**For**

**Academic Senate**

**April 18, 2017**

**Present:** Alvim, Azevedo, Bettencourt, Bice, Carroll, Chan, Crayton, C. Davis, Demers, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garone, Geer, Gerson, Gonzalez, Greer, Guichard, Hight, Huang, Nagel, McNally, Nainby, Odeh, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Sarraille, Sims, Strahm, Strangfeld, M. Thomas, Thompson, Wagner, Williams and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Bernard, Broadwater, Dyer, Wellman, Webster, Wooley, Stessman, Strickland, and Zhang,

**Guests:** Noted in the introductions.

Whitney Placido, Recording Secretary

**Second Reading Items:**

2/AS/17/SEC Resolution Reaffirming Equal Access to Quantitative Literacy for All California Children Enrolled in High School, Passed.

5/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendment to Article III. Organization of the General Faculty, Membership of the General Faculty, Passed.

6/AS/17/SEC Revision of University Mission, Vision and Values Statements, Passed.

7/AS/17/SEC Right to an Education Free from Fear & Harassment, Passed.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

May 9, 2017

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

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

**1. Call to order**

2:04 pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

**3. Approval of Agenda Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 4, 2017 (distributed electronically)**

Senator Wagner and Petrosky sent some text corrections via Asnet that will be incorporated into the final minutes. No additional changes, approved as provided.

**4. Introductions**

Steven Day (Student, History Major), Dave Evans (College of Science), Scott Davis (Faculty Director GE), Natalia Hermosillo (Student, Liberal Studies Major, Minor Ethnic Studies), Ariana Cruz-Araiza (Ethnic Studies Major, Co-President to the Ethnic Studies Club), Manuel Meacada (Ethnic and Liberal Studies Major), Xamuel Banales (Ethnic Studies Faculty), Bao Lo (Ethnic Studies Faculty), Oddmund Myhre (Dean COEKSW), Michele Lahti (University Advancement), Kilolo Brodie (Social Work, Chair), Dulce Moreno, Christian Fine (Theatre Major, Theatre Ambassador), Ramon Vargas (Theatre and Gender Studies, Theatre Ambassador), Shawna Young (Interim AVPAA), Gabriela Nuno (Enrollment Services), Neisha Rhodes (President’s Office), Janice Curtin (Communications and Public Affairs), Amanda Theis (President ’s Office), Clint Strode (University Police), Ron Rodriguez (Dean, Library Services), Gitanjali Kaul (VP-SPEMI), Helene Caudill (Dean, UEE), David Lindsay (Interim Dean, CBA), Jake Myers (AVP Faculty Affairs), Jill Tiemann-Gonzalez (Student Affairs), Mayy Lopez-Phillips (Student Affairs), Darrell Hayden (Business and Finance), Jim Tuedio (CAHSS), Lauren Byerly (Alumnia), Marcy Chvasta (Communication Studies)

**5. Announcements**

Caudill announced Greer who read a statement from President Junn.

I write to our campus community in light of recent events and to communicate some important information.  
   
First, ensuring campus safety and the well-being of our students, faculty, staff, administrators and community members is of paramount importance to me and my leadership team. Our campus has zero tolerance for violence and will always work collectively to protect and safeguard our students and campus community. In that spirit, and in response to the unease that has been communicated to me and others on our campus, I have asked our campus leadership, including our University Police, to redouble their vigilance in working to ensure a safe and welcoming learning environment.  
   
Second, we at Stan State cherish and uphold our core commitment to diversity and inclusion. As a community, we expressly and directly reject acts of racism, prejudice and intolerance. This strong stance for diversity and inclusion is clearly enunciated in multiple campus statements and resolutions, such as Respect for Campus Diversity of all Members of Campus Community (Sense of the Senate 10/AS/10/SEC). Reflective of this strongly articulated commitment, and in collaboration with the Academic Senate, last fall I convened our [President's Commission on Diversity and Inclusion](http://click.iwsend.com/?qs=c03a9de4ad76468c25aae2df20cce550488fc170beeff63c36eacb6d89e9b76486cf56b6447433ae5a51300de6481d46006c79e71b63b85c) (PCDI) and charged the commission to lead the establishment of a campus-wide institutional plan for diversity and inclusion. The PCDI and our entire campus community recognize our commitment to free speech and the 1stAmendment. In particular, we support the exchange of divergent views in the search for knowledge. We seek to balance this commitment with our core values of diversity and inclusion. As part of its work, and to assure this balance of free expression and a welcoming learning environment, PCDI and campus leadership will promote seminars, trainings and programs designed to help our campus community understand our shared values and establish effective strategies for addressing acts of prejudice and intolerance. To accomplish this, it is critical that our community address the underlying mindsets that endorse these acts.  
   
