for future grant opportunities.

Hight said the grant will require that the faculty take the initiative to write it, because the faculty are the ones with disciplinary expertise that is needed to make the OER work. We hope to have faculty attend the workshop and brainstorming session on 8 April on how to write the grant, and nothing definitive has to be put together until 2018.

Wood asked about the grant money available. Hight asked how many chemistry sections used the same textbooks, and used that as an example for explaining the grant limits. Each section is limited to $1000 of the grant. If the campus found 50 sections, that would enable us to get $50k. It is possible to use the money for assigned time.

The Speaker asked if there were objections. Hearing none, the consent item was accepted.

8. **First Reading Items**
   a. **5/AS/16/GC Graduate Learning Goals**

Moved/Seconded Ringstad/Strahm.

<div align="center">

California State University Stanislaus
5/AS/16/GC – Graduate Learning Goals

</div>

Be it Resolved: The Academic Senate recommends that California State University, Stanislaus adopt the attached Graduate Learning Goals.

Rationale:

These Graduate Learning Goals represent the shared goals of graduate education programs across the campus. Beginning in 2002/2003, student learning goals developed by graduate program Coordinators and Directors in Graduate Council have been incorporated, as appropriate to each discipline, into the assessment plans of graduate programs. These Graduate Learning Goals represent the most recent (2015/2016) revisions to the goals.

These Graduate Learning Goals serve to guide the kind of graduate curriculum we value and develop, guide the University's Graduate Assessment Plan, and respond to WASC recommendations that CSU Stanislaus "continue with the development of support for graduate-level programs, including…development of stated learning outcomes and their aligned assessment" (Report of the WASC Visiting Team Educational Effectiveness Review, 2010). The commitment to provide excellent graduate education is a fundamental component of the current Strategic Planning priorities of the University (Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Action Items,

2016-2018, Goal 1) and is essential to fulfilling the University's aspiration "to become a major center of learning, intellectual pursuit, artistic excellence and cultural engagement for California's greater Central Valley and beyond" (University Vision Statement).

GRADUATE LEARNING GOALS

Beginning in 2002/2003, student learning goals have been incorporated, as appropriate to each discipline, into the assessment plans of graduate programs. The following represents the most recent (2015/2016) revisions to the student learning goals.

The sentences in bold represent the general learning goals; the items bulleted under each of the goals suggest some specific options that may be implemented.

1. Students will demonstrate advanced knowledge, skills, and values appropriate to the discipline.
- To be awarded a graduate degree, all graduate students will be required to complete a program of coursework appropriate to the discipline. A culminating experience activity as defined by the program or discipline is required.

2. Students will demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers within the scope of the discipline.
- These abilities will be demonstrated in the culminating experience activity.
- Graduate level seminars and courses will require extensive research and writing activities that meet high academic standards in both form and content.

3. Students will demonstrate the ability to contribute to the scholarship of their disciplines.
- Students will work as individual researchers or scholars as appropriate to the discipline.
- Students will work in collaboration with others and to engage in applied scholarship as appropriate to the discipline.
- Graduate courses, seminars, and internships may require that students demonstrate their ability to work successfully on group projects or with others.

4. Students will demonstrate relevant knowledge of diverse perspectives and broader contexts as appropriate to the discipline.
- Students may be required to engage with diverse communities and issues of diversity in the context of the region.
- Student assignments may require demonstrated awareness of intercultural and global perspectives.
- Student portfolios may be required that reflect, in either an applied or a research-oriented context, an understanding of the diverse perspectives of the discipline.
- Students may be required to document proficiency or experience in second language/culture studies.

5. Students will demonstrate knowledge of new and various methods and applications as appropriate to the discipline.
- Students may be required to participate in a supervised practicum, internship, or service learning activity in which they demonstrate the ability to apply discipline-specific methods.
- Students may be required to demonstrate competency in accessing and communicating information in their discipline.
- Students may be required to demonstrate competency in gathering and analyzing information in their discipline.
- Students may be required to demonstrate their ability to use all relevant information technology, multimedia, and other technology-related tools that are appropriate to their fields.

