

Academic Senate
September 8, 2015

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

Excused: Advanced Studies, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Wellman, McCulley, Filling and Sims.

Proxies: None.

Guests: The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, John Tillman, James Tuedio, Kate Weber, Nael Aly, David Lindsay, Marge Jaasma, Doug Dawes, Dennis Shimek and Betsy Eudey and Lauren Byerly.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Discussion Items:

- a. CIPSP-Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan Recommendations
- b. Faculty Status

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
September 22, 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 August 25, 2015 (distributed electronically)

Approved.

4. Introductions

The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, John Tillman, James Tuedio, Kate Weber, Nael Aly, David Lindsay, Marge Jaasma, Doug Dawes, Dennis Shimek and Betsy Eudey and Lauren Byerly.

5. Announcements

Tuedio announced a CAHSS-sponsored conference November 5-7 on Social Justice in the Central Valley. Prominent speakers already lined up including Constance Rice (cousin of Condoleezza Rice), Shasha Abransky, and others. The announcement will be out on postmaster soon.

Nagel announced a panel discussion and open forum on Academic Freedom at CSU Stanislaus September 24, 2:30-4:30pm in JSRFDC 118. Goal is to have faculty, staff, administration, and students addressing day to day why it matters to us. There will be light refreshments.

Larson announced the ASI has partnered with downtown of Turlock to coordinate Warriors Explore Downtown event September 16. Transit will be provided from Warrior Arena to downtown from 5 to 8pm. There will be discounts on food and events suitable for smaller kids, all close to the Central Park area. The event is for everyone, to make connections in the community.

Speaker Thompson sent ASnet a spreadsheet of information related to teaching work done by various faculty groups, pertaining to the issue of faculty status. He thanked John Tillman and Lisa Medina for helping with this information. He also shared the information on the responses for the Senate discussion.

Speaker Thompson reported that 4/AS/15/SEC Policy for Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students was approved on 7/8/15 by President Sheley, and the president does not want to review it again.

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

FAC: Speaker Thompson, on behalf of Sims, stated that FAC will be discussing the formation of an ad hoc committee to review the current policy of having IDEA evaluations administered in 50% of all courses. FAC and CoC will work together to put together committee.

The FAC is also reviewing the faculty constitution in preparation should we decide to recommend any changes based on discussion of status of faculty. FAC requested that SEC facilitate the discussion on the topic but this will return to Senate at a future date.

FBAC: Peterson noted that FBAC will discuss the following items:

- a. Sustainable Financial Model for the CSU (Shared by Steven Filling, Chair of the Statewide Senate)
- b. Equity Pay (Refer to Sarraille email + President's letter, CSUEB Academic Senate Resolution on Campus-Based Equity Pay Increases for 2014-15 resolution)
- c. FBAC Budget Priorities
- d. UBAC Recommendations (2015-2016)

GC: Ringstad noted that the first meeting is scheduled for Sept. 17th. She will have a report at the next Senate meeting.

SWAS: Strahm shared a number of things that are going on, including resolutions supporting of SB 707 will prohibit persons to bring concealed weapons onto school campuses, calling for temporarily removing the exit exam requirement for high school graduation, and calling for creation of a task force that will look at GE transfer courses. Another resolution calls for suspension of CSU background check policy and creation of a task force to study the policy and review appropriateness of background checks for faculty. Yet another resolution would add an Emeritus or Emerita member to the Board of Trustees. Finally, a resolution would urge CSU to offer compensation beyond the administration's current 2% increase to the faculty unit pool.

Speaker Thompsons asked if the background policy is in effect yet. Strahm replied it has started on some campuses but not on others. Administration decided to move more slowly to review this. The folks in FAC SWAS need to figure out some kind of cogent policy/recommendation.

