

Academic Senate**October 6, 2015**

Present: Azevedo, Chan, Crayton, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Filling, Garcia, Garone, Gerson, Gonzales, Guichard, Huang, Larson, Loza, McCulley, Nagel, Odeh Oluwarotimi, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Ringstad, Sims, Strangfeld, Provost Strong, Silverman, Stone, Strahm, Strickland, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wood, Young and Wellman.

Excused: Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Hoover, Wagner, Zhang and Filling.

Proxies: Ellen Bell for Miller-Antonio and Ethnic Studies, Renae Floyd for Lee Bettencourt and Barbara Manrique.

Guests: The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, John Sarraille, Helene Caudill, Oddmund Myhre, Mark Grobner, James Tuedio, John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Dennis Shimek, Lauren Byerly, Amy Thomas, Officer Clint Strode, Melody Maffei, Andy Roy, VP Doug Dawes.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

First Reading Item:

12/AS/15/SEC Sense of the Senate Resolution California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate Presidential Search Transparency. Passed.

Discussion Item:

Baccalaureate Goals and Outcomes. This will return as a first reading item next meeting.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 27, 2015
2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:
Chris Nagel, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:05 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 22, 2015 (distributed electronically)

Approved with slight amendments.

4. Introductions

The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, Helene Caudill, Oddmund Myhre, Mark Grobner, James Tuedio, John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Dennis Shimek, Lauren Byerly.

5. Announcements

Floyd, on behalf of retired faculty association, announced that Ellen Brussels Dunbar, founding member of the MSW faculty, received induction in California Social Work Hall of Distinction. A reception in her honor will be held on Oct. 10th in San Francisco. Contact Barbara Dimberg, MSW department, for details.

Duggan announced the 12th annual technology fair in MSR, Wednesday 7 October, where vendors will show off technology.

Espinoza updated fall census report: student headcount 9285, a 2.6% increase from last fall; FTES 7783 students, a 0.86% increase. Students in general have reduced the number of courses in which they register .38%. The enrollment target was increased late by the CO, ending in a 4.6% target over last year. We ended registration at 1.5% above that target.

Sarraille announced that CFA is going to begin a vote 19-28 October to authorize the Board of Directors of CFA to trigger job actions if necessary. In addition, the CFA chapter is nearing completion of their goal of getting 30 people signed up to go to Long Beach on 17 November to join 1000 other colleagues in a demonstration of strength. Please share information with colleagues and other constituencies to get people on the bus.

Strong stated that he and Espinoza presented a plan related to student success and completion initiative, in particular addressing 6 activities identified by the CO. President Sheley will send the plan to the campus community. They told the CO the plan is tentative, subject to feedback from various stakeholders in the next month. Look for that plan.

Secondly, the legislative analyst's office will visit the Stockton center on Thursday. The LAO are visiting all branch campuses in the CSU. At the Stockton center enrollment is up 3% from previous years, indicating progress.

Azevedo announced the opening of the Art Space on Main, downtown, on Thursday 8 October at 5:30 pm, downtown Turlock, across from the Dust Bowl. Video work will be on display, and the print making club will be printing T-shirts as a fundraiser. The t-shirts will be \$10.

Peterson reminded the senate of the Tastes of the Valley fundraiser for Ag Studies, at the fairgrounds, Thursday 8 October. This is an opportunity to meet community members as well as sample locally produced wine and cheese.

Byerly announced first choral concert of the year, Friday 9 October in Snider Recital Hall.

Speaker Thompson reminded the senate that the next AS meeting is 27 October.

Finally, the Speaker reported that President Sheley sent a timely response to our query regarding counseling faculty. SEC will discuss this at their 20 October meeting.

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

FAC: Stuart mentioned three major items on the agenda. (1) FAC is reviewing the general faculty constitution and committee structure to make recommendations to SEC and senate about possible amendments related to the discussion of faculty status. (2) They are working to integrate EO 1096 into our existing Power Disparity policy. (3) They are reviewing the current Statement on Professional Ethics, in light of AAUP's subsequent amended statements, to see if any change to our current statement would be merited.

FBAC: Peterson reported that FBAC finished discussing the draft report on the sustainable model for funding the CSU, and sent their comments in response. They met with VP Shimek to discuss how equity pay increases were carried out on campus and analysis of salary differences within the past 4 yrs. They also discussed a cost of living analysis that Tillman done, related to salary data provided by staff. Recall that salaries at Stanislaus ranked 23rd of the 23 CSU campuses, but when adjusted for cost of living we are no longer at the bottom, but that does not mean our employees are overpaid by any stretch of the imagination. FBAC also discussed an email inquiring about Wi-Fi accessible data projectors. Next on their agenda is a faculty budget priorities resolution.