6. Students will be required to demonstrate advanced communication skills, complemented, as appropriate to the discipline, by the ability to access and analyze information from myriad primary, print, and technological sources.
- Students are required to meet standards in writing competency as determined by each program.
- Students may be required to submit scores from an examination such as the GRE or a similar national normed assessment instrument; a minimum score may be established by individual programs.
- Students may be required to make oral presentations in graduate courses.
- Students are required to complete a culminating experience/assignment that demonstrates their knowledge of the discipline and their ability to communicate this knowledge articulately in oral or written modes, or both.
- An original written thesis, project, or comprehensive examination may be required that reflects the students' ability to conduct research using primary sources from a broad spectrum of printed and electronic media. An oral defense or presentation of the thesis or project is typically required.
- When required to write a thesis or project, students will submit timely proposals/drafts to their committees. All research conducted by students must comply with relevant federal, state, and University policies. Students are required to complete theses or projects that are persuasive, cogent, and well-articulated
-

Approved by the Graduate Council 2/18/2016

Cooper asked about #1, what do you mean by values?

Ringstad responded that each discipline has a set of principles. All felt that in every discipline, there were standard expectations and types of involvement.

Cooper asked if this is something that can be enforced. Is the implication that if a student does not share our values, we can withhold that student's degree? Is that legal?

Ringstad responded that the goals are not intended as an enforcement document. They are intended to be a guiding document for developing curriculum assessment plans. This is really in reference to assessment of programs and the things we want students to learn, not assessing individual students. We will be assessing curriculum and programs using these goals.

Garcia offered the friendly suggestion that there was a typo in one bullet point under #3:

> **3. Students will demonstrate the ability to contribute to the scholarship of their disciplines.**
>   - Students will work as individual researchers or scholars as appropriate to the discipline.

b.   6/AS/16/UEPC Resolution to Modify the Individual Study Policy

Moved/Seconded Stone/Strahm.

6/AS/16/UEPC Resolution to modify the Individual Study policy
Resolved: That the following modifications to the Individual Study policy be approved; and be it further

Resolved: that the modifications are effective for Fall 2016.

Rationale:
The major changes include deleting a course (6980) that has not been offered for twelve years, removing summer term specific language that was relevant to Year Round Operation and including a requirement for college deans to approve individual study courses. Every independent study is a specific course and should be treated the same way we treat other courses. Independent Study should go to the dean's office for approval since the dean is responsible for budget and thus faculty workload and assignments. This is also consistent with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement which states that instructional assignments "will be determined by the appropriate administrator in consultation with department chair or designee and/or individual faculty member" (20.2). Since faculty workload assignments are the responsibility of the dean in consultation with department chairs and faculty, the dean's signature should be required on the form.

Policy:
Individual Study At the option of the instructor, Individual Study courses may be available in certain fields to a student who has demonstrated capacity for independent study. A total of nine units of individual study credit earned at Stanislaus State is the maximum permitted toward a degree, credential, or other educational objective. These courses are numbered 4980 or 5980 following the subject field prefix. A student seeking to enroll for an Individual Study course must file the original copy of an approved Request for Course by Individual Study form at registration. Request forms are available at the Enrollment

Services Office; they are required to obtain signatures from instructor, the major advisor, the chair of the department and the dean of the college that is offering the individual study.