Third, if you feel unsafe or observe anything of concern, we encourage you to contact the **University Police Department** (phone 209-667-3114; [Public\_Safety@csustan.edu](mailto:Public_Safety@csustan.edu)). In case of an emergency, call 9-1-1. The **StanCares team** is available to address the needs of students who have a concern or need support and guidance (contact Jill Tiemann-Gonzalez, Judicial Affairs Officer, 209-664-6700; [stancares@csustan.edu](mailto:stancares@csustan.edu)). Additional resources are available through **Psychological Counseling**, which provides professional, ethical and confidential psychological counseling to students (209-667-3381; Vasche Library Building, Room L185).   
   
As I have shared with you in an earlier message, our collective future lies in the hands of our students. We as a community want that future to be safe, secure and welcoming. Please join me as we strive to build more supportive mentorships, enhanced friendships and constructive relationships across our campus and in our community. We must commit to our collective efforts to educate, model and learn. We can achieve this by promoting respectful, constructive and peaceful dialogue and interactions with others, and by building a society and ethos of greater understanding and harmony for everyone.

Greer noted that this message is to be sent to the campus community after this meeting today. Thank you for allowing the message to be shared.

Strahm said one of the things consistent across the conversations among diverse students in classes, and was said in classes, was the idea of modeling. In particular, she understands that it’s very difficult to create cultural change on campus if we don’t see it from the top down. The people who hold leadership positions and authority on campus and within the system, if they are overly cautious, if they are not willing to stand up and make a statement that says we will not stand for racism, homophobia, etc., that allows problems to continue. We need to hear our leadership say openly and forcefully that while everyone has freedom of speech, the university strongly disagrees with racist, homophobic, sexist, bigoted language and disavow it. What she’s saying is her students aren’t hearing that strong disavowal. They would like to hear that. What they also would like to see is long-term plans that include them, that are less bureaucratic and more tied to generational cultural shifts, that’s within the classroom, the structure, and the broader system.

Filling said the message that Greer read created a lot of discussion about what we face, and he has to confess we are better off calling things what they are. We need to deal with white supremacy and white privilege that’s at the roots of the racism in our society. It helps people to deal with things when we acknowledge what they are.

Eudey noted that two resolutions on the agenda today will help to counter narratives coming from other voices. There are two statements that we as campus leaders can make supporting diversity and inclusion by voting and approving them as united body.

Sims said hopefully we will get to continue this conversation in the open forum if there is further desire for commentary about this.

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

FAC – C. Davis noted that we will be discussing items 7b and 8b on today’s agenda. FAC was able to meet with Myers about the recruitment and appointment manual and FAC suggested changes to him to clarify issues that have been sent to FAC. They are hoping for revisions to address the concerns.

FBAC – Wooley is not here today but they are reviewing their final year-end report.

GC – Garone noted that their next meeting is this Thursday, April 20, 2017 and he will have things to report on after that.

ASCSU – Strahm said that the Interim meetings are tomorrow.

UEPC – Thomas spent time discussing CA Promise, and offered thanks to the work group that wrote most of that proposal, regarding how our campus can comply with legislation. There was also discussion of General Education Pathways/SEEs and how those fit in with campus infrastructure, and student financial aid issues.

**7. Second Reading Items:**

**a.**  2/AS/17/SEC Resolution Reaffirming Equal Access to Quantitative Literacy for All California Children Enrolled in High School

Strahm said two people had shared comments, and she had email conversations with them and felt that their concerns had been addressed. The only change was moving from access from to access to in the title.

Eudey loves that we’re making this statement.

Results of the Vote, 28 yes, 3 No and 0 abstained. Resolution passed.

b. 5/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendment to Article III. Organization of the General Faculty, Membership of the General Faculty

C. Davis said that they changed part of the rationale to say some administrators are included in the general faculty, and the proposed text is unchanged.

Results of the Vote, 29 yes, 3 No and 1 abstained. Resolution passed.

This body recommends this amendment. C. Davis says this will go to the general faculty for a vote, along with the other two proposed amendments voted on at the last AS meeting. These will be addressed in three separate votes on the one ballot. All FT faculty are eligible to vote. Please encourage your colleagues to vote.

c. 6/AS/17/SEC Revision of University Mission, Vision and Values Statements

Sims says there were two changes, the first in response to clarity of the title, and it has been shortened to put more clarity on what the resolution does. A second was a request to include “social justice” instead of just “justice,” and that was affirmed.