UEPC: Stone reported UEPC has the following items on their agenda, under old business:

- A. Baccalaureate Learning Goals, these are nearing completion.
 - B. Review of the Two-Pass Registration System, please provide any feedback you might have on the two pass system.
 - C. Draft G.E. Procedures for Certifying New and Revised G.E. Courses \
 - D. Draft Report of the CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies
- Under New Business, UEPC will be discussing the Community College Baccalaureate Degrees

Speaker Thompson commented that the baccalaureate learning goals will probably come back to senate as an information item.

7. Discussion Items

a. CIPSP-Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan Recommendations

Provost pointed out that on pg. 4 CIPSP struck out the reference to the city of Turlock. The goal in 2007 SP reads as follows:

GOAL 2: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 1.6)

OBJECTIVE: Comprehensive advising will be available to all students regardless of major.

When this document was originally written they had the phrase but dropped the reference to it as goal 6 in this document which is as follows:

GOAL 6: Enhance our partnerships regionally. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 3.7)

OBJECTIVE: Increase the quality of relationships and partnerships between the service region and the University.

If we go to community members we don't want to bring additional attention that we're dropping this portion. That is a change to this document.

Speaker Thompson reminded the senate that the CIPSP has done a lot of work on this and not looking to make a lot of changes.

Provost said the committee has met with many stakeholder groups, is interested in the senate's feedback. This is an iterative process. One approach would be to provide whatever feedback they receive to subsequent CP groups. If there is an overwhelming consensus to change one of the goals, the committee will consider that. A lot of work has gone into the committee coming to agreement on these goals.

Gerson noted that many action items would require resources. The Biological Sciences department recommends including the AVP for Business and Finance as one of the responsible individuals for these items. She noted Objective 3 on pg. 5:

OBJECTIVE 3: Provide appropriate, sustainable and accessible campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

Does this include technology beyond classroom and OIT technology, such as the technology equipment used in Science Labs, for example? Does that include what is involved in CoS? The two-year timeline seems very ambitious given that we don't currently have any service or repair plans and that this is costly. Last questions on pg. 7 Goal 4:

GOAL 4: Recruit and retain a diverse and engaged faculty. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 2.1)

OBJECTIVE: Adopt teaching workload policies flexible enough to encourage faculty to engage in scholarly activities and participate in the life of the University.

ACTION: Within two years, increase by ten percent the number of tenured and probationary faculty who are teaching a 9/12 load, or lower.

Measured and reported by: Department Chairs, Academic Deans, Provost, VP Faculty Affairs and Human Resources

Gerson asked if this would include increasing tenure-track faculty, or decreasing their teaching loads, to support academic programs and research?

The provost replied that this would not pertain to tenure-track density.

Garcia commended the group for goal 6, which is an area we've struggled with. The struggle is not that we're not doing much, it's that we're not demonstrating what we're doing. Issue related events are great and we should do more, but we're doing a lot with service to the community, service learning, etc. and somehow the issue is partly that we should capture how much we are already doing.

GOAL 6: Enhance our partnerships regionally. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 3.7)

OBJECTIVE: Increase the quality of relationships and partnerships between the service region and the University.

ACTION 1: Within two years, increase the number of discipline-based advisory boards that include community representatives (broadly defined).

Measured and reported by: Department Chairs, Academic Deans, Provost, VP for University Advancement

Speaker Thompson directed attention to Goal 2 Action 2:

GOAL 2: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 1.6)

OBJECTIVE: Comprehensive advising will be available to all students regardless of major

ACTION 1: Within two years, each College will establish an advisory model.

Measured and reported by: Academic Deans, Provost, VP for Enrollment and Student Affairs, AVP for Student Services

ACTION 2: Within two years, the University will acquire information systems to make advising more effective.

Measured and reported by: AVP for Student Services, VP for Enrollment and Student Affairs, Provost

ACTION 3: Within two years, the recommendations of the University Advising Task Force will be thoroughly discussed and carefully considered by the University and serve to guide strategic action including budgeting.