5/AS/93/UEPC Approved May 7, 1993, 4/AS/05/UEPC Amended and Approved May 19, 2005, Amended by UEPC 3/10/2016

Line in/line out of policy:

Individual Study At the option of the instructor, Individual Study courses may be available in certain fields to a student who has demonstrated capacity for independent study. A total of nine units of individual study credit earned at ~~CSU~~ Stanislaus State is the maximum permitted toward a degree, credential, or other educational objective. These courses are numbered 4980, 5980, and ~~6980~~ following the subject field prefix. A student seeking to enroll for an Individual Study course must file the original copy of an approved Request for Course by Individual Study form at registration. Request forms are available at the Enrollment Management ~~Admissions and Records~~ Office; they are required to obtain signatures from instructor, the major advisor, ~~and the~~ Department Chair and the Dean of the college that is offering the individual study. ~~Individual Study during the Summer Term also requires a Dean's signature.~~ 5/AS/93/UEPC Approved May 7,1993, 4/AS/05/UEPC

Stone explained that it was brought to UEPC's attention that on the Individual Study form there is a line for the dean to sign "of required by the college," and it was causing confusion. UEPC did some research and found that the summer signature for deans was required because of the way workload was assigned in summer during YRO. It was confusing and vestigial, and there was reference to a course that hadn't existed for 12 years. UEPC cleaned up the policy and the question remained what to do with the dean's signature line. Arguments to UEPC were made that every IS course is a course, and deans approve new courses, so it made sense to include the dean's signature on the form for all colleges.

Regalado repeated that this was not presented as a discussion item so he wasn't able to run this by his department in a reasonable time. He just saw it this morning and can't offer good feedback without more time. One of his colleagues wrote to Koni Stone on this topic and he hasn't received a response. With respect to the resolution itself, it's a case of a budget criterion being used to torpedo a curricular matter. What we heard from the UEPC chair was a "cookie cutter approach" that because a dean should have some say in workload and other items. History sees this as stifling pedagogical opportunity. The catalog says IS courses are offered at the say of the instructor. Giving the deans blanket authority over IS undermines faculty's governance over curricular matters. History department finds this has no merit, or at least requires further discussion, otherwise there is no real faculty input.

Stone replied that the item has been on the UEPC agenda that has been published, so it did not seem to her that this was being "railroaded" in that way. She acknowledged that she received the email from Regalado's colleague at 1:39pm.

Regalado countered that Stone is correct that she got the email at 1:39pm, and he only got the resolution this morning. For someone who is teaching in the morning, he hasn't had an opportunity to look at it.

Strahm noted that she doesn't necessarily disagree with Regalado's viewpoint on the form, but disagrees with the way Regalado said this has progressed. It has progressed in the way all resolutions do. This has gone thru the same processes. Besides that, she's concerned about the dean having that kind of final say over things that provide us an opportunity to work with students doing more innovative things. She hoped that in the process of taking this back to their departments that senators can come up with some suggestions for UEPC.

Huang asked about the number of courses on the form itself. The form doesn't mention the 9980 doctoral level. Stone will add it to the resolution.

Speaker Thompson addressed process: when there is a concern like that expressed by Regalado, people can move to amend the agenda at the beginning of the meeting. They may want to ask to change the item to an information/discussion item. When it comes back from UEPC, it will be an action item and the Senate can refer to the committee if there hasn't been sufficient time to discuss with colleagues. When we decided to send this agenda forward, we thought we would have the resolution out earlier and he takes responsibility for that.

Regalado said the resolution will make our jobs more difficult by adding another layer of approval. Why advance this proposal? Has this been problematic?

Cooper said it appeared to her that the real argument is in the tiny phrase "as required by college." It is not clear to her which colleges require and which don't, and how a pre-existing condition is changed. For instance, if my college requires dean signature, but someone else's doesn't, who makes that decision? Does the dean?

Speaker Thompson said he sees the disagreement being that the requirement for the dean's signature is not currently in the policy. The question is, are we changing the form to adhere to policy or changing the policy to add the dean's signature?

> c. **7/AS/16/UEPC Resolution Live Sound and Recording Arts Technician Certificate Program**

Moved/Seconded Stone/Sims.