Sims provided a statement on justice. Terms are extremely important.

***Social justice****is the*[*fair*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fairness_(disambiguation))*and*[*just*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Justice)*relation between the*[*individual*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Individual)*and*[*society*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Society)*. This is measured by the explicit and tacit terms for the*[*distribution of wealth*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distribution_of_wealth)*, opportunities for personal activity and*[*social privileges*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Privilege_(social_inequality))*. In*[*Western*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_Civilization)*as well as in older*[*Asian cultures*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture_of_Asia)*, the concept of social justice has often referred to the process of ensuring that individuals fulfill their*[*societal roles*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Role_theory)*and receive what was their due from society. In the current global*[*grassroots movements*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grassroots)*for social justice, the emphasis has been on the breaking of barriers for*[*social mobility*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_mobility)*, the creation of*[*safety nets*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_safety_net)*and*[*economic justice*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_inequality)

*Social justice assigns rights and duties in the*[*institutions*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institution)*of society, which enables people to receive the basic benefits and burdens of cooperation. The relevant institutions often include*[*taxation*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxation)*,*[*social insurance*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_insurance)*,*[*public health*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_health)*,*[*public school*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_school)*,*[*public services*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_services)*,*[*labour law*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Labour_law)*and*[*regulation*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regulation)*of*[*markets*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Market_(economics))*, to ensure*[*fair*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fair)[*distribution of wealth*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distribution_of_wealth)*, and*[*equal opportunity*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Equal_opportunity)*.*

*Interpretations that relate justice to a*[*reciprocal relationship*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reciprocity_(social_and_political_philosophy))*to society are mediated by differences in cultural traditions, some of which emphasize the individual responsibility toward society and others the equilibrium between access to power and its responsible use. Hence, social justice is invoked today while reinterpreting historical figures such as*[*Bartolomé de las Casas*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bartolom%C3%A9_de_las_Casas)*, in philosophical debates about differences among human beings, in efforts for gender, racial and*[*social equality*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_equality)*, for advocating justice for*[*migrants*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emigration)*, prisoners, the*[*environment*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_justice)*, and the physically and mentally*[*disabled*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disability)*.*

*While the concept of social justice can be traced through the theology of*[*Augustine of Hippo*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Augustine_of_Hippo)*and the philosophy of*[*Thomas Paine*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Paine)*, the term "social justice" became used explicitly from the 1840s. A*[*Jesuit*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jesuit)*priest named*[*Luigi Taparelli*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Luigi_Taparelli)*is typically credited with coining the term, and it spread during the*[*revolutions of 1848*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revolutions_of_1848)*with the work of*[*Antonio Rosmini-Serbati*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antonio_Rosmini-Serbati)*. In the late industrial revolution,*[*progressive*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Progressive_era)*American legal scholars began to use the term more, particularly*[*Louis Brandeis*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_Brandeis)*and*[*Roscoe Pound*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roscoe_Pound)*. From the early 20th century it was also embedded in*[*international law*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_law)*and institutions; the preamble to establish the*[*International Labour Organization*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Labour_Organization)*recalled that "universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice." In the later 20th century, social justice was made central to the philosophy of the*[*social contract*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract)*, primarily by*[*John Rawls*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Rawls)*in*[*A Theory of Justice*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Theory_of_Justice)*(1971). In 1993, the*[*Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vienna_Declaration_and_Programme_of_Action)*treats social justice as a purpose of the*[*human rights education*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_rights_education)*.*

Sims thinks the feedback to modify the term to SJ was on point, and supports what the President’s Commission is trying to do, and as Strahm says, this is putting our values front and center as an institution, what we lead with as a public institution we are directly involved in the application or non-application of social justice. We are a large mover. Thinks it’s a positive change.

Wagner sent a statement prepared this morning to read. A student was in his office, a junior, and he asked her for her opinion. Another student said these are nice words, and agrees with justice in the mission statement. He offered the following as a statement from a second student, o

Dear Senators,

I am a junior at CSU Stanislaus. As a student, I am more interested in the quality of the education I am getting rather than whether the University agrees with my social views. I do not think that it is the role of a college to take sides or associate itself, even slightly, with political activist groups of any kind.

Some companies might not employ me just because of this. What if a future interviewer or hiring manager researches my school and finds that it showcases activism rather than academic excellence?