GC: Ringstad reported they haven't met since last report. They continue to discuss graduate education and strategic planning, and to work on a process for sharing with the campus steps involved in graduate education.

Speaker Thompson thanked FBAC for their response to the financial sustainability model draft report.

SWAS: Strahm had no report.

UEPC: Stone reported that UEPC will be meeting this Thursday. Under old business, we will be continuing our discussion of the Two-Pass Registration system. Our preliminary assessment indicates that the system is working and that no groups of students are disadvantaged. We have recently received more data from Vice President Espinoza and John Tillman (Director of Institutional Research) to inform our discussion. We will also continue our discussion of course time modules. Presently, we are using a modified course module schedule that was based on the schedule that was approved by the Senate in 2005. This was before the demise of our Winter term. Then with the change to a two semester calendar, these modules were modified to fit the 15 week semester class times. This new time module schedule was never approved by the Senate and a bit of chaos has ensued. We strive to bring order to the system. Under new business, we will be discussing GE sub's modifications of their GE course proposal forms. The modifications are a result of the new GE learning goals. Also, we will begin reviewing a new concentration in Biochemistry, and a modification of the BA degree in Chemistry.

Sarraille asked about revisions to course proposal forms.

Stone replied we have new learning goals and need a new procedure and that will be reflected in the new course proposal forms.

Sarraille asked if he could assume that the proposed course proposal form will be shared before being adopted, or if the revision would only be business for the committee.

Stone answered that the revision didn't seem to need senate approval.

Sarraille noted that CFA has an interest in the new course proposal form and may request a meet and confer depending on what the form looks like. Duly noted by Stone.

Speaker Thompsons thanked UEPC for doing the major work on the response to the system wide report on Ethnic Studies.

Wood reported that the Campus Safety Committee met yesterday, and discussed recent shootings on campuses. The issue of concern regarding "shelter in place" policy is that doors to classrooms do not lock. It may take a few years to put locks on all doors, because the university has only one locksmith. Another concern was cell phone reception in some buildings on campus and in Stockton Center. They were unable to get OIT's input in that discussion. Facilities Services has been finding confidential information in recycling bins. A third item was use of motor vehicles on pedestrian walkways on campus and risks posed by them. Safety grants up to \$10k are available from CO to make improvements, so anyone with ideas to improve safety should let Wood know and he will forward to the committee.

Strahm asked, about locks on classroom doors, what will happen if the problem is inside a classroom, if the door was locked, how would someone easily get in to intervene?

Wood replied that that would probably be handled by UPD.

7. Information Item

- a. Implementation of the RPT Survey Report Recommendation #3 (15/AS/14/FAC Endorsement of RPT Survey Report recommendations is provided electronically)**

Gerson explained that URPTC and FDC (Faculty Development Committee) were charged by FAC in late Spring 2015 to implement Recommendation #3 from RPT Survey Report. FCETL held meeting with chair of FDC, and co-chairs of URPTC, and formed plan for reviewing elaborations over the next year. Typically, URPTC contacts chairs and departmental committees regarding proper review of RPT files. To implement Recommendation #3, URPTC and FDC developed a three-phase plan. The first phase will be to contact those conducting review of candidates this spring, to encourage them to also review the elaborations themselves and to review the RPT Survey Report. In a second phase, FCETL will host a series of workshops to review elaborations, as a “meeting of tribes” to look at own and compare to others’ elaborations. The purpose is to get groups to critically examine their elaborations and whether they like them as they are or want to revise them. Phase 1 focused on senior faculty; phase 2 on junior. Phase 3 will encourage departments to look at their elaborations and consider revising if they see fit. New elaborations must go through URPTC before going to the Office of Faculty Affairs, and the deadline for submission to Faculty Affairs is March 18, 2016, for use in the 2016/17 Academic Year. Joint committees may decide to offer support into fall of next year, since the deadline is so soon. Format for phase 2 will be based on feedback on phase 1.

Silverman asked about section 4, on department committee structure. Suppose this step is violated? To whom should one present this issue?

Shimek stated that he believed the appropriate protocol would be to bring that to the attention of the chair, dean, and provost.

Sarraille said something that should not be lost sight of is that development of elaborations is a departmental process and decision. It is not something to be imposed externally. The process used to decide elaborations is not to be imposed externally either.

Thompson added that we’ve done this before, and English went through elaborations and made changes. He characterized the process as helpful, but noted the department controlled the process and faculty led the process. Last time it was FAC, and Thompson opined this would be similar to that prior time, when comparisons of elaborations would be encouraged but there would be no imposed change.