> 7/AS/16/UEPC Resolution Live Sound and Recording Arts Technician Certificate Program

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached proposal for the Live Sound and Recording Arts Technician Certificate program; and be it further

Resolved: That the Live Sound and Recording Arts Technician Certificate program take effect Fall 2016 upon approval by the Provost and President of Stanislaus State.

Rationale: This certificate program is to offer participants an academically based experience to students wishing to pursue music technology at a non-academic level. All currently offered degrees are based in an academic music program. Currently, the Stanislaus State Music Department offers only the Bachelor of Music and the Bachelor of Arts baccalaureate degree programs. The addition of an academic certificate program will allow the Music Department to expand the prospective student body to include non-degree seeking students without needing to add extra courses or faculty members. As these students will be gaining experience as student technicians for the music department, the level of technical support will increase as well. Courses will be offered state-side but students may also complete coursework and earn a certificate through Open University, allowing community members to enroll who look to better themselves and gain practical experience.

UEPC approved 2/25/2016

Sims explained that this will offer a new certificate program to make use of existing courses that have low enrollments. The program would allow non-music majors to complete a certification program in live and recorded sound, without getting in the way of music students.

McCulley had questions regarding whether this was the same basic program of students working to record sound at events. She also asked whether this would require additional staffing needs.

Wood asked if there were any area community colleges that offer similar programs.

Sims replied he was not aware of any, and there is a big need that they are trying to address.

Thompson announced that UEPC is discussing a specific form that is for Selected and Special Topics courses. He wanted to announce this in SEC and AS because in the past we have had discussions of modifications of course proposal forms, and the placement of optimum and maximum enrollments on those forms. This current version does not have optimum and maximum, but has SFR. In discussion, it became clear that if you develop a Selected Topic into a course, the grid for opt and max enrollment is on that form. If you have a Special Topics course, the course proposal form would be used when such a course became a regular scheduled course.

9. **Information/Discussion Items:**
   a. **Use of Unmanned Aircraft Policy**

VP Dennis Shimek asked Julie Johnson, Campus Compliance Officer, to provide an overview. Johnson gave the background that unless a policy was in place on campus to get authorization from FAA for use of drones, any use of drones would be unauthorized. For campuses to obtain a public declaration and to use drones under FAA authorization, this policy is needed. Most recently FAA has finalized rules for the use of small drones by state entities. It appears now that the final rules published in December of last year apply to public institutions. FAA simplified the process for institutions to authorize use of drones for research and education purposes. Prior to

this, an operator had to be a pilot and have a pilot's license to operate a small drone. Now there is new language pertaining to "Certified Operator" users for craft under 55 pounds.
As things stand, anyone who wants to use a drone in connection to university biz, it would have to go to the review committee, and FAA still requires we get the public declaration. Process is not different, but training required is different for small craft.

Johnson addressed a question about insurance coverage. FAA stipulates that appropriate insurance policy is needed for institutions operating under an institutional authorization. It is not clear whether that insurance would still apply to craft over 100 pounds.
Thompson said that it seemed initially like the regulations would require that drones be used for research with an approved project, etc.
Johnson explained that under new rules for small craft, FAA has expanded category for use to get Public Use Authorization to include educational, teaching, scholarly work. Under the new, final FAA policy, someone wanting to fly an under 55 pound drone for educational purposes could do so but would still need to go through the review committee to obtain an FAA Certification of Authorization.

Thompson asked if the insurance would cover an instructor using the drone for educational purposes.

Johnson said the system insurance policy covers users of drones up to 100 pounds. We need to determine what the campus deductible is if there was property damage, and who would pay the deductible.

Regalado asked whether members of Public Safety would be on the review committee.
Johnson referred to page 1 of the document stating that the committee will include the Chief of Police or designee.

Hauselt reported that the Geography Department faculty are really excited about this as they are really behind the community colleges and UC Merced in ability to use drones.

10. Open Forum
None.

11. Adjournment
3pm