

<p><b>Academic Senate</b>  <b>August 30, 2016</b>  <b>Present:</b> Alvim, Azevedo, Bice, Brandt, Carroll, Chan, Crayton, Davis, Eastham, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Floyd, Frost, Garcia, Garone, Geer, Gerson, Giventer, Gonzalez, Guichard, Hight, Huang, Larson, Odeh, Petratos, Petrosky, Sims, Stessman, Strahm, Stangfeld, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Webster, Wellman, Wood, Zhang,</p> <p><b>Excused:</b> Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Dyer, Sarraille, Strong, Lecturer Rep., Thomas</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Scott Davis, Jim Tuedio, Marcy Chvasta, Katie Olivant, Keith Nainby, Jenny Whitman, Oddmund Myhre, Julie Johnson, Doug Dawes, Cory Cardoza, John Tillman, Shawna Young, Mark Grobner, Helene Caudill, Martyn Gunn, David Lindsay, and Ron Rodriguez.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Consent Item:  12/AS/16/SEC Standing Rules of the Academic Senate Passed.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:  September 13, 2016  2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
---	--

**1. Call to order**

2:05pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 10, 2016** (distributed electronically)

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Introduction of all members of the academic Senate and the following guests:  
Scott Davis, Jim Tuedio, Marcy Chvasta, Katie Olivant, Keith Nainby, Jenny Whitman, Oddmund Myhre, Julie Johnson, Doug Dawes, Cory Cardoza, John Tillman, Shawna Young, Mark Grobner, Helene Caudill, Martyn Gunn, David Lindsay, and Ron Rodriguez.

**5. Announcements**

Stuart Sim's theme as Speaker is that we matter. He reminded us about Ellen Junn's talk earlier in the day about self, values, and the focus for the university. He suggested that we watch the stream of the convocation at this link:

<http://livestream.com/accounts/9451540/events/6259975>

Sims noted that past Speaker, Bret Carroll, said to wear ties as speaker, but he won't normally be dressed so nicely.

Sims noted that of today VP Dennis Shimek has retired from the administration. He was an active and valued collaborator and colleague, especially with the Senate and faculty on committees. We will not let his retirement go unnoticed. SEC will decide how to show appreciation and gratitude. Shimek is a genuinely humble person and does not like a lot of ceremony, but it would be remiss if

we don't let him know about his impact on our institution, especially given conditions at the time he was here, and the role he played in supporting faculty and the campus. SEC will probably prepare a resolution and perhaps we can make a video.

Martyn Gunn announced that there have been changes in Student Affairs over the summer. Psychological Counseling Services has moved to Suite 185 in the Library. One of the recommendations in the program's external review was to have Psychological Counseling be in a more private location for their clients, and this supports that goal. Also, as of today we are at 6 FTE of counselors. Disability Resource Services has also moved to the Library. These movements left suite 210 in MSR vacant, and following recommendations of the Advising Task Force, PACE Work Group and student success workgroup, all advising services have been moved to that suite. ARC, EOP and Career Services have moved there. The continuing PACE students are also advised there, and the PACE advisors are there as well. There will still be some remodeling to locate a lounge area there for a familial atmosphere for students, especially first generation students. Also due to the committee recommendations, it is now called the Academic Success Center, ASC.

Espinoza provided an update on enrollment, indicating there are 1,404 freshmen students, and this is the largest freshman class ever. There are 9,829 students enrolled, 544 more than the final fall enrollment in 2015, 782 more than 2014. The growth rate is 5.9% from 2015-16. Total FTE on Monday was 8,322 FTES. New transfer students total 1,092.

Julie Johnson announced we have a new victim advocate from the Haven, Ms. Diana Torres who is an MSW student. She is a Haven employee on campus for services related to crisis counseling, referrals to outside agencies, sexual assault and domestic violence advocate. These are services for employees and students, and they're located in Science 234. She will hold regular office hours. Johnson asked us to let others know that these services are available for students and also for faculty and staff.

Espinoza provided an update on Stockton enrollment, indicating we have 200 FTE for fall, with a headcount of 555. This is about even with last fall.

Cathlin Davis announced that she is on the Board for Habitat for Humanity of Stanislaus County. They're having a fundraiser and she's selling coupons for Primetime Car Washes, you pay only one extra dollar to support the Habitat for Humanity of Stanislaus. She has tickets with her if you're interested.

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

Sims noted that rather than submitting written reports the Committee Chairs will provide verbal reports at Senate meetings and you can follow up with these committee chairs if you choose.

