**For**

Second Reading of 1/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Policy on Amplified Sound Use on Campus (Replaces 1/AS/97/SAAC The Use of Amplified Sound on Campus). Passed.

Second Reading of 2/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy (Replaces the Posting Guidelines that were approved by the Academic Senate on 3/11/2003 and the President on 5/1/2003). Passed.

First Reading of 3/AS/15/FAC-- Charge for the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised 33/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC- Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89/FAC). Will return as a second reading item.
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Academic Senate

February 24, 2015

**Present:** Bettencourt, Brodie, Burroughs, Carroll, Colnic, Crayton, Espinoza, Foreman, Gerson, Ghuman, Guichard, Hoover, Huselt, Johnson, , Littlewood, Mulder, Nagel, O’Brien, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Powell, Provost Strong, Regalado, Silverman, Stone, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Tzu-Man-Huang, Wisniewski ,Won, and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Edwards, Price, and Filling.

**Proxies:** William Foreman for Andrew Dorsey, Dieter Renning for Barbara Manrique, Koni Stone for Chad Stessman and Marvin Hooker for Mariam Salameh.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, Marge Jaasma, John Tillman, James Tuedio, Joshua Levesque, Daniel Houlden Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, Dennis Shimek and Brian Duggan.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:05pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 10, 2015** (distributed electronically)

Approved.

1. **Introductions**

Speaker Carroll welcomed the following guests: John Sarraille, Marge Jaasma, John Tillman, James Tuedio, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, Dennis Shimek and Brian Duggan.

1. **Announcements**

Provost Strong distributed the Special Visit Site Team Report, which included the three recommendations listed below. Also, they had a phone call with a WASC special visit report. Last Thursday, Strong, Shimek, Jaasma, and President Sheley had a phone call with the WASC Commission Panel that reviewed this report. We received announcement that WASC accepted the report. WASC will issue the final report within 45-60 days and it will likely include the recommendations that are in the special visit report.

*Shared Governance and Institutional Climate:*

*It is time for the university to collaborate in a systematic analysis of the changing economic, demographic, and political environment and to update the existing plan or create a new one to respond to these realities. [CFR 4.6 and 4.7]*

*Strategic Planning:*

*It is time for the university to collaborate in a systematic analysis of the changing economic, demographic, and political environment and to update the existing plan or create a new one to respond to these realities. [CFR 4.6 and 4.7]*

*Scholarship and Creative Activity:*

*More work needs to be done in developing retention, promotion, and tenure standards that are fair and transparent, and that encourage faculty to aspire to excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service. [CFR 2.8, 2.9, and 3.2]*

We have plans in place for all of these recommendations. We have started activities to support these recommendations. Our next WASC visit will be in 2019 and the report for that visit is due in the fall of 2018. We should consider beginning the accreditation report process in the fall of 2015 so we have three years to create a new plan. This is a good amount of time to make progress.

A group has been working on a Strategic Plan and it will be in a draft form within the next three weeks. This draft will be shared with the university community for their consideration and input. We should start the Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan (CIPSP) process in parallel with the Strategic Plan. The WASC report has three commendations, including improved shared governance. The Provost thanked the faculty and staff for the progress that we have made to receive these commendations.

Speaker Carroll noted that the path of recommendations from the Strategic Plan Working Group will be coming to the Senate for our input.

Gerson announced that on March 9th Dr. Arnold Schmidt will talk about his sabbatical in Rome and London at 2pm in the Faculty Development Center. She distributed a flyer.

Regalado acknowledged the team that organized the Title IX reception and presentation by Dr. Sarah Fields. He thanked Marina Gerson for hosting the event and for being very gracious to our Dr. Fields. Also thanked VP Dennis Shimek and Provost Strong who were very active in participating in the forum with the coaches and came to our reception in the afternoon. He also acknowledged participation of coaches in the round table discussion with Dr. Field. She was very impressed with the beauty of the campus.

1. **2:15pm Time Certain for Joshua Levesque, Fitness Coordinator, Student** **Recreation Complex (Discuss fitness/wellness programs)**

Speaker Carroll introduced Joshua Levesque who introduced Daniel Houlden as the Director of the Student Recreation Complex. Houlden noted that the recreation complex is open to faculty, staff and alumni. Hours of operation are posted on the web page. Faculty and Staff can purchase SRC memberships for $27/month or $275 per year. Fitness wellness coordinator (Joshua Levesque) elaborated on their programs and informed the Senate that SRC members can come to group exercise classes. The group exercise schedule is online. SRC would like faculty to commit to participating in (joining) SRC. Go online to get more information at the following link: <https://www.csustan.edu/stan-recreation>

The SRC took over the intramural sports from the ASI and are looking at the program to meet student needs. They would like to schedule as many of the intermural sports in the fitness center as much as possible. The climbing boulders are out there to be used, and we want the community to get involved and come interact as they develop programs. Every campus is different and we want your input.