Gerson explained that the committee understands their role as facilitators, not as imposing anything.

Wood asked if there are guidelines about how often elaborations should be reviewed and revised? CJ went through a number of revisions over the last few years, and wondered if departments might be doing too much to revise them.

Tuedio advised that a department would want to consider how reviews were conducted and how different levels of review used elaborations, to consider whether there was ambiguity, etc.

Eudey agreed and added that it’s useful to ask current faculty their views of whether elaborations reflect currency in the discipline, and their own work in the discipline. Adjustments may be warranted to clarify changes in the discipline or in what weight things are given. For instance, changes in publishing standards may shift the significance of co-authored articles, or course revisions, etc.

Sarraille apologized if he was belaboring anything, but addressed the issue of “ambiguity.” Sometimes people want criteria that are ambiguous. It can be a desirable characteristic. People with a stack of things to evaluate may want unambiguous standards; however, not everything that counts can be counted. A

deeper analysis of elaborations may reveal that what may appear ambiguous to a pedestrian reviewer serves a purpose.

Speaker Thompson added that later levels of review could contact earlier levels of review if they want clarification regarding recommendations and elaborations. He also pointed out the last paragraph of the memo, which requests faculty to review the survey. Every once in a while we come across powerful statements like this that state why departments and programs make recommendations on RPT, and why they establish elaborations: "First, given disciplinary differences, faculty members at the discipline level possess expertise that is core to the development of elaborations. Second, peers in the discipline understand the norms, constraints, and body of work in their discipline, which makes them better able to assess their colleagues' scholarly and pedagogic accomplishments given the resources available. Third, discipline faculty members also have a deep experiential understanding of the realities and constraints of workload in the department." "RPT Survey Group Report: Perceptions of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Processes and Practices" (7) <http://tinyurl.com/RPTreport>

b. Campus Safety Presentation (3:30pm Time Certain for VP Dennis Shimek and VP Doug Dawes)

Shimek noted the context of the presentation, following so closely upon the shooting at Umpqua College in Oregon. Shimek encouraged as many questions and concerns as senate members have to be brought forward.

Dawes introduced Amy Thomas and Lt. Clint Strobe.

Thomas said the focus is on mindset and preparedness. What happened in Oregon could happen here, in fact it has, several years ago. Materials distributed included an outline and slides. Encouraged faculty to show the presentation to students, to help students understand safety and preparedness. She also encouraged faculty to include safety information in syllabi. Also distributed was a "pocket guide" for active shooter response. All materials are available from university emergency website. Thomas encourages department chairs to use video to help with faculty preparedness, and is available to speak to departments herself.

Strobe said that in an incident, anyone in the room might need to be a leader. At the beginning of class, it would be helpful to explain to students where to go in the case of an evacuation, and how shelter in place would operate in the classroom. It takes about sixty seconds, and if half don't retain it half will.

Thomas said another question they hear is "how will I know?" Before UPD can arrive, it may be that someone will need to respond in the meantime. UPD will track the incident, not necessarily go to where there are injured people.

Strobe reminded the senate of the Stan Alert system, and the importance of adding a cell phone to the contact list in the system, for text messages.

Guichard asked about the hard line phones in classrooms.

Thomas said those phones will not ring.

Wood noted that many faculty require students to hide phones during class, so a text message would not be useful. Is there a way to make hard wire phones ring?

Strode said they would have to ask OIT if that was possible, and that a phone alert may sometimes involve a delay. Instructors could situate their own phones to make them visible.

Garone noted that the administration has pointed out that removing phones from faculty offices could save money. Is it a safety risk to do so? He stated that he's heard of at least one of the CSUs that have already removed faculty office phones.

Strode noted that from a public safety standpoint, they have more than enough ideas on spending money to enhance safety, so leaving wired phones in offices seems like a good idea. The csustan.edu/emergency has two videos posted, one from federal government, one produced by a Canadian university, both presenting safety information along the lines of "run, hide, fight" – the first step is, always, to evacuate.

Strode and Thomas presented the safety video "Run, Hide, Fight." They stated it would be good for faculty to share this with their students.

Strode discussed the hiding response, including the difference between cover and concealment: cover protects against attack, whereas concealment only prevents being visible. Having plan ahead of time is the best approach. If sheltering in place, barricading a door is useful. If the classroom is the place to take shelter, desks and tables can be a barricade. UPD can guarantee that they will be on their way as fast as possible but may take 2 minutes so you can always consider fighting. Shelter in place focuses not on the run and fight. In a worst case scenario, defending oneself by fighting back may be necessary. One should not exclude the possibility of needing to fight. In some mass casualty events the ones that decided to fight stopped further destruction.