C. Davis – FAC – Davis noted that this committee's work is often confidential. If there is an issue among faculty whether it's interaction between faculty and a department, faculty and administration, anything that needs to be looked at, often the FAC is the first line for looking at it. Last year the big focus was providing a vote on the non-full time faculty on campus. This went to a

vote of the full faculty to change the constitution, and it got 64% approval, which was an indication to FAC to continue to work on this year. We needed 66% approval to pass the resolution.

Brandt – FBAC – Brandt noted that FBAC looks at matters with a monetary component, ties to the Senate and faculty priorities. Usually they draft a list of budget priorities offered as a resolution that is sent to the Senate for a sense-of-the-senate statement to go to UBAC.

Garone - Graduate Council – Garone indicated that Grad Council discusses issues of curriculum and policy, large and small. Scholarship for graduate students and how to distribute them and fund them, issues like multi-authored theses in some disciplines, and they are trying to get a graduate Dean. If you have questions about curriculum or policy related to graduate programs, contact Phil Garone or others on GC.

Ann Strahm & Steven Filling - Statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU) – The ASCSU is focused on system issues, and tries to deal with general policy while staying out of the way of campus issues and local curriculum. On Sept. 1 ASCSU is getting a link to a report on quantitative reasoning in the CSU, including standards and criteria to meet for incoming students and what they leave campus with.

Sims noted that on Oct. 18<sup>th</sup> the ASCSU Chair, Christine Miller, will visit our campus and attend our Senate meeting, as part of a tour of CSU campuses this fall.

UEPC – Sims stated that Megan Thomas is not here today so we will defer to her at the next meeting. This committee deals with policy, which is a giant bucket, and several subcommittees do a lot of work as well. When see emails from UEPC, do pay attention to those agendas. The UEPC agenda is always consequential.

Sims noted that we sent out last week the Senate packet and also posted it online on the Faculty Handbook page. He asked if anyone had difficulty accessing the handout information for this meeting as we posted information online instead of emailing it. There were no indications of difficulties. We will continue to post supporting documents for our meetings on the website, but will still send the agenda and minutes out via email.

## **7. Consent Item**

### **a. 12/AS/16/SEC Standing Rules of the Academic Senate**

Two small changes to the Standing Rules are indicated in red in the electronic version and highlighted in the printed version. One change clarifies that once an item is sent to SEC and moved forward to the Senate, it cannot be amended away from the original subject matter or be altered to include unrelated issues or concerns. On page two, we changed the wording from an indication of written reports to oral reports at the AS meetings by committee chairs.

Sims asked for objections. Hearing none, it was taken as consent, and adopted as the Standing Rules for 2016-17.

## **8. Information Items**

Sims stated that a lot of this information was sent out over the summer or posted to the university website, but we wanted to draw senator attention to it to make sure all are aware of what is happening.

### **a. Student Success Initiatives Update:**

#### **i. PACE Workgroup Recommendations, Response and Academic Success Center Update**

Sims indicated that a document went out a while back entitled “Recommendation for a Transition Plan.” Last year in AS we had a lot of conversations about our PACE program, a grant-funded program that served students in a number of ways. The grant was ending, and we needed to find a way to transition the PACE program into a sustainable practice, or learn from it and scale up as institutional practices. That was a part of the grant, to find out what our highest impact practices were and determine what makes the biggest difference.

In Spring Provost Strong formed the PACE Workgroup. This group dug through five years of data, and identified best practices and transferred this into the proposal in the memo. The recommendation for creating the Academic Success Center Gunn mentioned earlier was a component of this proposal. You’ll notice a lot of the projects tied to student success completion monies that we talked about last fall are reflected here. There are components that are particularly exciting, including the structure and resources for increased faculty roles in the advising process. We are creating a Faculty Director position for Advising and Learning Cohorts that is a half time release position that will be advertised soon. We are also looking to recruit and create faculty meta-major advisors. If you’re not familiar with that term, it’s a fairly recent practice in the advising world where faculty get training to advise students as they try to find a major. Faculty are trained in a group of disciplines so that they can advise students across different areas. We would like to have a pool of faculty members who will spend time in the Academic Success Center, with release time. The Faculty Director and meta-majors will have time in the Academic Success Center and working with staff advisors to create a stronger bridge between two parts of the advising process. The ASC is rolling over practices from PACE. Please peruse the report and visit the new space in northeast corner of MSR.

Espinoza added that it was important to the work group to make the move during the summer to prevent the delay of an entire year. There will be some additional activities in that area, including some remodeling. The creation of space for students to congregate will be important. This is something PACE students valued. The area that was occupied by PACE, is a student support services program, all are welcome to use that space and the lab areas that were designed for PACE. They are thinking about how to expand access to labs and printing for a larger group of students, as that is a universal need among students. Eventually this space will be targeted for a career center, and we still have the former ARC space. This is a work in progress, and we need to figure out where the pieces go.

