

**Academic Senate****October 18, 2016**

**Present:** Alvim, Azevedo, Bice, Brandt, Carroll, Crayton, Davis, Demers, Dye, Eastham, Espinoza, Eudey, Firc, Frost, Garcia, Garone, Geer, Gerson, Gonzalez, Guichard, Hight, Huang, Larson, Odeh, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Sarraille, Sims, Stessman, Strahm, Strangfeld, Strickland, Strong, M. Thomas, Thompson, Wagner, Webster, Wood and Zhang.

**Excused:** Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Filling, Floyd, Strickland and Wagner.

**Proxies:** Sims for Chan and Hudspeth for Wellman.

**Guests:** Mark Grobner, Doug Dawes, Oddmund Myhre, Martyn Gunn, Shawna Young, Martyn Gunn, John Tillman, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Michele Lahti, Ted Wendt, James Tuedio, Faimous Harrison, Marcy Chavasta, Ron Noble, Helene Caudill, Kilolo Brodie, Scott Davis, Michelle Johnson, Amanda Theis, Neisha Rhodes, Stan Trevena, Cory Cardoza, Francisco Marmolejo, Luis Segovia, Janice Curtin, and Christine Miller.

**Second Reading Item:**

10/AS/16/FAC – Consensual Relationships & Power Disparity Policy. Resolution passed.

**Discussion Items:**

Strategic Planning Council – membership & charge OTM course policy and Intellectual Property Rights policy

**Information Items:**

Call for Nominees for 2017-19 Faculty Trustee  
Active Learning Classrooms & Space Management update  
OIT classroom technology demonstration room – feedback needed  
GREAT Team & Graduation Initiative update  
Presidential Transition Team update  
Update: MPP Searches

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

November 1, 2016

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

**1. Call to order**

2:05pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Added item: OIT classroom technology demonstration room – feedback needed

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 27, 2016** (distributed electronically)

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Mark Grobner, Doug Dawes, Oddmund Myhre, Martyn Gunn, Shawna Young, Martyn Gunn, John Tillman, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Michele Lahti, Ted Wendt, James Tuedio, Faimous Harrison, Marcy Chavasta, Ron Noble, Helene Caudill, Kilolo Brodie, Scott Davis, Michelle Johnson, Amanda Theis, Neisha Rhodes, Stan Trevena, Cory Cardoza, Francisco Marmolejo, Luis Segovia, Janice Curtin, and Christine Miller.

**5. Announcements****a. Welcome Statewide Academic Senate Chair, Dr. Christine Miller**

Gerson offered some Faculty Center Announcements. You will notice the new artwork in the hallways of this building is by Transformations Artist Ellen Roehne from the Department of Art. The Artist Talk is Tuesday, October 25, 4-5pm. Also, Cathlin Davis, professor of Liberal Studies presents Louisa May Alcott's Practical Philosophy on Wed. November 9, from 4:30pm – 5:30pm, in FDC 118. C. Davis was the 2015-16 Outstanding Service in Faculty Governance Award recipient.

Gerson noted there will be an email announcement about the High Impact Practices (HIP's) Summit by the HIPs Task Force and FCETL. The summit is scheduled for November 18<sup>th</sup>, from 11am – 2pm, in FDC 118. Please RSVP if you want lunch.

Sarraille – CFA warmly invites all faculty unit employees to share morning coffee, tea, and cookies with colleague's tomorrow morning, Wednesday, October 19, in South Dining from 8:30 to 10:30. Bring a friend - maybe a faculty member who is new this year.

Hudspeth indicated she is a proxy for Wellman. She announced that the Department of Political Science & Public Administration is sponsoring an information forum on ballot propositions, in MSR 130 at 6:40pm tonight. Also, a week from today, at 6pm, MSR 130, there will be the Congressional Candidate forum with Michael Eggman.

Alvim distributed a brochure on a summer session 2017 course he is teaching in Brazil. This is an opportunity to learn about the Brazilian culture and civilization: History, Cinema, Soccer, and Beyond. Consider this when advising students.

Tuedio distributed information on the upcoming Social Justice in the Central Valley Conference scheduled for November 17-18. Keynote programs are from 6-9pm at the Mainstage Theatre. Summaries of speaker and topics were distributed. More information will be coming out about the daytime program. Presenters are especially local people from UC Merced and nonprofits. Kathryn McKenzie will be speaking. You may also visit the Social Justice Website with information. Please encourage students and faculty to attend, as there are many rather dynamic speakers.

Sims reminded everyone that many have indicated interest in attending the recital this evening, if you took advantage of some free tickets, don't forget to attend. Internationally known pianist Alan Goldstein will be performing at the Snider Music Hall at 7:30pm.

Sims Introduced Christine Miller, ASCSU Chair. Miller will report on ASCSU. She is thrilled to be here. She noted the FDC building is amazing. She is from Sacramento State and would love to have a facility like this. Communication Studies is her discipline. She is representing the entire CSU faculty in the context of shared governance via ASCSU. She's following in the steps of Steven Filling, and she has leaned on him a lot as he was the past chair of the statewide senate. Filling still sits on the ASCSU Executive Committee. One thing he helped her with was to determine priorities for the upcoming year. The Executive Committee wanted to promote academic quality, shared governance and faculty advocacy in government relations.