We want maximum participation for the health of the campus. President Sheley wants a healthy campus. At least participate by sending emails giving them your ideas. SRC is expanding fitness to include health screenings. Next month, there will be opportunities for free training with a personal trainer and group classes for $30. All senators get a free day pass. That is our gift to you for having us here today to talk to you. We will be sending an email to Postmaster.

O’Brien asked if the fees apply to retired faculty. They will include a fee for retired faculty and are currently looking into that. This facility was built with students in mind. He came here to run a fitness center, the field nice and get involved with the overall community. Dieter Renning is the President of the Retired Faculty Association and wants to visit with Mr. Houlden.

Guichard asked if the faculty and staff health screenings will be available to non-staff members too. Yes, we want to show how healthy we are and want to improve on the program by offering it to non-members as well.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

SEC has been addressing some issues that has to do with Bookstore orders. We had a few representatives from the Bookstore and Barnes & Noble meet with SEC last week. Speaker Carroll distributed copies of an email with Dana Hagge to give you a sense of where things are now. Look it over and if there are any issues you want discussed you can bring back to Senate or SEC. Dana Hagge’s memo refers to a bookstore advisory committee. This committee does not exist yet, its formation is being discussed.

SEC has sent a memo to the Provost regarding our commitment to preserving faculty primacy in curricular matters. This is a result of a proposed course that was not approved based on partly budgetary concerns. Speaker Carroll distributed two memos for senators to consider.

**First Reading Item**

* 1. **3/AS/15/FAC-- Charge for the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised 33/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC- Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89/FAC)**

Johnson moved the resolution, seconded by Thompson. Johnson said that in lieu of reading the resolution, she will describe what is in the resolution. This new resolution is a result of a preceding resolution that requires evaluation of the 50% of courses. A committee will be established and their charge will be to assess the impact of evaluating 50% of classes on the RPT process. There are guiding questions for this analysis listed in the charge of the committee. The membership of the committee is also listed. Members should be full professors, and one of the members should have expertise in institutional analysis.

**3/AS/15/FAC -- Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised the 33/AS/13/FAC--Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC--Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89 FAC)**

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus recommends that an Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses be established, and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the charge and membership of the committee will be as follows:

The ad hoc committee will assess the impact of 27/AS/13/FAC on the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) process. Specifically, the committee will gather, summarize, and evaluate data relevant to the following questions:

1. Did the change in policy provide a better evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness for RPT purposes?
2. Did faculty find that the change in policy increased their ability to evaluate the effectiveness of their pedagogy and implement course improvements?
3. If so, does the incremental benefit obtained outweigh the cost of administering the revised policy?
4. If so, does the additional benefit suggest that the percent of courses evaluated each year should be increased above 50%?

The Ad Hoc Committee will determine the criteria for judging the effectiveness of 27/AS/13/FAC, the relevant data to be gathered, and the methodology to be used in the study. The committee should consider gathering information from those associated with the RPT and evaluation processes including the Provost, current and past members of the University RPT Committee, College Deans, Department Chairs, members of departmental RPT committees, and faculty members who have recently gone through an RPT review.

Committee Membership: Vice-President of Faculty Affairs/Human Resources and three faculty members appointed by the Committee on Committees. All three faculty members should be full professors. At least one faculty member should have expertise in statistical analysis, including expertise in developing and analyzing survey instruments.

**RATIONALE:** 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses established a pilot program whose efficacy is to be evaluated by an ad hoc joint committee of faculty and administrators after two years. This resolution establishes the requisite committee.

Approved at FAC on 11/29/14

Nagel had two concerns; the first was that evaluation of using IDEA for 50% of a faculty member’s teaching load for RPT omits analyzing how IDEA affects non tenure track, coaches, counselors and librarians. The new CBA permits the use of student surveys in evaluation of coaches, counselors and librarians. The charge should address the use of evaluation with respect to non-tenure track faculty. The second suggestion is to include a committee member that is non-tenure track faculty. Some part time faculty are only evaluated by student surveys (IDEA). Non tenure track faculty in a three year contract would not have a conflict of interest, just like full professors. Johnson stated that she will take these concerns back to FAC.

Regalado commented on #4: he would not want to see an increase above 50%. On the 5th question, should the university wide standard format be scuttled? Each discipline should have its own evaluation method. We need a standing process to allow departments to have their own evaluations.

Taylor stated that coaches are evaluated by outgoing seniors on every team. Wisniewski inquired about the rationale for not evaluating 100% of courses. (Why only 50%?) Johnson responded that IDEA is expensive. The IDEA evaluation costs increased from $12,000 to $30,000 when we moved to 50%. This addresses the course evaluation requirements that are part of the CBA. Anyone who wants to have additional information can have all their courses evaluated. The CBA requires 100% of courses evaluated unless the campus president decides that less can be evaluated. Faculty are able to have additional courses evaluated for their own purposes.