I would rather be valued for my knowledge and skill rather than my ability to conform to a certain view, whether it’s good or bad.

Sincerely and respectfully,

[A CSU Stanislaus student]

Wagner also read from a longer statement that was submitted in full to Asnet just prior to the meeting. It reads:

I was asked at the last Senate meeting “why” I had a problem with the term, “social justice,” and I brought up “riots in Berkeley.” I did not and do not intend to talk about the Berkeley riots. All of us know how to use Google so, what’s there to talk about, right?

I do realize there is potential litigation risk involved – that was actually one of the reasons for my objection two weeks ago – so I do not want to talk about the Berkeley riots other than to point out two facts about them:

1. Those people participating, on both sides, are generally college students.

2. Many of those people participating, on both sides, are getting hurt.

I point out the obvious because I believe that those two facts should concern all of you as much as it does me. It concerns me because, as a professor and an advisor, I consider Stanislaus State University students to be under my protection.

This is important to me, and I believe that the label, “social justice warrior,” is an obvious word association given our school mascot that anyone would make, so even though the word “warrior” is nowhere in the revised mission statement document itself, I thought it relevant to the current discussion. Furthermore, I believe that carrying that label, intentional or otherwise, will make our students less safe.

Generally, I am with the Committee with respect to the spirit and intention of the document overall. But I believe that violence is bad for everybody, and I, personally, want to minimize the risk of its coming here to Turlock. To illustrate my perspective on the whole student protest/counter-protest situation, please give me a couple of minutes to tell you about something that happened to me somewhat recently.

I remember it was just a couple days before my 50th birthday. I was in an argument with my youngest daughter, who is 8 years old. She was mad at me, and I was mad at her. She had stomped off and I thought that that would be the end of it. But then she came back to me and said, “You are a grown man, Dad, but I’m just a little girl.”

I did not respond immediately. I was angry, but I thought about what she’d said. It was a true statement after all. And then, rather suddenly and only for an instant, I saw myself from her perspective; and what I saw, quite frankly, was just terrible. And I cried, which I almost never do, and she forgave me. We both healed. I have absolutely no business being mad at her or any other little girl. I am supposed to protect her from trauma, emotional or otherwise. The point is, my words caused a visceral response, and my realization of that shook me to my core.

Which brings me to my point: For many people, social justice has negative connotations. For some, it can trigger a visceral response. I would prefer that the term social justice be removed from the proposed mission statement document without replacement. I am attaching an amended version of the document that I believe preserves the intention and spirit of the previous revision, and I am submitting it as a friendly amendment.

Wagner summarized by noting, for many people Social Justice has negative connotations. For some it triggers a negative response, it’s visceral. He’s not attacking social justice, itself. But we can’t ignore that it also has some negative connotations. He asks to remove Social Justice from the statement without replacement. As a friendly amendment, he’d like to offer a revised mission statement that he believes preserves the intention of the statement, and by emphasizing inclusion may be gaining something.

C. Davis noted that a within a resolution, an attached document cannot be revised on the floor, you can only request it be returned to the committee. We cannot amend attached policy, only the rationale. C. Davis said we can’t amend the MVV and diversity statements on the floor of the Senate. The only thing we can do via parliamentary procedure, is to request it to be returned to the committee for further discussion. Wagner moves that we send it back to committee.

Thompson wants to clarify that if you look at the standing rules of the Senate, you can’t go into an underlying document unless under a 2/3 vote to waive the rule. It’s not impossible to go into an underlying document, but it requires a 2/3 vote. The following are the parliamentary procedures we operate under:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Motion** | **Floor?** | **Second?** | | **Debate?** | | **Amend?** | | **Vote** |
| Amend | Y | Y1 | Y | | Y | | Majority | |
| Amend Amendment | Y | Y | Y | | N | | Majority | |
| Call for previous Question (end debate and move to a vote) | Y | Y | N | | N | | 2/32 | |
| Challenge ruling of the Chair | N3 | N | Y | | N | | Majority | |
| Debate, limit | Y | Y | N | | Y | | 2/3 | |
| Divide the question4 | Y | Y | N | | Y | | Majority | |
| Division (provide a countable vote) | N | N | N | | N | | N/A | |
| Point of information/parliamentary inquiry | N | N | N | | N | | N/A | |
| Table to a certain time | Y | Y | N | | Y | | Majority | |
| Table indefinitely5 | Y | Y | Y | | N | | Majority | |
| Refer (e.g. to a committee) | Y | Y | Y | | Y | | Majority | |
| Waive 2nd reading--move to action item | Y | Y | Y | | N | | 2/3 | |

**Floor?** If *yes*, you must have been recognized by the Chair and have the floor to take this action.

**Second?** If *yes,* the action requires a second.

**Debate?**  If *yes,* the action may be debated.

**Amend?** If *yes*, the action may be amended.

**1** For any amendment, the proposer may ask if the amendment is “friendly”, meaning acceptable to the senate without the need for debate. If it is “friendly”, it is simply incorporated into the resolution. *Any senator* may object to an amendment, thus making it “unfriendly” and causing the proposed amendment to require a second and majority approval.