Measured and reported by: AVP for Student Services, VP for Enrollment and Student Affairs, Academic Deans, Provost

ACTION 4: Within two years, each major (academic) will develop and distribute a (document) outlining requirements for completion of the degree.

Measured and reported by: Department Chairs, Academic Deans, Provost, AVP for Student Services, AVP for Academic Planning and Analysis

The Speaker asked: Do we already have in mind the kind of systems that we're going to get and the problems we'll respond to? Do we have advising software models that we have in mind, or is determining that a part of the process? Objective 4, do we not have road maps or outlines of degree requirements for all majors yet?

Jaasma stated that Academic Affairs is working on a website and have received roadmaps from a little over half of the departments.

Provost noted that the roadmaps idea came from student members of the committee. Some departments either didn't have roadmaps or they weren't accessible. The university has an advising information system, but it is not as robust as we would like it to be. We've looked at a number of products. Education Advisory Board has a system that is very robust for providing many dimensions of advising, including an early alert system built in: advisers are notified when a student is experiencing difficulty. There is also close to real time info about courses. This is quite expensive, \$180k a year. Starfish, owned by Hobson's, a long-term vendor to Stanislaus, is another product. Academic Affairs is scheduling webinar for the whole campus, advising task force in particular, to look at this. These systems provide a lot of information, at an adviser's fingertips, to make advising less onerous.

Speaker asked about action 2 on top of page 7:

ACTION 2: Within two years, the University will acquire information systems to make advising more effective.

Why this, rather than more robust career counseling services? What were the ideas of the committee on that?

Lindsey stated that whatever the career center would do would be valuable, but it is somewhat diminished now. There could be discipline-specific aspect for preparing students for a career, and certainly for grad school. There are differences that are discipline-based, and this is something the career center couldn't do. CoB came to the conclusion that this was of especial interest for them. Employers are grateful that our students are great, but had certain deficiencies, that Lindsey might call "polish." They thought there might need to be a kind of "finishing school" which they appended to the culminating experience of the undergraduate degree. Part of this is a well-crafted resume, part is interacting face-to-face with employers, how to do more networking. They found that valuable, and while every program would be different, it was the committee's thinking that there would be analogous types of activities for other majors.

Huang mentioned that Communication Studies offers a career interviewing course that serves a similar function. The course provides a chance to prepare resumes as well as a personal website. Huang hoped that there would be similar campus resources as well.

Provost recalled that this action item was initially proposed by student members. They felt that it is important to include graduate school and not focus on only on undergraduate students seeking jobs.

Garone offered the appreciation of the History department for the goals, but mentioned one particular concern. Each of the six goals has at least one action that says it would be measured and reported by the department chair. This seems like it increases demands on faculty for assessment, taking more attention away from teaching and research. Perhaps streamlining such reporting and data gathering would be a goal.

Strangfeld noted that advising systems that would provide real-time assessment of where students are in their classes and that provided early warning sounds great, but since she has 40-50 advisees, she envisions getting a great deal of email and would have to respond to it. Another concern is that faculty would have responsibility to report on these advising activities. What is the true impact that such systems would have on faculty labor, in the broader sense?

Espinoza noted the Starfish system interacts with Blackboard and presents mid-term grades, for instance. The system works with other systems we already have. This is important and useful information, and if this does present a burden to faculty, academic advising may be able to help with that load.

Provost said that the committee was concerned about strategic planning becoming onerous, and making sure it does not become so, by integrating it with what we already do. The only way to accomplish that is to use software that makes that process easier. In terms of the advising concern, the intent was not to create a burden. It would be feasible that, integrated with Blackboard, an early alert system taking the info directly from Blackboard would not require any additional work.

Strahm thanked Provost, and raised several interrelated questions. Would faculty who don't currently use Blackboard now be required to use it? Is there a privacy issue because someone besides the instructor could see student grades? What kind of impact would this have on faculty choices about grading and recording grades? This could become a means of administrative oversight into faculty teaching practices, evaluating of student work, etc.