She's taken that personally and is on the road a lot trying to connect with the CSU Academic Senates. She's checking these off, as she's been to Fresno, Dominguez Hills, Pomona, Bakersfield and San Bernardino. Next week she's visiting three more campuses and trying to do the circuit. She's been visiting the book stores and purchasing campus pennants. We are her inaugural pennant which will be hung in her office in Long Beach.

She's learning what it means to represent the faculty of CSU. She recalls when she was a faculty member and received emails from her student's parents, now she's getting emails from parents about why their child has to do Early Start. She's learning what it means to represent the faculty of CSU. She's figuring out what to do to respond. She's also getting emails from faculty about offering more classes with some of the additional monies the Chancellor's Office appears to have. Learning to be representative of the system. She is learning what it means to represent the system.

Miller attended an AAUP conference on shared governance. She gave a presentation and attended one that was quite interesting about a study by the Association of Governing Boards that was reported in Inside Higher Education. The article does a good job of articulating the values of governing boards and presidents about shared governance, and is troubling to her. According to the survey shared governance is generally OK on campuses, but raises question if good enough. Miller would submit, that she doesn't think so. We have a Graduation Initiative to raise the rate for 4-6 year graduations, and it has been called in various areas audacious. If we meet goals, we'd be seen as a flagship for country for how successful we are. If we can be a flagship for graduation rates, we ought to be a flagship for shared governance as well. Okay is not good enough. We should be as audacious for shared governance as for graduation rates. They will never get to system targets without shared governance; it's not going to happen. We need robust shared governance to get the goals of GI met. We need to do what we can to advance shared governance – and that's an Executive Committee priority.

The way shared governance manifests itself in ASCSU is through resolutions. They are having the next plenary meeting in November. At the last meeting they passed three resolutions including one in support of Prop 55. ASCSU, the CSU Board of Trustees, CFA and others are recommending yes on Prop 55. They received the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force report, and that means that it can then be considered and acted upon. In addition, we passed a resolution reminding the Chancellor what the ASCSU said about quantitative reasoning in the past, including the need for a center for math instruction that is similar to the WRE model, and a recommendation is to pursue a fourth year of quantitative reasoning in high school for admission to the CSU. ASCSU had a first reading embracing the other two recommendations in the report. They also had resolution that called for a working group looking at General Education. There was a coded memorandum from the Chancellor's Office that asked each campus to lay out the landscape of GE programs on campus to survey a landscape of programs in the system. This working group would review this survey to determine what it says in terms of GE in the system. She doesn't want to get ahead but we are not putting our heads in sand in terms of embracing the GE curriculum in the system. The curriculum is owned by the faculty. There are lots of conversations about GE internal and external to the system including by the Governor and legislature, and we ignore that scrutiny at our own peril.

Miller indicated that ASCSU talked about other issues that weren't tied to resolutions including academic freedom and intellectual property. They are pulling faculty together from ASCSU and CFA to talk about those two issues and try to engage the Chancellor's Office on their draft policies about those issues to be sure we're satisfied with those policies.

Lastly, Miller has tried to be like Johnny Appleseed laying seeds of issues in our brain. The Graduation Initiative focuses on 4 and 6 year rates, but especially 4 year graduation rates. There have been a lot of times when we talked about those rates and not just people in the system but also the legislatures and the Governor. We have talked about graduating "on time," in that context, and when talking about on time it means in four years. She's worried about the potential impact. In her discipline of Communication Studies, they look at the rhetoric and discourse, and she's concerned with the rhetoric of failure that is offered by the discourse of "on time." If you do not meet the 4 or 6 year rate, you have somehow failed. If the gold standard is higher rates and you're not able to get there because of a complicated life, that's establishing a perception that is not conducive to student success. Miller is trying to suggest that we challenge that discourse. Instead of on-time, embrace graduating in "their time," finding what works for them to achieve their objective. We do not want to have two tiers of students – those succeeding on time and those who aren't because of what's going on in their lives. This is just something to mull over. It has been a pleasure to be here. Ovation.

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

C. Davis noted that FAC sent an email to all faculty on Monday with a short survey. She wants to assure all that as they pursue the issue of PT faculty enfranchisement, FAC is pursuing a lot of different angles to determine the best way to give PT the vote. That's what this survey is for and they are looking at other issues as well. C. Davis encourages all to answer the survey. There is a yes/no question and an option for adding ideas. Please encourage faculty in your department to answer the survey as well. The more responses we receive, the more we know what the campus thinks. If other questions come up that you want FAC to pursue, let them know as they are keeping a list of questions raised in their discussions. They are keeping the questions on screen in FAC meetings so they are always in front of them. Send questions to C. Davis or I. Pierce. Please answer the survey and get others to answer as well so FAC can get an idea of what the campus thinks on this one piece of this issue.

Brandt mentioned that FBAC is continuing discussion of the budget priorities for this year.

Garone noted that the GC meets this Thursday and he will report at the next Senate meeting.

Strahm indicated that as a member of ASCSU she went to a statewide student mental health services advisory committee meeting at the start of this month. She brought to them our concerns about having stable, psychological counseling services on our campus. They also discussed

trends at different campuses. They brought up the idea of merging issues of sexual assault at campuses with issues that many veterans who are now students face because there is a large problem of sexual assault in the military. People leave the military without prior counseling or are unable to acknowledge it and then come to campuses and something triggers this or they begin feeling comfortable and safe so are ready to seek help. They are going to see if they can put together a statewide committee between the VA and SA to come up with holistic things to do at all campuses to make sure veteran students receive counseling that would be useful for them.