**2** Requires a countable vote. Vote is 2/3 of those *voting* (rather than 2/3 of those present) and excluding abstentions. Outcome is determined by taking the number of “no” votes, doubling that number, then seeing if it is greater than the number of “aye” votes. E.g. **23** aye, 12 no; 12 x 2 = **24**, motion fails **OR** **24** aye, 12 no, 12 x 2 = **24**, motion passes.

**3** That is, you may interrupt.

**4** For example, in a resolution on program review an amendment is proposed adding “that the program reviews will receive written feedback from the Provost and the President to the program under review.” Someone might wish to “divide” and consider separately whether the Provost provides feedback and then whether the President provides feedback.

**5** Table indefinitely means the resolution is “dead” for that college year but may be proposed again in the following or subsequent college year.

Panos seconded Wagner’s motion to to return the resolution to committee.

Greer said after the last time it was presented to the Senate, it did go back to the workgroup, to add social, and there was agreement with this, and ASI made a recommendation to add the words social, so it has been revisited once, and this would ask them to revisit it again.

Vote on return to committee: 5 Yes, 25 No, 3 Abstained 76% vote No. Motion defeated.

Wagner asked the process for revising it.

Petrosky said while any group has its outliers, the sentiment of his dept. and college is overwhelmingly supportive of the revisions presented.

Thompson said we are not necessarily for or against something if we ask questions about the language and process. This is now the fourth discussion he’s been in around the “diversity” statement and every discussion he’s been in, he’s been supportive of it, but in the first three discussions he was left with the perception that most people in the room thought he was not supportive of it. When Wagner asked about the minutes, he looked at them, and didn’t think the conversation went this way. Thompson noted that after his comment at the last AS meeting, Wellman made kind of an angry response. Thompson said if someone asked a pointed question, it doesn’t mean that they’re against the resolution. Not every statement has to be a gushing endorsement. The question he asked was about the effect it would have on hiring. That’s a real question without speaking to whether he supports the document or not. Especially when discussing this type of document, we need to take strenuous pains to understanding what people are saying and take care to understand others. Irony there.

Filling said that to Thompson, should note the ordering of the comments had very little to do with you, but that he was next in line to speak. He wouldn’t dare make those statements suggesting Thompson wasn’t supportive of diversity and inclusion, he knows you better. Sometimes accurate appearance in the minutes still distorts what people meant.

Wagner wanted to minimalize violence coming to Turlock. The point is that the worst possible response, negative emotions, have to at least be acknowledged. He wanted to have his two cents there.

Nainby echoes what Thompson says about discussion at the dept. level. He had a sense that in his dept. there would be relatively unanimity in his department. But this is complex with respect to language. Some consternation in his dept. about how to include language in a document, and to what extent they reflect a broad consensus, and can undermine our ability to take a stance in respect of power and privilege. He was caught off guard by that, which won’t change his vote, but it’s a difficult question to bring back to a group of people, especially how language represents values across a group of people even if committed to understanding power and privilege.

Garone has a question for Wagner, hopes it is appropriate. Based on what you were just saying, he shares concern about violence not coming to the campus. Have you heard directly or indirectly? Sims asked to direct topics to the chair, to try to keep conversations from becoming emotionally elevated or person-to-person. Sometimes the strongest allies may be the persons asking the most pointed questions. Parliamentary practice is designed to keep us in that safe space.

Filling suggests, “if I might ask my esteemed colleague through the speaker”

Garone hoped it was clear that he’s trying to be polite and respectful. He’s curious if anyone heard directly or indirectly if anyone made threats of bringing violence if this was approved. Wagner said no. But did indicate a negative emotion.

Bardon is in favor of inclusive statement and use of social justice.

Responding to an inquiry, Sims noted that Meriam Webster was the source for his statement on Social Justice.