Speaker Thompson pointed out Goal 1, Objective 1, on p. 5. One of the two listed measures of attaining "higher level skills" is the CLA. What is the percentage, and what cross section of students will we be gauging about attaining higher level skills?

GOAL 1: Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and professions. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 1.2)

OBJECTIVE 1: Attainment of higher level skills will improve for students in all academic programs.

ACTION 1: Within two years, increase the self-reported average number of hours per week spent on assigned reading, as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Measured and reported by: Academic Deans, Provost, AVP for Academic Planning and Analysis, Director of Institutional Research

ACTION 2: Within two years, increase the value added by our baccalaureate degree programs, as measured by the Collegiate Learning Assessment (which measures critical thinking, complex reasoning and writing).

Measured and reported by: Academic Deans, Provost, AVP for Academic Planning and Analysis, Director of Institutional Research

Silverman referred to goal 2 action 3, asking what would give high scores or low scores. In fact, all the actions seem to be measured by AVP of student affairs, or other administrators. What gets you high scores and what gets you low scores?

GOAL 2: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability. (*Framing the Future*, Strategic Action 1.6)

OBJECTIVE: Comprehensive advising will be available to all students regardless of major.

ACTION 3: Within two years, the recommendations of the University Advising Task Force will be thoroughly discussed and carefully considered by the University and serve to guide strategic action including budgeting.

Lindsay replied that whenever possible the actions were described in language such that it was clear that it was either met or not met. That's the level of measurement that we're talking about. The same is true of action 2 and 3. Action 3 is more ambiguous since the recommendations of the task force aren't forthcoming yet. If those are straightforward, then the same binary will apply.

Tuedio reiterated that there is a question among CAHSS faculty about the first goal. It was not clear what the relationship is between higher level skills and the reporting data of time spent reading and the CLA instrument (which is more about foundational skills). What is meant by higher level skills? How will these two actions help track student progress?

Lindsay replied regarding the CLA, that we test students both early and late in the program, to try to capture what students learn.

Tuedio stated that we definitely value the improvement critical thinking skills at a fundamental level, but academic programs teach higher level skills. The higher level skills are specified by the curriculum in each discipline. Hence CAHSS faculty are puzzled about what is being measured.

Strahm is concerned about issues of standardization and concerned with CLA. Each program will have its own focus, but the CLA assumes a level of standardization. It assumes each department would develop the skills that the CLA tests. Not all students do well on standardized exams. What is in place to assure that test anxiety does not adversely affect standardized test scores that reflect on departments or programs.

Young voiced concern about the CLA, and noted that what constitutes "higher order thinking" is still an issue, since "critical thinking" is only tested by the CLA on a basic level; loosening this action so that it is not linked only to the CLA would address this.

b. Faculty Status

Speaker Thompson thanked Tillman for providing data on headcount, FTEF, FTES, and percentages. He thanked the folks that responded and noted that they were thoughtful responses.

Nagel received several emails from non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. Some part-time (PT) and some full-time (FT). One lecturer felt that she should not come to the senate and should not speak before the senate as she is a PT faculty member. This lecturer said the university, including TT faculty, have to start seeing us as human beings. Personally he thinks of this relating to broader issue of recognition of the large number of faculty on campus that work without benefit of tenure status. That there are so many, who do so much of the teaching work, is a reason why the word adjunct is considered an insult by many. Another faculty member is PT asked if this was merely academic discussion or if there is a possibility of changing things. Would PT faculty be able to vote on any changes that the senate proposed? Per the current constitution, ironically, PT don't have the right to vote on the issue of if they have a right to vote.

Wood reported that in Criminal Justice, out of five or six lecturers, only one responded. That one said lecturers are too busy teaching and don't have time for this. One FT faculty tenured expressed concern that this is a slippery slope of losing tenure-track (TT) faculty.