Thomas noted that UEPC has continued discussions with the GE Advisory Council about implementing GE goals on campus. They discussed EO 1071 information and sent information to the Chancellor's Office. They also discussed the campus space management committee plans. Let Thomas know if you need other information.

## **7. Information Items**

### a. Call for Nominees for 2017-19 Faculty Trustee

Sims noted that this is something that only comes up every few years and is a significant shared governance role the faculty can participate in. Miller will discuss the role, and why we should take our nominee seriously.

Miller says the term is 2 years and renewable. The current trustee will not run for re-election. The current representative is a tenured faculty member and sits on the Executive Committee of ASCSU. The rep attends all executive and plenary meetings, attends all BOT meetings, does 1-2 campus visits a month, and generally does the kinds of things a trustee does for a large institution like the CSU. The only committee that the faculty trustee is not allowed to sit on is collective bargaining. They have to leave the room when the bargaining committee meets, but are actively involved in BOT committees, and can chair or vice chair committees. They get full release from teaching as this is a full time job and very rewarding work. The system has a faculty trustee as well as a student trustee. They are the voice of those constituents from folks who come from different walks of life. Board members often are business leaders and lawyers and don't understand classrooms. The faculty and student trustee are well respected among the board. The board relies on the faculty and student trustees to articulate a voice and perspective they might not have otherwise.

Sims said the process we will use to nominate candidates is what is described in the handout. Anyone can submit a nomination by petition with signatures of 10% of the full time faculty members. There is not a fixed due date yet, but expect a submission to Senate due December 6, 2016 before the end of this semester. We will target a submission to SEC and will forward any qualified nominees who have completed materials. Keep an eye on this. If you know someone who would be good in this position, please talk to them. The call will be sent out to the general faculty soon.

Strahm wants to nominate a person, so how does she get 10% of faculty signatures? Will an email suffice or do you need signatures on a petition? We will figure out the answer by the next meeting. Sims wanted folks to know this is in process.

### b. Active Learning Classrooms & Space Management update

Sims said that a set of documents was disseminated at college meetings, and lots of questions were sent to Sims about this. The documents identified classrooms as possible candidates for conversion, and there were questions about process and concern about teaching spaces, so he's asked Dawes to come by and discuss this issue and the process.

Dawes noted that he was asked by President Junn to look at the possibility of a few ALCs on campus. They first looked at the infrastructure to allow for this technology and moved from there. After talking to Sims, they realized that they need to get a collaborative effort to move forward to work with the faculty side via UEPC and the Technology and Learning Subcommittee. This item will be forwarded to those committees. He is hoping to have a subcommittee formed by the end of year to have a dialogue. Nothing has been decided, and they are doing some preliminary work to see if there is a possibility to create some ALCs.

Sims said decisions need to be made as to whether there will be conversions. This requires robust conversations about the use of our shared teaching spaces. Doug Dawes and Stan Trevena will discuss this. They are going to interface with existing senate committee structure so consultation is robust as it should be, and it won't alter teaching spaces without faculty knowing.

Strong said that these documents were a discussion at the Provost's Advisory Council with the Deans and Dawes. Deans were asked to discuss this with their department chairs to consider possibilities of ALC's.

Garone wanted to reiterate a common faculty response, that even if the suggested classrooms are preliminary, a common response was that when looking at suggestions they were disproportionately the largest classrooms on campus, the ones we could least afford to convert. He wants Dawes and the committees to keep that in mind. Medium and smaller classrooms would be more likely to be able to be converted than the bigger ones we definitely rely on.

Dawes thanked Garone. This is the kind of feedback they need. Sims said if you have questions, let Dawes know. They are eager to get input and make sure we make the best decisions for our students.

### c. OIT classroom technology demonstration room – feedback needed

Trevena said at the end of the year they distributed a survey on classroom technology to find out what folks want in the future. The survey got a lot of responses/data. Over the summer, Corey Cardoza's team received \$1.2 million to be set aside to address issues raised in the survey which will include improving current technology in the classroom, and improving wireless capabilities. They have put together a demonstration room where people can touch, feel and play with the technology and then fill out another survey to share thoughts on options.

Luis and Francisco are working with Cardoza on the project, and have lots of experience in this area. They shared a video to introduce the demonstration classroom, and the technologies they're hoping to institutionalize. They want feedback, and will open up the demo room to allow faculty to experiment with the technology.

Cardoza noted this is a new way to connect and collaborate wirelessly in the classroom, although cords are still offered. He identified some of the features available when connected wirelessly. It is BYOD compliant with any device, can stream content in HD at 60 frames per second, and can mirror completely any iOS and android device. There is advanced security, and bank encryption 1024 bit encryption. There are powerful tools with white boarding, and there can be annotation on a spreadsheet collaboratively. They are also able to distribute access to students. Integration for video conferencing is built into the unit that will be in every classroom. You can download the app for any device, although there are some limitations for Linux users who can still connect via the fixed cord. Chrome browser with present feature.