Sims said that as this gets established and grows, there will be space for students to meet and work and study. They will have lap top checkout for students and limited free printing. He was knocked out by how successful PACE was and how some simple things have such a large impact on

students. When we look at the graduation 2025 initiative, a lot are very straight-forward things like more frequent contact with faculty, and having access to laptops when needed. We are trying to do some of the more aspirational things but some mundane things too. His experience on the work group was very positive, and it was an extremely collaborative group and really powerfully focused on student welfare and outcomes. It was the kind of work group you hope you're a part of when at a university. Sims thinks outcomes are going to lay a foundation for something meaningful.

Espinoza said that she has been working with the new president for 60 days, and Junn has had the benefit of having experiences at 6 CSU campuses, some larger than ours and some the same size as us. She has lots of ideas about how we can improve student success and support it. Espinoza suspects that as we move forward, and as we are already working hard to keep up with her and her ideas, we can anticipate these big and small changes in next year. She is impressed with what we are able to do to support student success.

"Strahm thanked Sims and Espinoza for the run down, and apologized in advance for being a cranky person, but feels the need to express her thoughts on this subject. Students of color, even on a campus such as ours, feel they don't have a safe space on campus, which PACE provided to them and also to first generation students who are students of color. While Strahm is super glad we are thinking about these services in another context and want to expand it, nonetheless, marginalized groups of people need to have appropriate spaces on campus to engage with people who understand what they go through. The destruction, murder, slaughter of PACE to make it "better" for all to join in, does the opposite of what PACE was doing. Strahm is glad we're funding and providing resources for even more students in support of student success, but she remains unhappy with the fact that we have marginalized an entire group of people who were getting the help they needed and successfully getting through their college degree programs."

Thompson asked if this is a growth project for more students, what's the marketing plan for it, how students find out about it. He would like someone to come to his freshman composition classes to share information. How do we get information to students about the ASC? Martyn Gunn said this is a work in progress this coming year. They still need to hire faculty advisors and work with them to get ready. PACE students are being taken care of by advisors incorporated into the center. Other marginalized groups, EOP, and Summer Bridge, all are being taken care of during this transition period.

Eudey noted that one thing that the grant required was good record keeping, assessment and research. Are we maintaining all that data collection to compare the outcomes of the grant work to our extended services to a broader population? Is there an ongoing data plan that would allow us to see if we are marginalizing members of these groups we previously served well via PACE? We had to have this data collection under the original grant and she hopes that we continue to track data.

Gunn responded that yes, he's working with John Tillman in IR and student groups at the university to continue to assess the programs. In his view we have to have some kind of accountability, so the short answer is yes.

Sims noted he is happy to follow up if you have more questions or comments.

**ii. Report on Feedback from Stakeholders Regarding the University Task Force on Advising Report**

Sims referred the senators to the June 23 memo, a report on feedback about advising, in the AS packet. He asked if anyone had anything to add to the memo.

Espinoza reported that last year we had a plan that was responsive to the CO regarding student success, and a working group for academic advising that uncovered issues related to advising, and the PACE transition team. A lot of the work with three committees melded into the ASC plan. Now we are moving forward, the President has a set of initiatives along these same lines put forward responding to the \$1 million dollars available for the graduation 2025 initiative. Going back to what we learned from committees and college data, the president has new ideas that we hadn't contemplated. This is a work in process. The report mirrors feedback and memorialized feedback about academic advising.

Sims noted that Provost Strong sends regrets about not being here to address this topic. He will be around to answer questions subsequent to this meeting.

**iii. Retaining Sophomores at Stanislaus State – Report (Authors: Keith Nainby, Gerard Wellman and Katie Olivant)**

Sims noted that if you haven't read this yet, please do. This report taught him a lot. He turned reporting over to authors of the report.

Nainby reported that there were some student success initiative dollars from the CO, and as a piece of our campus plan we wrote a proposal to study sophomore dips in retention. Data historically showed that retention dipped significantly relative to other retention patterns just before and after 60 units. The team explored qualitatively what some reasons might be. They were focused on how to more effectively retain sophomores. They scheduled focus groups in fall 2015, targeting sophomores in the sophomore success program, and invited some to explore what they thought were factors to shape continuing here successfully, transferring, or dropping out. There was some sense that the availability of Community Colleges encourage some to go to local CC. They wanted to see what was true, the reasons for leaving, etc. The focus group recruiting efforts were marginally successful, out of 4 groups, they interviewed 19 sophomores. One group was canceled for lack of attendance. In the second part of the project, they prepared for phone interviews with students who stayed here but who might otherwise demographically be expected to drop out and also to interview others who had left. Nainby reported that there was grim participation, as they contacted 60 students, were only able to schedule 4-5 interviews, and only one actually happened. Some of the data they were able to glean from the interviews reinforced the sentiment that the most significant factors in retention have to do with engagement beyond the classroom. What leads someone to participate in interviews or focus group? A sense of belonging, obligation, and participation in the community are reasons for some of the lack of attending and not participating in interviews. The report offers some evidence as to why we think this is true, and some tentative recommendations based on this limited data.