Garcia appreciates the definition offered, and fully supports the resolution. He thinks the questions are good questions. He worries if we’re clear about what we’re signing up for here. The statement says we embrace diversity, equity, inclusion and social justice as components of education. This is not SJ broadly, but what it means for an educational institution. This leads to discussions in his dept. What does a socially just classroom look like? Violence he’s concerned about is less about outside violence, but the violence in our classrooms. Freire uses the idea that in educational institutions, social justice is acting in opposition to oppression and overwhelming control. These are aspects of educational classroom where there is overwhelming control, and that’s what he is signing up against. Citing Freire, oppression in the classroom includes views that

(a) the teacher teaches and the students are taught;

(b) the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;

(c) the teacher thinks and the students are thought about;

(d) the teacher talks and the students listen – meekly;

(e) the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;

(f) the teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply;

(g) the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher;

(h) the teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it;

(i) the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his or her own professional authority, which she and he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students;

(j) the teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects (Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, p 73).

To Garcia, when we address social justice in classroom and educational setting, he thinks this Freirian perspective is what we’re talking about. If you put this in the document, does this have an impact on hiring? What is your teaching philosophy? This fits beautifully in his discipline. He leaves it to others to consider does this fit in your classroom and is that what you’re signing up for? He’s in full support, but it’s worth discussion as to what this means in the educational institution.

Sims said he read the minutes from three years ago in this body when the diversity statement was first addressed. It’s important that there isn’t prescriptive language, what we have to do or are supposed to do. It is a statement of values just like the other values listed, and no more prescriptive. The values do influence what and how we teach, that is why they’re articulated in the MVV. This is what drives an institution. While not perspective, it is an articulation of our values and a facet we thought needed to be articulated forthrightly. This is tied to academic freedom, collegial decision making, and policy that goes through normal processes.

Addressing again the possibility of revising the MVV during this senate meeting, C. Davis noted the procedure is to vote with a 2/3 majority to waive rules of the Senate so that the attachment can be revised on the floor. If we vote on this resolution and it failed, it would come back next year only if the committee brings it forward. This Senate cannot set the agenda for next year’s Senate.

Results of the Vote: 29 yes, 3 No, 2 abstained 85% yes Vote. We will recommend the resolution to the president.

d. 7/AS/17/SEC Right to an Education Free from Fear & Harassment

Strahm said that the changes that have been made are noted in blue. There were comments requesting changes, in particular the Senator from History suggested on page 3, in the second full resolved, second bullet point that perhaps the language could be read as discriminatory, so they changed that to “Assist DACA students…” When she was in college at University of Oregon, the Asian fiscal crisis took place, and students saw money collapse. U of Oregon and OSU created deferred tuition and financial assistance programs, and emergency loans. So to allow consideration of something similar, she also added a fourth bullet, to pursue sustainable funding sources. On the back page, they added some groups to be included in the distribution based on feedback received here and through email. She also updated the campus name throughout.

Sims noted lots of feedback was taken to heart. FBAC had feedback about not overpromising about financial supports.

Carroll noted a grammatical error in the footnote, and the need to take out duplicative “1998” wording. Carroll was thanked for the close reading, and this will be edited.

Greer noted support for the resolution. On page 3, toward bottom in the next to last resolved it mentions “14 days’ notice,” and she wonders if “when possible” could be added, as this is asking for notification when agencies or groups are here for trainings and career fairs, but there are times when don’t know or don’t know in 14 days in advance. Sims said that’s why we used the term “should” rather than shall. We agree, thought it was okay. Greer did catch the should. In spirit, she didn’t know if we would always know or be able to provide it.

Nainby said, in the bullet point above, if distinguishing between should and shall, shall should be in the place above. The one above is more prescriptive than ideal language, so “shall” should be used in the resolved above.

Sarraille said administrators haven’t had trouble interpreting the term in the future. Greer said if there is a shared interpretation, she’s okay with it. Sims agrees with Sarraille, that should be a loose term.

Carroll noted that should also appears two resolved above that.

Sims is asking if this is an objection or critical observation. If it’s a stronger comment, then we may need to send back to committee and consider the changes.

Nainby underscores, if we’re looking at “shall not enter into agreements…” this may be problematic. He didn’t come to the meeting expecting to be concerned. But now he’s more convinced it would be “shall.” We wouldn’t want to signal latitude for administration.

Greer than encourages use of language from the Chancellor’s statement, to avoid interpretative concerns. If we quote the statement from CO, it’s shorter and more clear.

Filling said with respect to “shall,” as a body, we don’t have the role to set policy. We can say should, or urge setting policy, which seems to be equivalent.