We are presented with wallpaper when we turn on the experience. You join the campus Eduroam, enter the room name, and enter encryption code that changes every 5 minutes. Type in room name to download the app. Once downloaded, you can display in any room the device is in. Log in, you'll see the device on main screen, and are able to move around the room and present wirelessly. The features button gets you to third party apps. You can see the participants who want to join in, and can create active learning scenarios. Wireless streaming, white boarding, collaboration, etc. You can also file share at the end of the class.

Under the Participants option, the instructor takes over classroom, and can give permission to students to present and can chat with them or file share as desired. Multiple people can connect. Can compare things with one another, side by side up to four screens.

L162 is the demonstration room. There will be public announcements about it. Bring devices to see how they might work with the experience. Come down or make an appointment, and they can help faculty with anything.

Thomas noted a faculty member must enter a code for the room, so what happens when class is over and this faculty member leaves and is still locked into the room and new person cannot log in. Cardoza said the box will log you out once a time of no activity has passed. There is a disconnect on the app, so if you click "X" you're off. You can also step in and out.

Thomas asked how new the computer has to be to work with the system. Cardoza said the application will launch on any format. Windows XP is okay. If you can't do wirelessly, they can still be tethered. Trevena said model has a run time windows on it, so if the material you need to use is on a thumb drive you can plug into the box and use internal system without bringing your own device. There is an operating system in box so if there is a problem with a device, you can plug a USB into a machine.

Sarraille saw that there was a whiteboard application in that. Does that allow having a separate screen to be used as a white board to write things on and look at a PowerPoint at the same time? Luis said the experience will demonstrate that. You can whiteboard separately or actively in the classroom, but it's not a smart board. You can write on your screen as if it was a whiteboard, the mouse becomes a pen, and can annotate on screen. If not a touch/writing program, it won't write except with the mouse. There will be a list of items that come out on that feature when you choose white boarding, select the format – text, font, height and width for annotation.

Sarraille appreciates tech advancement but the single thing to help the most was ability to project stuff on the screen and use a blackboard at the same time. Too many classrooms are set up that only allow one at a time. They have to put the screen down in front of the blackboard to use it. Separate locations for screen and blackboard is the single most important tech innovation he would desire.

Wood understands that most of this is wireless, and wondered if the network be able to handle this number of simultaneous users as wireless is already slow in Bizzini. Will the network handle this? Trevena said a wireless survey will be conducted in the next 6 months. One person now often has several devices and this impacts the system. They will start with Stockton, then the Library and instructional buildings. They will obtain a heat map to see where there is the most demand and where to supplement the system more. They will have to grow the wireless network.

Larson asked if a student with a laptop and iPad can access this. Yes. Does this server prefer PPT or keynote? Yes, but with explanation. If the presentation is on a thumb drive using keynote and you have a windows machine, windows will translate the presentation before displaying it. If you bring a device connected to the wireless it will work with any system you have on your device without translation.

Strahm asked if you need an appointment for testing things in the demonstration room, and is it just for faculty or should we bring our classes. Cardoza indicated it's just for faculty right now. They can schedule appointments at any time of day; more information will be shared shortly.

Eudey asked about the time line to try to make these real in the classrooms. Next steps will dictate that timeline per Cardoza. They will try to prioritize which classrooms will be targeted first. This academic year they are looking at completing some of this. Some may be available in winter and spring. Expects that it will take a year and half to complete, and \$1.2 million won't cover all costs. They will start with priority classrooms and will need another infusion of money to complete it.

Garone asked how long the session appoints would be to go through the demonstration. Cardoza indicated that to go through all, expect 20-25 minutes to get the full sense. A quick demo could be done in 15 minutes.

Sims asked all to let their faculty members know about this. Every we time talk about technology, just like with active learning, our teaching spaces are integral to our work and they

need volume and richness of feedback for better decisions to be made about the classroom. Let colleagues know to take advantage of this so that we're mostly happy after implementation.

d. GREAT Team & Graduation Initiative update

Shawna Young reported that the Graduation Rate Excellence and Assessment Team (GREAT) Steering Committee has met twice (Oct. 4 & 11), and will be meeting every 1-2 weeks in the near term. The agenda for the first two meetings included the following:

- We ratified the charge of the committee (President Junn was in attendance at both those meetings when the charge was discussed and ratified)
- We set this year's milestones for the Steering Committee
- We brainstormed strategies for deploying the entire GREAT Team, including what are now its 5 workgroups (who will be hearing from us soon – and actually, may already have been contacted by Ms. Neisha Rhodes who has been confirming participation on GREAT and the various workgroups – Ms. Rhodes is the Director for Presidential Initiatives, and is helping to facilitate the work of GREAT). The 5 workgroups include:
  1. Improving 4-Year and 6-Year Graduation Rates
  2. Eliminating Graduation Rate Gaps for Underrepresented Minority and Pell-eligible Students
  3. Improving Transfer 2-Year and 4-Year Graduation Rates
  4. Reviewing Special Programs in Relation to Student Success
  5. Reviewing and Recommending Budget Allocations and Tactical Resources for GRI 2025
- We identified strategies for the GREAT Team communication plan, which will include several dimensions, some of which include:
  1. Website on the President's webpage – where all the committee's documents will reside – membership, charge, and key documents serving as evidence of its work
  2. Regular campus and external community updates
  3. Methods for soliciting input/feedback

One key dimension of the charge of GREAT Team, which influences the campus immediately, is its responsibility to provide and lead consultation and refinement of the GRI 2025 Student Success Short-term Plan that was submitted to the CO in September. As many of you know, we are currently operationalizing the first phase of the Short Term plan, which entails that set of interventions (intrusive advising, responsive course scheduling, and tuition/fee waivers for those students who meet financial aid eligibility requirements) interventions designed to help facilitate timely graduation for students who are on the cusp of graduating this spring/summer 2017. Knows there is some dissonance around that statement. Struggle within ourselves how to resolve that dissonance.