Wellman noted that the next step for the project, part II, is attempting to train students to conduct the interviews. He noted there might be an intimidation factor talking to a faculty member at school you dropped out of. They plan to train students, and have at the ready resources to help the drop out student get re-connected. Olivant said this continuation of the project is based on a SJSU project noted in the Retaining Sophomores report, and we are adopting some of their methodologies, incentives, and co-inquiry process. They discovered along the way that some of the factors leading to drop out have to do with alienation from campus and cultural capital barriers, and these findings connect to kinds of work others are doing with regard to the advising task force, ASC, etc. We have to figure out how to talk to some of these students and ask the right questions. We need to start from a position that doesn't assume they know all that they should know, and recognizing that they do not necessarily know what questions to ask us. There is lot of meat to chew on here. They are looking forward to getting more information and answers.

Steve Wood was struck by the unrepresentative sample of students and has concerns about the conclusions based on a small sample. Besides training students as interviewers, what are the steps to create a more representative sample of successful and struggling sophomores?

Nainby recognized and shared the concerns with the sample. A change in the interview process may support more meaningful engagement with students. They would love a larger sample. They tried to match characteristics of those interviewed to those who were more difficult to retain, but they need to encourage broader participation. They noted that gift cards and monetary reward for participating worked at SJSU. Nainby also noted that in the report they were not coming to conclusions, just very tentative recommendations. Nainby again shared concerns about representativeness. Wellman noted that most were from a group needing more assistance than the general population.

Garcia said he is less concerned about a sample size at this point in time, in a sense that there are tradeoffs. If a larger size, we can't hear the people's story. We need to gather people's stories and experiences in depth. A smaller group size is more useful for this reason. Can you connect it through to the push to get students to graduate in four years? If stories tell us that our students are different, with cultural responsibilities, if those things interfere with graduating in four years. Our students have cultural responsibilities so those things may interfere with the four year graduation. Their paradigm may include that they have other responsibilities. Our CSU paradigm is now set for four years, but their paradigm is tied to other responsibilities. Garcia loves that this is qualitative research providing thick description of their experiences.

Nainby said the report supports Garcia's insights. These had to do with family to care for, and job opportunities that compete with Stan State. These questions are more salient for students who might not be retained than for general college students.

Wellman noted that from the data there were a lot of these students coming from Southern California where universities are impacted, they are coming here because there is no alternative, living life with their home community 4-5 hours away. It's an interesting angle. The dominant thing is that they have family members to care for and medical issues at home. Nainby said in the

largest focus group, students brought people with them, and 10 of 12 were from San Bernardino County.

Eudey thanked the research team for their work. She, Mark Thompson, Daniel Soodjinda, Martyn Gunn and others are in the Men at Stanislaus State Working Group. Many men are leaving college, including high numbers of ethnic minority males. Maybe we need to have a conversation between these two groups. She's interested in your data, and how many are men? Some national data shows that it's mainly the Latino men dropping out. Eudey was also wondering how many of those who are leaving are enrolled at other colleges, and how many are not enrolled at all.

Nainby agrees with Garcia about value is the narratives. It's important to know what is happening for those not retaining here and whether they're finishing elsewhere. We don't know and the number we talked to is not enough to know. We need broader participation to answer that question. No exist surveys are done, and it's hard to gather that data. It would be helpful to answer some of those questions.

Sims is interested in the various ways to determine what non-classroom factors prevent students from finishing degrees, and which can we change, control or influence. This 2025 goal is in part a great thing because the state and system are giving us resources to chase after that, but as Garcia put the finger on, some factors are out of our control as an institution and are fundamentally impacting completion of their degree in a timely fashion or at all.

Filling reported that the CSU system survey showed 10% of students aren't assured of a place to live and 20% are food insecure. It's great that the state is willing to give us \$1 million dollars, but it would be better if they knew that it will take more than \$1 million on an ongoing basis to fix that problem.

Sims noted that we need more data to marshal the argument that we can't control all factors tied to student success, and send this information back up the chain. This report, and all of these efforts we discussed today, will be extra information to draw upon and the process will be very valuable. Thanks to the task force.