Thomas stated that shelter in place drills have been run and continue across campus, including in Spring Semester, starting in Bizzini Hall. The drill will take about ten minutes. The drill will be announced, possibly by bullhorn, and last ten minutes.

Strahm asked about classroom doors and the way they swing, and the impossibility of barricading the doors.

Thomas replied that fire code requires rooms with an occupancy over 50 must swing out. During the drill, safety officers will check doors and classrooms to see who is and is not visible.

Strong asked for confirmation that the fire code prevents us from locking doors that swing out. This was confirmed.

Strahm stated that virtually every classroom in Bizzini Hall has a door that swings out, and tiny desks and small tables. Logistically, where would we hide in a typical classroom in Bizzini?

Thomas agreed, and stated that she wanted ideas.

Strode reminded that there is no perfect option, and we are stuck with what we have. Desks can be piled in front of doors, and although it may not prevent someone getting in, it may deter someone. There are

things you can do to impede, and an active shooter would know they have very little time. Making it difficult would discourage.

Silverman was curious about doors having to open out because of fire danger, and found a statistic about children killed in fires in schools that said 0 children have died in fires in North America. Perhaps the doors should have locks, because it seems that shooting is a larger danger than fire in schools. Perhaps we should protect against shooting rather than fire.

Thomas said we are stuck with having to prepare for many things, not just one event. They are all unlikely; we have to be prepared for many such things.

Byerly noted that it's possible that the reason no children have died in school fires is that fire codes require doors to open out. Some doors automatically lock, but can be pushed open from inside. Perhaps that kind of lock and door configuration could work.

Strobe noted that the doors issue is more complicated also because of ADA regulations. Over the years, the campus has looked at various ways of locking doors. Following VA Tech, interior locking doors seemed to be the primary focus. Before that study was finished, there was an incident in which a perpetrator was inside a classroom and had locked the door, which led to concern about having doors that locked from the outside. Science 1 is an example of an approach: card locks provide the possibility of locking down an entire building. That's a type of system the university is looking at. It will take a lot of time, and every door requires special hardware and installation for that kind of door lock. They have also looked at door latches like those common in hotel rooms, and an alternative that has a latch but also a lever that is pushed open to exit—but this still puts people in a situation making it impossible to get into a room. All code regulations are law, so violations can lead to buildings being shut down by regulators like fire marshals. There is no perfect solution. Number of doors in a classroom also depends on occupancy of classrooms: over 50 requires two doors. Locking doors in classrooms presents other problems.

Wellman asked about the recommendation for Bizinni 102, which has stationary desks.

Strobe replied that this is a location where shelter in place does not make sense. Other locations are also not ideal.

Larson noted that after talking to other student leaders from other campuses, the idea of using 911 cellular app came up. It initiates immediate video and a 3-d map that provides signal and GPS information of an incident.

Thomas replied that there are a variety of technologies, but the university has some constraints. Officers are on duty 24/7 but not our dispatch staff, so it may not be possible to administer such an application. They do not rule anything out, but they look into whether they are useful for our campus.

Byerly noted that even if someone is locked in, as long as keys or cards were provided to first responders had those, they could get in. ADA compliant handles could still have a chair shoved under them.

Strobe noted that first responders form contact teams. Turlock PD can integrate as needed. Campus police will move toward the problem quickly. PD may pass people who need help; their initial goal is to handle the incident. Following would be extraction and first aid teams.

Duggan said there were no plans to remove phones from faculty offices or departments. OIT is considering VOIP possibilities.

Peterson said she was still somewhat confused about what was required for the drills.

Strobe explained that Thomas will send out emails about the drills ahead of time, and will include information and suggestions about what needs to be done to shelter in place. The drills are exercises in considering whether particular classrooms are good places to shelter in place, to know how it feels to be sheltered in place. The idea is to get campus members to consider what they would need to do. Examples included where and how to secure people.

8. First Reading Item:

- a. 12/AS/15/SEC Sense of the Senate Resolution California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate Presidential Search Transparency**
- Strahm moved the resolution. Seconded by Nagel.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

12/AS/15/SEC Sense of the Senate Resolution

California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate

Presidential Search Transparency

Resolved: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate calls for an open and transparent search process for all CSU presidential searches, in which finalists' names are publicly announced and official campus visits for them are scheduled; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate strongly urges the CSU Chancellor to ensure that community members appointed to campus presidential search advisory committees be from groups with strong ties to the local community and individuals who have made significant contributions to the university's local service area; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate strongly encourages the California State University Board of Trustees to revise their September 2011 Policy for the Selection of Presidents to include mandatory public visits to campuses for finalists in presidential searches; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the Academic Senate of the CSU, and campus senate chairs.