However, that aspect of the plan is not anticipated to require the entire \$1 million one-time 1-year budget, and the GREAT Steering Committee is developing a process that will enable the campus to apply for unallocated funds from this year's one-time \$1 million budget (that we have not yet received) for student success initiatives that are already existing on campus, existed at

one time and are ready to be reactivated, or are ready to be piloted. The unallocated amount has not yet been identified, as it is taking some time to project what some of those interventions in the short-term plan are going to cost (relates in part to getting a clearer sense of how many additional wi/sp/su sections we'll need to add to the schedule to be responsive to that student population, and how many tuition/fee waivers are exercised). Lots of unknowns at present to know costs in the short term plan. At next week's GREAT Steering Committee meeting, the committee will be reviewing an updated projection of costs of the first phase of the short-term plan, and will make decisions for proceeding forward with the new aspect of the plan which will call for proposals from the campus. More information will be shared with the campus community soon!

e. Presidential Transition Team update

Sims noted the process has begun. Gunn is co-chair with Brodie.

Gunn reported, as you know from her convocation address, President Ellen Junn has formed the Presidential Transition Team to assist her as she acclimates to her new position on this campus and becomes familiar with the context and relationships key to the University's ongoing success. Kilolo Brodie and I are co-chairs.

The Team has several faculty members including Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Al Petrosky, Mark Thompson, and Steve Filling, as well as staff, students, alumni and community members. Good representative group.

A key feature of the charge is to help the President develop an understanding of the needs, shared goals, history and culture of our University community.

In order to gather this information, the Team will be hosting a series of open forums with all constituencies including students, staff, faculty, alumni, the Stockton community and other community folks.

There will be three forums each for faculty, students and staff.

The first staff forum is tomorrow, the first student forum is next Tuesday, and the first faculty forum is Friday October 28 in MSR 130. Dates, times and locations for each forum are published on the President's web site as follows:

For more information, visit [www.csustan.edu/presidential-transition](http://www.csustan.edu/presidential-transition).

**Faculty**

Friday, October 28 <sup>th</sup>	12:00pm-1:30pm	MSR 130
Wednesday, November 9 <sup>th</sup>	12:00pm-1:30pm	TBD
Thursday, November 17 <sup>th</sup>	9:00am-10:30am	FDC 118

At each forum, the Team will record and then transcribe the proceedings at each forum to assist in the short-term and long-term prioritization of issues, and the needs facing our campus and the Stockton Center.

At each forum we want you to share your thoughts about Stan State, its strengths, weaknesses and challenges. What do we do well? What are areas for improvement? What challenges do we face?

The Team will then collate and categorize the information to provide perspective for the President.

The President intends to use what she learns in the forums to guide her as she settles into her new role as President and inform her as she makes decisions.

The forums also will provide her with a framework of ideas for incorporation into emerging initiatives and goals as well as informing our new Strategic Plan.

An electronic survey will be sent to all constituencies to capture the perspectives of those who could not attend one of the forums.

Also in the survey we will solicit ideas for improving the Stan State tagline (*Engaging, Empowering, Transforming*), so please begin to think about whether-or-not we should change the tagline and if so to what.

A preliminary report is due to the President on February 1, 2017.  
A full report is anticipated by the end of March 2017.

Eudey asked if the transcriptions in the meetings will be anonymous. Gunn indicated that they will be anonymous, no names will be mentioned and they will only be noting the issues raised.

Sims noted that the issues raised will be merged into several processes. It is really important, so be sure to attend the forums available to us, and to encourage students and staff to also attend their forums. We want as much rich feedback to them as we can get.

#### f. Update: MPP Searches

Sims noted we received the document updating us on MPP searches before the meeting. It came from Neisha Rhodes who prepared it. Her new role is Director of Presidential Initiatives, and she is the lead implementation person. She is the person Pierce and Sims go to when they need updates. The summaries of information can be passed along. The Dean of COB search was pushed to the spring to start July 1<sup>st</sup> to get a better pool and allow the incoming provost to participate in hiring process. The AVPFA search has started moving, and the search committee is meeting later this week. The closing date was yesterday. They will establish a timeline then. Three other searches have closing dates coming up on the 25<sup>th</sup>, including Provost, VPSPERI, and AVP Financial and Support services. The committees are assembled.

Myhre noted a search that was omitted from the list, Dean for COS which is ongoing. It was postponed last spring and they have 42 candidates so it's winding down. They hope to complete this fall. The candidates will be on campus in November.

#### **8. Second Reading Item**

##### **a. 10/AS/16/FAC – Consensual Relationships & Power Disparity Policy**

C Davis identified the changes that were made and read the following two statements from FAC.