Wagner said it seems there have been many friendly amendments. Sims noted none were offered formally, but instead were ideas presented via discussion. Sims noted that we could make some changes because the text is in the resolved clauses. If there is a friendly amendment, without need for debate as a clarification or improvement, we can make it. Any senator may object to an amendment, and if there is an objection, it makes it unfriendly and requires a vote. The language of the resolution can be changed by the senate in this meeting because of the manner this was written (content in the resolution, not an attachment).

Eudey said to be clear people are making comments. Sims was asking if anyone is concerned enough to send this back to the committee. Right now, we need to decide if it needs to be sent back to the Committee or if the comments are not enough to send this back to the Committee and we can either accept it as it is, or vote to make adjustments while we’re here before the final vote on the resolution.

Sarraille spoke in favor of the resolution. He strongly recommends to everyone to vote on this today and approve it. The most important thing is to get our expression of support to the people involved. Everyone knows where the will to help flies, where authorities come in with a warrant we may not do all that we would like to do, if they come with a court order or whatever. This expresses where we stand, and we should get it out there as soon as we can.

Chen said it’s maybe a typo, but the document uses the term Latinx. Sims noted the term is now adopted as an alternative to Latino/a.

Carroll is still confused. Regarding Nainby’s suggestion of shall in the resolved. Where does that stand? Carroll favors it, and moves it as a friendly amendment, that on page three, second to last resolved clause be changed to read we “shall” enter into agreements and enforcements. There was an objection. Sarraille seconded the motion, so there was debate on the amendment.

Filling said this body is not enabled to mandate CSU Stanislaus to do anything other than consider, so you would need to further modify to say “respectfully suggest that the CSU Stan administration institute a policy that says we shall…”

Thompson asked if this is a Sense of the Senate. Sims indicated this is a recommendatory amendment. This doesn’t indicate a Sense of the Senate, so it would be so. He would entertain a resolution to make a Sense of the Senate, but that’s not the issue on the floor.

Wood asked if federal law asks us to comply with authorities because we receive federal funding. Immigration law may require us to abide by law since we receive federal funding. Strahm said that the current understanding is that FERPA law supersedes the public records act, so ICE cannot come to campus and demand records because FERPA supersedes. In that case we can say all of this.

Wood is having trouble with his esteemed colleague’s suggestion to change the wording to “Shall” because of the concern is that if the administration abides by that, they could place self or university in violation of law. Sims said he didn’t want to place the president in a position to sign something she can’t sign.

Greer said she’s not sure if this helps or complicates things. Because there are questions, she wonders if using the Chancellor’s Office language would help. If we revised the statement to be consistent with the CO memo, but would be a significant rewrite. Greer doesn’t support the current amendment because there is a clearer way to make a statement about “should.”

Sarraille seconded proposal for the amendment to try to facilitate the conversation, but his opinion is we should go on, pass it, without overthinking this. He thinks we should defeat proposed amendment, pass the resolution as written, as there’s no way to be perfect or to have a beautiful statement that is exact. The chancellor’s office statement doesn’t do that, and this doesn’t. Let’s pass it and show where we stand and that we’re not afraid to make the statement.

Carroll said he is now voting against the amendment he proposed based on the discussion. Carroll then withdrew the motion, and Sarraille concurred. The proposed amendment is withdrawn.

Carroll called the question, Davis seconds. Voting to end debate. 30 Yes 2 No 1 Abstained.

Results of the Vote on the resolution: 32 Yes, 1 No, 1 Abstained. Resolution passed.

**8. First Reading Items**

a. 8/AS/17/SEC Adoption of Electronic Working Personnel Action Files

Eudey moved, Filling seconded.

**8/AS/17/SEC Adoption of Electronic Working Personnel Action Files**

Whereas: Adoption of an electronic Working Personnel Action File (e-WPAF) system will improve reviewers’ access to materials submitted in the Retention, Promotion and Tenure process; and

Whereas: The use of e-WPAFs will improve the organization of material submitted for RPT review; therefore

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommends the adoption of e-WPAFs; and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate encourages the Associate Vice-President for Faculty Affairs to work in close consultation with the University’s Faculty Affairs Committee; Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee; and chapter of the California Faculty Association, to determine an appropriate timeline and process for implementation of an e-WPAF system; and be it further

Resolved: That the consultation process will address additional needs for implementation, including ready availability of appropriate tools for faculty members to convert, upload and archive all materials.