Rationale

CSU presidential searches are governed by the Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents. That policy creates a two-tiered committee process for a presidential search. The Trustees Committee for

the Selection of the President (TCSP) ultimately recommends final candidates to the Board. The campus advisory committee for presidential selection participates in the search process, including interviews and deliberations that lead to the selection of a final candidate(s).

Several provisions of the policy have significant implications for the nature of a presidential search. On the one hand, the policy expresses a welcome “deep commitment” to consultation with campus and community representatives and diversity. On the other hand, rather than mandating an open search process, the policy provides that the Chancellor and the Chair of the campus search committee together decide whether to schedule campus visits for presidential finalists. They may also appoint up to two additional members from constituent groups to the ACTCSP “...to strengthen its capacity to cope with the complex requirements of a specific search, including diversity of the campus, the service area or the state.” (<http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml>)

The California State University Stanislaus Academic Senate strongly urges that the TCSP conduct an open and transparent search process. Forgoing announcing finalists’ names publicly and scheduling official campus visits for them would be behavior more characteristic of a private corporation than a public university. This means a less transparent search process and less confidence in the outcome on the part of the university community and public. The thoughts of the new president at CSU Sacramento are instructive in this regard. In his Fall 2015 Address, President Robert S. Nelsen frankly expressed his dislike for the search process for new presidents. He spoke to the absence of an on-campus interview and who actually selects the president. In his words, “I hate that I didn’t get the opportunity to meet all of you during the search and that I am only meeting you now. And I don’t like it that you are only meeting me now and that the huge majority of you had no say in whom [sic] your next president would be.” (http://csus.edu/sacstatenews/Articles/2015/08/documents/FallAddress2015_AsPrepared.pdf)

Meaningful consultation means open campus visits where all members of the university community have the opportunity to meet finalists and ask them questions in a public forum. Such visits give the university and public insight into finalists’ knowledge of the campus and their ability to unify and lead the students, faculty, staff and administration of CSU Stanislaus. Such visits also give finalists insight into the university community they aspire to lead.

A “deep commitment” to consultation and diversity extends to the membership of the ACTCSP, too. Members appointed from local constituent groups should live and work in the region, and have made significant contributions to the university’s service area. Such individuals would add an important depth of insight and perspective to the campus advisory committee. Their appointment would also demonstrate the CSU’s commitment to consultation with the local community and acknowledgement of the contribution that local constituencies make to the university’s mission.

Strahm introduced by saying this resolution calls for us to join other campuses calling for a return to transparency in presidential searches. Chancellor Reed changed to process to eliminate campus visits as a step in the hiring and interview process. Even some presidents hired by this process have found it unhelpful because they then lack insight into the campus when they arrive.

Petrosky asked for clarification on whether there was time pressure to pass the resolution.

Strahm said there was some, but that she would not push for it.

Petrosky moved to waive the rules of the senate and move the resolution to a second reading. Seconded Nagel.

Nagel pointed out reasons to move to second reading would include that the resolution is not controversial, and that it is a sense of the senate stating the faculty's position.

Gerson asked if other senates were passing similar resolutions, or are we the first.

Strahm replied that several are, some are considering a resolution that would take approval, and was not merely a sense of the senate.

Motion to move to second reading passed: 36 yes, 1 no, 2 abstentions.

Resolution passed: 38 yes, 1 no. Resolution will be distributed per the resolution to the chair of BOT etc.

9. Discussion Items

a. Baccalaureate Goals and Outcomes

Speaker explained this will return next senate as first reading item.

Nagel asked for rationale for "demonstrate" vs. "develop" in the statements of the learning goals.

Peterson suggested that "develop" would express that, for instance, one would be able to assess the ability to make ethical decisions, but not whether they necessarily would. As for "demonstrate," it suggests that one could tell whether someone internalized values or were doing something because someone was watching, or in order to graduate.

Eudey explained that 2-4 come directly from GE goals and outcomes, and it would help if 1 and 5 had parallel language that was equally assessable or aspirational. In addition she said it was great for the campus to develop back learning goals. Our campus is one of the last. They will be helpful and encourage us to see how our programs fit into these overall goals. One thing to like about many of them is that they have a distinct campus flavor: you can tell whether they come from Monterey Bay or Channel Islands. She would prefer learning outcomes that expressed Stanislaus State's identity and locality more explicitly, rather than generic goals. These look like they could come from anywhere.

10. Open Forum

None.

11. Adjournment

4 pm