#### **b. Strategic Planning Update**

Sims noted that this is an information item at the moment, but there are a few important decisions to share. Sims noted those in the Senate may remember from last year, as SPWG did its work thru the spring to draft the committee structure and process for developing the strategic plan for the university, they got in a philosophical dispute with the former president.

Regardless of how we characterize this dispute, it doesn't matter anymore as in Ellen Junn's first day on campus one of the five topics discussed was the strategic plan, and she had conversations with several folks, and met with SEC, and the consensus is that we would like to hit the reboot button and start over with the strategic plan and not tie it to any disagreement from past leadership. Junn is excited to hear us and we were open to that. There isn't much to report at this time. What we have in place is a draft of the Strategic Planning committee membership that Junn shared at convocation this morning. She is proposing, and SEC has supported, a small committee of a dozen

members with co-chairs being the Provost and Speaker of Faculty. Two additional faculty reps. and the President will serve along with VPs of Enrollment/Student Affairs, Faculty Affairs/Human Resources, Business & Finance, and Advancement. There is also the ASI president, a community member and a staff rep. The committee is smaller than before. Significantly Ellen proposed a faculty co-chair for the process. It was a smart decision to turn the page and start fresh. CoC will be putting out a call to the campus for those faculty interested in serving. Within CoC the sense is it should be tenured faculty members, if there is input as to why this is unwise, they are open to input. There were no restrictions given by the president about faculty members. Let Sims know who should be on the committee. Perhaps being tenured is easier in the role. The timeline for the SP is to be from 2017-2025. This process will quickly supersede the interim goals, and will become the new process, with hope to draft the new plan by Jan-Feb 2017 followed by consultations prior to adoption. The president has lots of experience doing this at other campuses in Academic Affairs, but this is her first university-wide one. Sims read the plan Junn led at Dominguez Hills, and he was impressed by the consultation and feedback process in Academic Affairs at Dominguez Hills. The Senate will be in the loop and consulted as we move along.

Giventer said this process reminds him of the first year of President John Moore's administration. Giventer asked what the status was of the university's Capital Facilities plan. Sims will get back to him on that. Giventer said it is important to look at facilities as the prior plan led to two major buildings – DBH and MSR. Doug Dawes said that he has that plan and the document exists. The University Facilities Planning Advisory Committee works on it twice a year. He is happy to share information about the five-year plan. The first item on the list is the remodel of the Library. Hoping to have that worked on in 3 years.

Filling asked if there will be an impact on plans with the change in bond issuance and CO policies on funding of projects. Dawes doesn't know. The group meets next Friday, and he's hoping to have more information on that. Usually there is a faculty and staff member on the committee and Dawes will share who those are. Pierce said that we get quarterly reports that go to general faculty. The last meeting was May 6. Pierce will share those reports as she receives them.

Sims said that if you watch Junn's comments from this morning, there's more information on strategic planning. Look at that if you're interested in following this topic. He's hoping this process will get moving soon.

### **c. Presidential Transition Team**

Sims noted that some have already heard about this team, and it was mentioned at the Convocation. CoC is trying to find a third faculty member to serve. This is a listening tour with a team of folks helping to guide the process. Please peruse this document. There will be at least three forums each for faculty, students, staff, and the community. This is a thorough and sincere effort to learn about issues, and to inform medium and longer-term plans for the institution. The process will help inform her as she moves beyond immediate plans for the University. Sims indicated that this is an important process. Martyn Gunn and Kilolo Brodie are the co-chairs. Thus far the CoC has appointed to the committee Mark Thompson and Al Petrosky. There is an invitation out to a third member, which is not yet confirmed. David Zhu is chair of CoC this year. This team will have

professional support for facilitation and note-taking. As members of the campus we need to do our part by participating in the process, giving them substantive things to listen to.

#### **d. WASC Update (Harold Stanislaw – 3:00pm time certain)**

##### **Background**

Our campus is due for a “reaffirmation of accreditation.” In Summer of 2018 we need to submit our institutional report, which will summarize an extensive self-study we will be conducting over the next two years. The institutional report and supporting documents undergo an offsite review in Fall 2018, followed by a campus visit in Spring 2019.

Reaccreditation is complex with lots of moving parts. The principal facilitator of this process is the WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee, which was assembled with the assistance of the Committee on Committees. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by Shawna Young, who is our Academic Liaison Officer, and me, the Faculty Co-Chair. Also on the Steering Committee are Christopher Claus, who is the principal writer, Amy Worrell, who is the University’s Accreditation Specialist, and several other faculty members, administrators, and staff.