*A concern arose regarding a possible record being kept in a faculty member's Personnel Action File, should there be an investigation. It is the view of the FAC that it is not appropriate for this policy to reference the PAF. Issues regarding the contents of the PAF are addressed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 11. If you do not have a copy of the CBA, CFA would be happy to provide you with one.*

*To those who have expressed objections to this policy in its current form: we have heard and discussed your concerns. We must comply with the Executive Order. This policy is the result of a year of consultation. If that consultation had been just a bit more efficient, the policy would have been before the Senate for a vote last year, and would already be in place. We believe that this policy is a significant improvement over the policy in place. We wish to remind the Senate that every policy put in place is a living document, and can be revisited if it becomes necessary. It is the view of the committee that this policy should be adopted by this campus.*

Carroll read the following statement:

I appreciate the work that FAC has put into this matter, especially since a campus summary of EO 1096 is not required but was, rather, deemed a good idea. But after hearing Sen Frost mention differences btw the summary and the actual text of EO 0196 at our last meeting, I went back and took a close look comparative look at EO1096 and the local summary. After doing so, I've concluded that revisions are needed to both the resolution and the local summary. I understand that the summary cannot be revised at this meeting, meaning that a vote in favor of this resolution is a vote in favor of the summary as it currently stands.

My motive in offering my critiques is not simple obstructionism but to make the local summary more serviceable. I'm not sniggling over mere imperfections; the current summary is, in important particulars, misleading and therefore positively disserviceable. Because the concerns that EO 1096 addresses are serious and sensitive matters, it is imperative that our local summary, if we are to have one, be serviceable and accurate.

- 1) Regarding the RESOLUTION: What's attached to the resolution is not, technically speaking, our campus policy. It is, and is only intended as (as the preamble or "Purpose" acknowledges), a

*summary* of EO 1096, which, as the system policy, is also the policy for our campus. Therefore the fourth word of the 3<sup>rd</sup> resolved clause is misleading, as is the preamble of the local summary.

- 2) Regarding the RESOLUTION: The rationale for the resolution alludes not only to prohibited but also to “undesirable” behaviors. This adjective does not appear in EO 1096 and should be removed from our local summary; our concern, both as a campus and a system, is prohibited behaviors, not “undesirable” ones.
- 3) Regarding the SUMMARY: The preamble or “Purpose” claims to offer a “clear” summary, but the summary includes not only some problematic lacks of clarity but also some departures from the actual system policy, to wit:
  - a) The proposed campus “policy” refers to “apparent” conflicts of interest, whereas EO 1096 neither makes specific mention of conflict of interest nor attempts to warn against “apparent” problematic behaviors and positions. This latter term in particular introduces a problematic element of subjectivity and ought to be removed if our local summary is to be a faithful and serviceable reflection of the system policy.
  - b) The proposed campus “policy” alludes to the problem of favoritism; EO 1096 does not. This term, too, ought to be removed if our local summary is to be a faithful and serviceable reflection of the system policy

I think that a simple reference to EO 1096 in the Faculty Handbook would be more serviceable than the problematic summary that FAC proposes to put there. So in the interest of showing support for EO 1096 itself, I intend to vote against this resolution; those who agree that a simple reference to EO 1096, or a more serviceable summary is required, should consider voting likewise. I'll leave it to my fellow senators to decide for themselves whether these problems are sufficiently serious to warrant a similar no vote.

Fourth word of third resolved is misleading as is the preamble. Also, rationale mentions prohibited and “undesirable” removed from local summary. Problematic subjective issue. Departures from system policy.

Thompson asked if there was there discussion as to whether we need a local iteration of this policy. Did FAC discuss this? Also, what is FAC's rationale for the change in the language in the fourth paragraph of the policy?

C. Davis said that FAC discussed whether the policy was needed. Several members felt strongly that a statement of this sort saying we think it's important on this campus was something we should do. FAC had a lengthy discussion of that. The rewording that happened this year on that paragraph was because a member of FAC felt the original was not clear. After 15 minutes of discussion, they rewrote it and it became the new sentence we see. It was an attempt to make the crossed off sentence read more clearly regarding its intent.

Bice stated that we've gone over and over this resolution and he called the question. Strahm seconded. We went straight to vote, which requires 2/3 vote of those present.

33 yes, 8 no on the vote to call the question. Motion passes.

Vote on the resolution. A Yes vote supports the resolution and it will replace the Power Disparity policy in faculty handbook. A No vote means you are not supporting the resolution. Results of the vote, 28 yes, 12 no, 1 abstention. Resolution passes.

C. Davis reiterated that this is a living document. If issues arise, bring them to FAC and we will keep track of concerns that might require changes to it.

Sarraille asked if the summary Carroll referred to is online. Sims said that Carroll was referring to the policy statement attached to the resolution. You already have it, and the summary is pointing toward EO 1096.

## **9. Discussion Items**

- a. Strategic Planning Council – membership & charge

Sims cited the following resolution passed last year. This is something that we hope will satisfy that resolution and he requests feedback.

### 11/AS/16/SEC Shared Governance & the Strategic Plan

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus urge the President to recognize the recommendatory authority of the Faculty in the creation of the texts that define our institution and focus our efforts, including the Strategic Plan of the University; and be it, further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate urge the President to refrain from establishing any structure, charge, process, or timeline that does not recognize the recommendatory authority of faculty in the revision or creation of a Strategic Plan.