Speaker noted that one response to the online survey on the effect on TT faculty.

Petrosky wondered what percentage of contingent faculty rely on teaching as their sole source of livelihood.

Sarraille doesn't have a lot to say except it is time for faculty to start grappling with the issues. This leads to all-encompassing things. The profession is changing things nationwide. Three out four are contingent faculty. Our profession is changing whether we're on the tenured side or the contingent side. Each institution should try to figure out how the structure should respond to it. There's panoply of ways one might want to respond. Many of us are trying to get greater percentage of tenured faculty and many are trying to create a path to TT for qualified NTT faculty. Many have grave second thoughts about sending students to graduate school because of time, debt, and uncertainty of career prospects when they finish. We have a contract that provides some answers. In our particular circumstance we only have a limited amount of things we can change and some are decided by CBA.

T. Savini called for the faculty to theorize and think about how the system should change in response to the changing demographics. Her motivation was to become more involved in her department; many NTT are very involved and go beyond their job descriptions.

Eastham said she started as a lecturer for 16 years before becoming tenure track. Part of her motivation for pursuing terminal degree was to become more involved in department. Many temporary go above and beyond what is required. They are a valuable part of our department.

Speaker Thompson noted that in English the contingent faculty have done a lot to develop in the composition program.

T. Savini stated that since she teaches at MJC and Stanislaus, she has a broad perspective. What Sarraille said about this being a broader issue is a call to action. She is aware of many in the department here and at MJC who rely solely on teaching as source of income. We should also be aware of the drain on the institution and on TT/FT faculty who have to work with a skeleton crew, for instance in curriculum and in committee work and governance. Many NTT do go above and beyond, not only because of an interest in some day becoming FT or TT, but because of responding to the needs of students. Not only locally but at a national level what is happening is the downsizing of the work place. There is top-down pressure to deliver, for instance to maintain or increase graduation rates, but will it continue to depend on volunteerism of faculty? What is really being done about the health of these institutions? It is more complex than it was 20-30 years ago.

Nagel addressed the issue of slippery slope—the concern that extending participation in governance to more NTT faculty will undermine TT faculty positions. It is not the effort of contingent faculty to be recognized as faculty that undermines tenure. What is eroding tenure is the administrations of universities choosing not to hire TT faculty, a trend for 40 years. As another NTT faculty wrote, we deserve to be recognized as faculty because we are faculty. This has nothing to do with anything else but us being human and being faculty.

Speaker Thompson pointed out that while some of this discussion is about voting and representation, it is not all just about technical changes to the constitution. A second point is to place this discussion in the context of what is going on nationally as well as locally. Local and national data should inform our choices.

Gerson reported that in her department no one voiced dissent to the idea that NTT faculty should have a voice. Concerns expressed were more about the details, the nuts and bolts.

Byerly asked about the way FTEF is calculated. Are tenure-track faculty calculated by a 4-4 load, and NTT faculty by a 5-5 load? If it is 4-4 for TT and 5-5 for NTT.

Tillman replied that the NTT are 5-5 and TT are 4-4, and the reason for that is because TT have expectations other than instruction. The rest of the load fulfills those other requirements.

Byerly responded that then the question is, if we're comparing just students taught, making a 5-5 NTT load the equivalent of 4-4 TT load distorts this. It would be good to see the comparison based not on status but on courses taught. She'd like to see these numbers being at the same scale, regardless of the teacher's status.

Speaker Thompson was thinking of this. If you have 59% of your FTEF teaching 49% of your FTES you have to factor in that only 80% of the 59% so if you adjust that it would look better for TT faculty. We spend 80% of our time teaching 49% of our students so if adjusted that upward to 100% it would look better.

Gerson stated that before getting tenure, TT faculty feel that they put in a lot of volunteer time compared to pay. For FT and PT lecturers, if they have hopes for tenure track in the future, they have to put in extra overtime if they try to maintain research or provide service, let alone the time to apply for positions. For them it is an added burden with no foreseeable end.