The Steering Committee will help organize preparations for the reaccreditation review. However, the review is really the responsibility of the entire campus community, which is why I’m sharing this update with Senate.

##### **Progress to date (Reaccreditation 101)**

The Steering Committee has been holding monthly meetings, beginning in February 2016. We began by creating an organizational chart to highlight the different members of the campus community who are integral to the reaccreditation process. That org chart continues to grow. We’ve also started on what WASC recommends as the initial self-study activity, which is completing a document called the “Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards.” The worksheet examines four standards:

1. Defining institutional purposes and ensuring educational objectives
2. Achieving educational objectives through core functions
3. Developing and applying resources and organizational structures to ensure quality and sustainability
4. Creating an organization committed to quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement

Each Standard involves a particular set of criteria. These are called Criteria for Review, so one acronym you’ll often hear during reaccreditation is CFR. Examining the CFRs and completing the worksheet helps initiate a dialog, which is then complemented by the process of gathering additional materials. That word “process” is important – this isn’t just about generating documentation, it’s about engaging in an authentic dialog about where we are, where we want

to go, and how we plan to get there.

The end result of this self-study process is a document consisting of eight required “essays.” I’ll paraphrase their titles:

1. Institutional context
2. Compliance with federal and WASC guidelines
3. Degree programs and their meaning, quality, and integrity
4. Educational quality, and student learning of core competencies
5. Student success, including learning, retention and graduation
6. Quality assurance, including assessment and use of evidence
7. Sustainability and financial viability
8. Reflections and plans for improvement

There is also an optional ninth essay that can be used to discuss an institution-specific theme. Institutions are like students; they don’t often complete optional assignments. However, faith-based institutions sometimes submit this optional essay because the CFRs don’t address issues central to their mission. During our self-study we might identify a theme that we feel is central to our mission but not expressed in the other essays, in which case we might also decide to submit the optional essay.

### **Upcoming activities**

Our WASC liaison is Melanie Booth. She will be visiting our campus on Friday, September 9, and will be meeting with the Steering Committee, with the President and her cabinet, and with SEC.

In addition to Melanie’s visit, the Steering Committee will continue to flesh out the worksheets for the preliminary self-review, with two major goals in mind. One is to identify documents that are relevant to the WASC Standards. WASC is all about evidence, so we need to start identifying and gathering the evidence we have, and determine if there is evidence we don’t currently gather but should. The second major goal we’ll be working on is more important, and that’s engaging the University community in the self-study process and gleaning from University stakeholders the insight and information needed to respond to the Standards in the institutional report.

I’ve suggested that it might be useful if I were to provide updates to Senate of the reaccreditation project, and I’m hoping you’ll agree. If you do, some of my reports are likely to be very brief and consist of little more than a “here’s what we did since last time” summary. However, others may be more along the lines of “here’s what we’re working on and can you make some suggestions or help us get more input for this particular piece?” I should point out that Senate won’t be the only place where we’ll report out and seek information, but it’s an important forum and the Steering Committee wants to ensure that faculty governance is integrally involved in the process.

Sims indicated that we are trying to use accreditation as a way for us to be reflective in meaningful ways and think about what we're doing.

Strahm reminded the senate that during the last review WASC was instrumental when we were struggling with issues with the president at the time. Part of the reason we're healthier now is because of WASC's intervention.

#### **a. Clicker Training**

Pierce instructed senators to turn on the clicker using the orange button. A is yes, B is a no, C is abstain. Votes can be changed until the end of voting is announced. Results are visible to all. This is how we vote on resolutions. She asked senators to turn off the clicker after the meeting to not waste the batteries. Filling noted that a check mark on the clicker screen means the vote got accepted.

### **1. Discussion Item**

#### **a. Importance of Faculty Governance (attachments)**

Sims noted that this statement has been passed out over the past few years. Thompson participated in drafting the first version of this. This statement affirms the importance of what we do via the Academic Senate and our role as senators specifically.

Eudey remarked that of the key things about being on the Senate is that you're a representative, representing a department or targeted group, and it is your responsibility to share what is addressed here with that group and to bring to the meetings their thoughts and concerns. Many times department faculty don't have an idea of what is occurring here. Please do your best to consult and represent your department or group.

C. Davis noted that this desire for consultation and representation is why we have first and second readings. The reason we do the readings two weeks apart is to give time to go to departments for consultation. Davis noted she sometimes puts information in a mailbox with a routing slip for her department faculty which gives her information for the second reading.

Sims said that because we are putting supporting materials online, it should be easier to refer faculty colleagues to the information online. You can send the link to the documents to your faculty. You don't need to copy and route things. Please share information with your faculty – when Sims says he wants to know “what you think” about an issue, the “you” he is referencing is your collective, not just your personal views. Consult and talk to colleagues about questions and concerns.