Before you is a document that Speaker Sims and President Junn have come up with as a charge and committee structure that will satisfy that resolution and it is offered for review and feedback. Notice there is strong faculty representation on the composition of the committee. The Speaker is co-chair along with Diana Demetrulias who will be involved thru the fall and then hand it over to the new Provost in the spring. Four additional faculty, one from each college and a Library rep. will be on this council. Faculty comprise about half the folks on the council so there is a robust faculty representation. They've added under timeline to seek formal recommendations from the Academic Senate about the Academic Affairs portion of the strategic plan. This is a bit different from spring with Sheley, but it recognizes the primacy of faculty, and the Senate as a representative body. Sims would like feedback.

## **University Strategic Planning Council (USPC)**

### **Composition**

- Diana Demetrulias, Vice Provost and Professor Emerita: Co-Chair (Fall 2016, New Provost will assume the role in 2017)
- Stuart Sims, Speaker of Academic Senate: Co-Chair
- Ellen Junn, President (Ex-Officio, non-voting)
- Suzanne Espinoza, Vice President for Enrollment and Student Affairs
- Julie Johnson, AVP for Human Resources, Title IX, and Campus Compliance
- Doug Dawes, Vice President for Business and Finance
- Michele Lahti, Vice President for University Advancement
- Faimous Harrison, Dean of the Stockton Center
- Julia Reynoso, University Budget Advisory Committee (**UBAC**)
- Library representative
- Nicole Larson, ASI President
- Four Faculty Members to be chosen by Academic Senate Committee on Committees (One from each college, to include one graduate director (two-year, staggered terms, with two representatives serving initial 3-year terms)
- Two Staff Members to be chosen by consultative process (two-year, staggered terms, with one representative serving initial 3-year term)
- Eileen Hamilton, Community member/Alumna
- Maggie White, Student Trustee/Graduate Student (Ex-Officio, non-voting)

### **Abbreviated timeline**

Fall 2016	Council Established
Fall 2016	Gather campus input
Fall 2016	Review and revise (if necessary), university mission, vision, values, and diversity statements
November 28, 2016 (tentative)	Fall Campus Forum
Spring 2017	Drafting the plan shall commence
April 13, 2017	Completed first draft is due and shall be posted online
April 17, 2017 (tentative)	Spring Campus Forum
April 13 - May 5, 2017	Additional campus input gathered
No later than May 17, 2017	Council will submit final draft to President
2017	Adoption of Final Plan

Thompson thinks it is positive that President Junn is on the committee as an ex officio member. This is a better role for a president than what was desired by the prior president. The formal recommendation language does meet the spirit and sense of the resolution from last year, and just to be clear what we mean with the formal recommendation is that the Senate will send a resolution on the Academic Affairs part of the strategic plan and the president will accept or

reject it. The President won't be writing sections of the Academic Affairs portion of the strategic plan. These are two main things we were trying to work towards last year. This is good work.

Sims said what Thompson just said is what he understands as well. We are trying to line it up so the Senate will have about 4 weeks in total to review the final draft, a week prior to the second-to-last meeting for a first reading, and then it gives three additional weeks for review before moving to a second reading. He hopes that is sufficient time after lots of collaboration that we will come to a draft that we like as we get to the last phase, allowing enough time for thorough deliberation.

Strahm said SEC pushed hard on this, and hopes folks in here know that the folks up here (SEC) worked hard at this and the conversations we had with president Junn were collegial and 180 degrees different than last year. She is not holding her breath that nothing can go terribly wrong, but what we came up with here was in the spirit of what our concerns were last year and concerns were met by administrative leadership in an equally respectful way. Sims agrees. He tried not to editorialize as speaker, but he can say that this process feels genuinely collaborative to him. As someone in a collaborative field, it is 180 degrees different from where we were last year. We went from concern to being excited about what we'll produce collaboratively. With the transition team feeding into this and information sharing we're trying to have, we'll produce a collaborate document. This is exciting, and we will keep this on as an information item so we can be radically transparent in processes. Let Sims know if you have questions.

b. OTM course policy and Intellectual Property Rights policy

Sims is bringing this to AS to see if this is something to be concerned with and to follow up on. The OTM and IP policies are in the packet. As far as the system goes, our campus has pretty good policies on intellectual property rights, but with the grad initiative we have a push to create more online courses and sections, or hybrid and this might include monies for course conversion that may tie to IP rights. With regard to this OTM policy on our campus, he has talked to Miller about it and looked at other campuses, and he sees creating or converting to online is a substantial curricular change. Our current policy does not indicate that that change should follow normal curricular procedures. Is that a concern? There are cases where changes/conversions with no consultation with colleagues just happened. Do we need to reconsider details in policy?

Sarraille thanks Sims for bringing this up. He considered how little he cared about this until we discussed the transition to online formats and he took notice. If it is true that there is no provision in the policy, that's extremely important.

Sims read from the policy, section 3.2 "OTM courses may be offered or modified only with the approval of the department following consultation with other relevant college and university bodies. Proposals for OTM course offerings shall follow standard department and University policies and procedures." This seems a loose description of consultation considering how rigorous the course change process is otherwise.

Garone noted that even when doing a course modification, not a new course proposal, a simple modification goes to the dept. and college, but there being no requirement for drastic overhaul for fully or partially online course seems more disconcerting.