T. Savini thanked Gerson for the acknowledgment that NTT faculty have to spend extra time to be able to continue their own creative work or research. In the shifting way institutions are run, the bottom line seems to be that volunteerism is obligatory. This will continue to be an issue. There are many people in PT work who don't have PT lives or PT commitment, with little institutional support. You are always in a vulnerable position, have unreliable benefits, and work and live in a changeable environment. You might spend many hours to prepare and teach a course as a sabbatical replacement, but only teach it one time. The financial difficulties of PT/NTT faculty makes a difference in their ability to do their work.

Eudey added that new TT faculty said that it was important to them to be able to discuss tenure elaborations with their department colleagues, about shifting them to respond to their working conditions and the new faculty members' special needs and interests. Most conversations about criteria of evaluation for NTT faculty take place without those faculty in the room, let alone have a vote. In many departments IDEA forms are used as a primary means for evaluating, and we know these are not a great source of information. If teaching is the number one or only reason you are rehired, an evaluation that emphasizes needing to score well on IDEA is problematic. There are practical reasons why all instructional faculty should have a say, and probably also a vote, because all of these activities relate to instruction. It should not be possible to exclude lecturers. First semester TT faculty have more say in some instances than long-term NTT faculty. The conversation should have moved, and should long ago have moved, beyond whether we should include NTT faculty, to how we include. This would be better for the institution and the university.

Speaker noted that the comments received in response to the online survey concur with the general idea of inclusion, but point to a tangled question of how to distinguish rights: one-person, one-vote, or some limitations?

Dorsey addressed the differentiation of rights. For instance, in the info provided, Sonoma State has broad faculty definition and inclusion. Is there a way we can learn from that experience?

Speaker noted that Nagel has done some analysis of constitutions, and FAC is charged with reviewing our own and other campuses. That may entail getting help from HR.

Nagel said the Lecturers' Council of CFA has a subcommittee on shared governance and through these connections he can get information like that. Sonoma State has a long experience of a policy of inclusion and also compensation for non TT faculty that worked in shared governance. He can help to get comparisons. Nagel will also work with Sims in FAC.

Speaker Thompson shared the memo that went to all faculty on May 27th. He sent a memo to Sheley, Provost, Shimek, Espinoza, Pok and ASI outlining process in considering the status of faculty and inviting them to provide us some feedback. If we do amend the constitution, it will require a 2/3 vote of the faculty and the president's approval. On the process: next SEC will discuss this issue further, and how to promote discussion more broadly, then this will be referred back to FAC. There may be a hiatus from senate discussion on this issue, but because the discussion is moving into different venues. The Speaker will share the amended version of the Status of Faculty document with the senate reps.

8. Open Forum

Speaker Thompson related a communication he received concerning campus safety in relation to the shooting at Sacramento City College and there a fatal shooting back East. Have we addressed campus safety on our campus? The faculty member brought up concern about cellular connection and about door locks in classrooms. Speaker Thompson note he directs students' attention to the campus run, hide, and fight video.

Wood announced that he is the CFA representative on the campus safety committee. They meet this month and meet once a month. He will bring this to their attention.

Shimek suggested inviting Andy Roy Chief of Police to a meeting to discuss protocols already in place, for instance, "shelters in place."

Strahm thanked Shimek, but averred that there is still a safety issue without locks on doors, since campus police response is not faster than a trigger. A shelter in place is only as good as being able to be sheltered. The policy does not address the two issues the faculty member raised.

Garcia added that the campus Public Safety number can be posted in the classrooms.

Park noted that a survey was sent out regarding safety issues among library faculty and staff. Results of that have not yet been compiled.

Gerson pointed out that if there is a hardline telephone in a room on campus, calling 911 will reach campus police.

9. Adjournment

3:55pm