Sims noted that SEC is drafting with Ellen a joint statement on shared governance. This is something two campuses have done – Sacramento and Chico – that have been drafted between AS and the president. We are hoping that we can develop a clear articulation for our campus that reflects our tradition about how we enact shared governance. The shared governance statement is up a level from this document on the importance of faculty governance, where collaboration between administration and faculty occurs. We can articulate what we mean on our campus by this.

We have a draft that we will be looking at the next SEC meeting, and we will share with the senate when ready.

**b. Call for Campus Student Success Plans Pursuant to AB 1602 and Graduation Initiative 2025 Goals for CSU Stanislaus**

Sims noted that you may have heard about a graduation initiative. In brief, please read the Vice Chancellor's memo posted in supportive material entitled LJB2 plan from Lauren Blanchard. This was sent to system presidents. This is dated July 29, with a response due date Sept. 2<sup>nd</sup>, this Friday. We have been working on a draft plan. The graduation initiative sets 2025 targets for the system. On a separate slide in the packets are the 9-year targets. The freshman four-year rate currently is 12% and they want us at 37% by 2025, and there are also 6-year targets for freshmen and two and four-year targets for transfers. There are goals to close gaps for URMs/non-URMs and Pell Grant/non-Pell Grant recipients to zero. They're encouraging us to work toward these goals and they are tying additional funding to it. There is \$35 million available this year, and the short term plan gets us some of this money.

Sims stated that Young has been doing much background homework on this project to understand requirements and the campus plans are being compiled by a team. A system wide plan will overlay campus plans to advocate to the Dept. of Finance and the Governor to secure the tentatively promised \$35 million and potential future continued funding. The good news is a sizeable portion of funding available possibly longitudinally will be used to look at student success issues in meaningful ways. The short term plan is meaningful and consequential. Many for Academic Affairs. The bad news is even this year's chunk of funding isn't guaranteed. We have to jump through the hoop of the master plan and decide if they will release the \$35 million to the system and then the system goes thru review of the individual plans. Young stated that there is currently no formula published by the Chancellor's Office for distributing one-time monies for the 2016-2017 allocation. There is currently no methodology published for allocating this money, but as of yesterday each campus was allocated \$1 million and the remaining \$12 million is up for grabs depending on what is articulated in campus plans. [Correction submitted by Young 9/1/16: Young misunderstood the allocation. Further information indicates that the \$35 million has been allocated, and \$1 million is the total allocation for our campus.]

Sims says this is all only for 2016-2017. We have to be prepared to provide a long term plan for the future. Young said that the long and short term plans are due Sept 2nd, though acknowledged that the long term can't be at the level of detail that it should be for the time period, and there will be a call again for further developed long term plans that enables dialogue on campus.

Strahm asked if we will be seeing the short and long term plan before it is submitted. Sims said no but he has been at the meetings regarding the short term plan. The campus allocation is currently \$1 million so the short term plan reflects that with additional ideas for the longer term. Strahm said we just got done talking about 9a (shared governance), and this is making her uncomfortable not seeing the plan. She is not saying that these are not good thoughtful people, but the importance of shared governance should be recognized. She's terrified that they are not hearing from the people who teach students and are on front lines with students and understand the circumstance of our student body in this mix.

Sims understands that concern and it is troublesome to him. There was no way to connect a consultative process to meet the timeline mandated to us. There were days and hours to respond to it. They made sure Sims was at the table as the speaker. The short and long term plans are to a great degree drawn from the last couple of years of feedback from faculty, students, staff advisors, different constituencies, and the advising task force report. The decisions of the committee are not what do we want to put on here, but instead they're looking at information from our community in last couple of years and building on that. It didn't happen in a vacuum. Most of the resources will come to Academic Affairs and at the classroom level. That's the great part. We will see a tangible increase in resources for more classes, sections, and advising. Tangible resources are good, but the way it's happening is a problem. This will be an agenda item for the next SEC meeting to fit into the process.

Eudey indicated that she has mentioned to Filling the need to make it clear to the ASCSU that the timeline is inappropriate and no one has had consultation on this. Not all campuses are even in session when the report comes due. This is a real problem. She recognizes that some of the deadlines are tied to due dates set by the legislature, but we can't let this go unsaid that this is a problem and the CO should have pushed back on the deadline and they didn't.

Garcia is wondering given Strahm's concern, we have lots of timelines by which we have to do certain things. Should we not take on that initiative right now? Looking at what we have going on, from WASC to retention of students, etc. we need a wide dialogue. It's unrealistic that we can do all of these things and do them well. Can we push back on some of these things? Are all of these priorities? Is the transitional team and listening tour priorities or can we push back while other work can be done?