Strong said when being discussed there was some concern that it not be overly onerous to convert a course to an online delivery, and that course was separate from the delivery mechanism, so it might explain why the language is not as specific as the existing process. The existing process applies to a course whether it is online or not. That's his recollection, but maybe it's not what body wants now. At the last Academic Council meeting online teaching came up in regard to graduation rates, and the importance of academic integrity was addressed, as there is in fact concern that any online course that is created be held to the same standards of academic integrity for face to face courses. VC Blanchard was adamant about that. There is no push from the CO or our administration to create online course that are less rigorous as part of an objective to improve graduation rates.

Thompson noted with course modification, is that a course modification in the sense we generally understand it? Group work was once a new pedagogy, do we have to have a special process to approve courses with group work? In a budget crunch, when we change enrollment or workload to change numbers is that a change that requires special review? Just because of new technology with students where I can't see them, do we need to approve if it is a pedagogy rather than a modification of a course? He is not sure how this fits with intellectual property.

Sims said these don't intersect, because they are parallel issues. This was discussed in ASCSU, with statewide chairs sharing policies. With financial incentives to create more online courses, there were questions about IP rights to online course if given a stipend. If taking GI money to create the course, this is work for hire, so the campus/CSU may retain intellectual property rights. He's not sure if local policy would stand up. Sims wants to get in front of this. These are good questions we should answer and decide what to do. So IP is connected but parallel.

Petratos suggested one year certification for faculty to teach online courses, using the online learning consortium. It's a rigorous process. Courses according to Thompson should not be different online or face to face. Delivery method differs, but learning outcomes should be identical.

Eudey noted that there are many interesting issues around this, and it may be worth reconsidering the OTM policy. She does lots of online teaching and her program may soon offer a mostly/fully online option for majors. She agrees with Thompson's comments that every time we change a pedagogical method to meet the size room we're in that we should have it go thru a curricular review. Depts. should be having conversations about every course we teach, what time blocks to use, whether we want to teach in the evenings or use different delivery methods. Unfortunately, schedules are made with individual faculty emailing their chairs and conversations are not happening. We are sometimes dropping the ball on this. We should, by this policy, be having dept. conversations and we need to decide if we need to do a better job. In regard to intellectual property, when she was on ASCSU there was an interim Vice Chancellor that thought any

special stipend under \$10K wasn't substantiative enough for us to lose our IP rights. This was an interim person giving his opinion and we may want to push the CO to find out if there is a cap and if we're under it.

Sarraille noted one problem with this is the idealistic way of looking at it. It is like putting a round peg in square hole. Certain things are not offered well online. The reality is a course might have a dramatic change due to the technology and support that goes with it. He is not sure what the answer is and where to draw the line, here's the thing we have to look at. He has seen dramatic changes that one person can create in a department.

Strahm wants to bring things back to Eudey's point. Why is there even a monetary amount involved if it is individual property or not? We're doing the work, and frankly we're the experts and our time and energy and creativity and yes in some instances the university may be providing for us extra incentive, but how should you lose your right to the things you create just because there was an incentive over or under some arbitrary amount. We should push back no matter what, no matter how much money or stipend. We keep our intellectual property rights period.

Gerson has worked with a number of faculty creating online and hybrid courses. Technological pedagogy tools are not especially different from other teaching tools which can be used in a way that is good or bad for face to face and online courses. What is more important is whether an instructor really works to deliver a course that helps student to meet the student learning outcomes. She doesn't know of any faculty taking online teaching lightly. Soodjinda, who was the Papageorge recipient last year works with our faculty to help them decide, "What are technology tools to achieve what I would do face to face?" Whatever is normally done in the face to face class can be offered by choosing the right technology tools, to allow students to engage with the content and have a transformative experience. Just like any course, the first time online may not be perfect, but every time you teach it gets better. She echoes Eudey: departments should be having those conversations about moving a course into the online format. Moving a class to online is very much like if lab exercises in a science course are changing; it is not a curriculum modification, but there should be a group decide if we are meeting student learning outcomes for hands on and theoretical portion when we make these kinds of changes.

Sims, wondering if policy does cover good actors who go to workshops and plan deliberatively, but if we flip the script, does the policy prevent a bad actor from delivering subpar courses? On the plus side our deliberation and review and collaboration as colleagues is affirmative and creates a good sense and substance, but does it protect against inadequate efforts, bad efforts. If a chair does not encourage collaborative decisions we could have bad outcomes to students. While taking about concerns and not wanting to eliminate faculty choice, can we guard against bad actors, and the loophole of winter and summer being UEE that weren't given local review.

Eudey stated that the assessment practices should be helping us to recognize whether our delivery forms are getting us the outcomes we want to achieve. We should be seeing outcomes that should include online and face to face teaching so that we can gauge if our assessment

practices are working well and if poorly intentioned people are doing a good job or not. We should ask UEPC to review this policy.

Thompson stated that the magnitude of change should be the same either direction regarding defects. Face to face to online, or review from online to face to face. Regarding IP, most recent iteration of policy tried to address IP of both staff and students. Strahm raised a point regarding IP, what if an instructional designer like Glenn Pillsbury helps to create course structure, aesthetic, and function, do they have IP rights? Our policy attempt to address it, but he hasn't heard it come up.

Sims said we will roll this to the SEC agenda, and sending to UEPC is probably the way to go.

c. Facnet Forum

Sims noted that the link was sent yesterday. Use it, and if you have any strong objections or suggestions on anything that makes it a non-starter or undesirable in any ways please send feedback. We will discuss at the next Senate meeting.

**10. Open Forum**

None.

**11. Adjournment**

4pm