Thompson elaborated that he is a tenured, full professor, has no RPT or PTR concerns, but he is teaching a radically different class and is thus not evaluating it. IDEA is the least useful set of information. It has had very little impact on his teaching over the last 20 years.

Colnic added that some IDEA evaluations are voluntary, some are mandatory. Foreman stated that IDEA is designed for everyone in every situation, so it is not precise. Faculty can design their own assessment device. IDEA is not a precise instrument.

Gerson suggested that students may get evaluation burn-out. They give even less feedback. Speaker Carroll stated that all history courses are evaluated. Ghuman commented that if we have forms specific to one course, would it become harder to compare the data to other courses. Speaker Carroll noted that there is widespread dissatisfaction with IDEA. The use of IDEA makes URPTC’s job more challenging. Regalado noted that IDEA is not effective; it is prudent to explore other avenues. There are much more efficient ways to evaluate.

Tuedio said that this analysis will provide data. Are there other forms that we should consider to compliment IDEA? IDEA does is show the connections that the faculty and students have. This resolution will return for a second reading.

1. **Second Reading Items**
	1. **1/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Policy on Amplified Sound Use on Campus (Replaces 1/AS/97/SAAC The Use of Amplified Sound on Campus)**

Shimek apologized for missing the first reading. He thanked Isabel for taking notes and giving him the comments. He also received emails that were germane and he incorporated these comments into the edits. He believes we have come to an understanding of the edits contained in these two documents. It is clear that there is a standard and it would require someone making a complaint to measure the sound to make a determination, with consultation with all parties, whether it is disruptive.

Wood asked if this policy covered sound in a classroom. Shimek responded that this policy covers all amplified sound. Wood asked what about students with hearing disability? Bettencourt responded that accommodations are made for hearing disabled students. Usually it’s a film that is captioned so they can read it and they may get a word by word transcription of the film. Carroll suggested that speakers could be installed to hang down from the ceiling.

McCulley received input from Staff members. Most staff suggest that instructors close their doors. The amplified sound is disruptive to staff working in their offices.

Strahm is glad that McCauley brought this up. She supports this policy as is and appreciates all the efforts that Shimek and others made. With regard to amplified sound in the classrooms, it is a valid complaint that it is disruptive in the offices of staff and faculty. When forty students are crammed in a small classroom with no air and no windows, it is necessary to open the door to get the room temperature cooled down. There are narrow and long classrooms packed with students, and the speakers are often located at the front so the sound has to be turned up so all students can hear. Regalado suggested that department chairs be made aware of these issues, as part time faculty may leave the campus before an agreement can be reached.

Strahm called the question, seconded by O’Brien. Results of the vote, 33 Yes, 2 No, 2 abstentions. The resolution passed.

Shimek said that based on these discussions, he has talked to Facilities about the sound issue in Bizzini that impacts students, faculty and staff. He has requested them to investigate and address these issues.

Regalado stated that Dept. chairs need to be aware of this problem and notify their faculty of this because lots of part time faculty may not be privy to all of this. Shimek plans to discuss this policy at the meeting of Department Chairs.

**b. 2/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy (Replaces the Posting Guidelines that were approved by the Academic Senate on 3/11/2003 and the President on 5/1/2003)**

Shimek highlighted several changes to the policy: “orderly appearance” clause was removed.

An addition was made: campus remains attractive and safe.

Silverman mentioned a specific situation in the computer science lab. He would like to post a sign to keep voices quiet during class, so he would like to post a sign on the lab door. Can he put the sign on the door per this policy?

Shimek stated that item C refers to faculty office doors, so a door to a classroom is not an exception to this policy. Shimek suggested that Silverman discuss postings with his colleagues.

Silverman noted that this is not his door so he can’t post a sign? Shimek said that it would have to meet the standards relevant to posting that flyer on that door. Shimek suggested that you and your colleagues would discuss that. Silverman wants a yes or no and what he heard is that he can post on his door and there is not an exception so the policy does not forbid that. Thompson asked about specific language 5 c on pg. 5 as follows:

Individual faculty offices including office doors and bulletin boards outside the office, except for the provisions of article IV. A. I. are not subject to this policy. Academic departments may post materials in designated areas assigned to them.

 Shimek stated that the last sentence refers to the department; each department will decide what will be posted on doors that the whole department uses.

Park inquired as to what the penalties are for violation of this policy. Just removal of the posting? Shimek stated that if something is posted that violates the policy there will be an administrative review. Strahm and Wisniewski commended Shimek for using the feedback from students to revise this policy.

Colnic called the question, Foreman seconded. Result of the vote, 36 Yes, 2 abstentions. The resolution passed.

1. **Open Forum**

Speaker Carroll noted that the WASC report was clipped with red and gold clips. He appreciated the school spirit.

1. **Adjournment**

3:25pm