Tuedio said the answer is probably no because the new president wants to engage with us. For the Governor and Legislature, 4 year graduation rates are big getting attention and need to improve. There's a big back story tied to for-profit universities that were under-performing and taking student aid from the state. This put pressure on the CSU to increase 4 and 2 year rates. CO is taking this on as a challenge and an opportunity and giving campus standards for us to meet between now and 2025. \$35 million is a potential source of revenue to make an immediate impact on the coming spring graduation rate, or maybe carried into the following year. The President is interpreting this as attention to this year and seeking ways to obtain higher graduation rates in spring 2017 by putting attention to seniors at various stages of progression to graduation. Who are the students who are close enough to a four-year graduation that we could be proactively engaging them with opportunities, resources including summer to close the gap in ways that would address expectations? We need to understand what students need, especially among those close to a four year completion. We need to help those who are behind to get what they need to graduate within that time frame. This comes with a lot of challenges, as we don't know what they need and all the reasons they don't operate on a four-year track.

Filling noted there is also more back story. This is not something the members of the administration will share as it has to do with the legislature's and governor's work with the CSU. The legislature is undeniably tired of getting reports on things they don't care about and not getting numbers they do

want. They have spent 10 years trying to have this conversation about graduation rates to no avail, so it just went forward as a legislature requirement. We need to figure out how to educate legislators because they don't understand our students or the reasons students drop out or take longer than 4 years to graduate. We must help colleagues in Sacramento to understand that. We don't need to focus too much on low-hanging fruits. We need to remember that transfer and 6 year rates need to go up too.

Tuedio noted that this conversation often surfaces but doesn't go anywhere. We should be thinking about whether we can do anything with period of time, based on experiences we have.

Strahm said this push that's happening really terrifies her because although she's, not saying it will, she's seen at charter schools and K-12 that in efforts to get numbers to improve are getting rid of students who aren't performing to a certain standard. They are increasing the entrance scores and doing other things to change the population to influence outcomes. There are lots of ways we could improve the numbers that would be detrimental to our students and us. She's hoping we are keeping an eye on that.

Eudey agrees with Strahm's concerns about ways schools manipulate student outcomes, and also has about vulnerable faculty and the integrity of our classes. This is dual issue, as there can be a push to get students out by passing them even if not meeting course expectations, at the same time that we are increasing rates of non-tenure track faculty who are more vulnerable than tenure-line during evaluation processes. We are at a perfect storm of people not enforcing academic integrity and undermining faculty responsibility for the curriculum and student learning. We need to find ways of protecting our lecturers and non-tenured faculty in this process. We need to support vulnerable faculty who wish to resist increases in class sizes and changes to curriculum that might undermine learning and academic integrity. We're all getting calls from students trying to get into our full classes, and with this initiative over us we need to protect our faculty and integrity of our classes by ensuring that none feel pressured to take on too many students.

Garone said that many of our students are already behind in terms of earning units toward graduation. In a couple of years we can have effects, but in one year it seems that with the exception of a small number of students who take an extra class, no matter what we do this year, it's hard to show substantial increases in numbers. It's not mathematically possible. We can start policies with new transfer and freshmen, and over time graduation rates may be in a better position. Starting with students in progress already, looking at who graduates this year, is not a realistic and mathematically possible goal. We can expect this year only to have a fractional uptake.

Chan noted that preparation for coming into college is very important. There are many underprepared students, and in her department often they need to work on reading, writing, and hearing for music. It is hard to get to a level to graduate in four years with the skills they need when they get here. Some students retake classes for various reasons. This ties into public school systems previous to college. The Modesto school system may cut out the arts from K-12, and this could impact students in a variety of areas. These preparation issues should be factored into discussions about legislation and graduation rates.

Sims indicated that he will send updates and any drafts he can share. He offered thanks for the feedback and was taking notes on this to share with others. This was terrific feedback.

**c. Consensual Relationships & Power Disparity Policy**

C. Davis said that this policy came out of FAC last year. She asked all to please read and share with departments. This was written by FAC and Shimek, addressing an Executive Order. There will be a first reading soon, so please talk to your departments so you're ready to discuss it. This is the item we didn't get through at the end of last year – there were no changes made since last spring, we just didn't get to it before the term ended.

**2. Open Forum**

Gerson noted that the lecturer representative is on fall sabbatical, and wondered if we could have a proxy lecturer representative for the next meeting. Pierce will look into this and have the CoC appoint a lecturer representative for the fall semester until Nagel returns in the spring.

**3. Adjournment**

4pm