Rationale:

The replacement of traditional, print-binder portfolios for Working Personnel Action Files with electronic portfolios will simplify the process of file review, assist faculty members in file preparation and maintenance; increase access for all who will review the files; and save considerable human and material resources currently involved in review of print-binder portfolios. Further, an effective e-WPAF system will provide a number of additional tools and resources not currently available either to faculty members or reviewers, and lessen the time required to prepare, read and review files each year.

Eudey clarified what the resolution aims to do. Eudey wants to be clear that the resolution is asking for a consulting process. This doesn’t mean that the first day back this exists. This is giving Jake Myers time to work with governing committees to develop a process. We would be indicating our acknowledgement that there is a financial cost to moving to an electronic option.

Filling will vote in favor. He wishes the whereas statements were less assumptive of facts not in evidence. He’s not clear it will undeniably improve things without evidence, so he’s a little cautious. Maybe modify the statements.

Petrosky asked will we revisit this before implementation with respect to security. Myers says before we purchase the contract, OIT has to do a security risk analysis. Sims says it’s a formal part of the process.

Nagel is unclear why this resolution is here. Why do we need to empower this discussion to begin exploring this? In addition to other issues raised about security, there are questions about confidentiality of these documents. This doesn’t suggest that he mistrusts anybody, but this is sort of a blank document saying these are good. He’s not sure what systems are in place to make sure consultation is done so that when working with PAFs for appointment, hiring, tenure and review that only those people who are part of that process have access to the files since they are confidential. He can’t support this because he doesn’t know about the system that may come. But again, he’s not sure why we need a resolution to say let’s look into it.

OIT should be listed in the resolved as part of the bodies to review issues in an appropriate timeline.

Giventer asked if the idea is to purchase a product from a vendor that will facilitate the composition of these things. Sims said there was a presentation at the end of the last meeting showing the recommended vendor. Interfolio is the provider other CSUs are using. It is more robust, more secure, more reliable than other versions people have used including Bb. Most moved to Interfolio to be more robust.

Davis said this is the system presented by the presenter over the phone at the last meeting. She believes the reasons it’s coming to senate to discuss is so that there is some sense that we either say yes we want to continue looking into this, or we can make an expression that at this moment we don’t think we should pursue it. Davis is not 100% for it, but that’s why we’re bringing it to senate.

Sims said as a matter of process, the AVPFA wanted to be sure he was consulting early to have a sense this was something we wanted to look at. If no, he wanted to know that early. While generally there is support, there is also some hesitation and wariness about specifics. His sense is that our AVP is trying to build consensus so no one seems to be moving on their own. Sims sees this as positive, transparent, consulting early. Consultation is happening early in the process, which is something we’re not always accustomed to.

Carroll is in favor of consultation. He shares Nagel concerns, but seriously considering this sounds great. The first resolved is saying we recommend this. He’s asking SEC to consider qualifying the statement in the first resolved.

Thompson agrees with points from Carroll and Nagel, from SEC, does it not need to go out to URPTC, FAC, to look at the idea of adopting electronic files?

Myers noted he consulted with the chair of URPTC and the former co-chair. He made clear that the current CBA does allow for e-WPAFs. While consultation with CFA is not required, since the former co-chair of URPTC is also CFA president, this means there was also some consultation with CFA. There were also consultation with FAC. All those mentioned by Thompson were consulted prior to bringing this resolution forward.

Thompson said that wasn’t the sense of consultation he was referring to. He asked if senate referred this item to FAC and URPTC. Sims said SEC engaged FAC. Davis said FAC has been busy, so it was not a full in-depth discussion. Sims noted there will be formal consultation with FAC if this starts moving forward.

Nagel mentioned asking a couple of campuses about how they have experienced moving to e-WPAFs. One that is stated to have them, does not. They use Interfolio for dossiers, but still have paper WPAFs. He notes in the current process someone who looks at contents must sign a log sheet, and this is useful info during grievance procedures, and he’s not sure how Interfolio gives a confirmation of that or not. Sims said Interfolio time logs who logs in, can designate who has access, turns off, more robust to see who reviewed the file. It does account for that.

Please send additional questions or comments to SEC.

McNally is concerned if they will be forced to be all electronic, or will have a choice of paper or electronic. Sims noted that this is some of the detail that will be worked out via the consultation process, but nothing in the resolution requires only electronic WPAFs.

b. **9/AS/17/FAC Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy for 2017-2018**

Davis moved the resolution, Nagel seconds.

**9/AS/17/FAC Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy for 2017-2018**

Whereas: CSU system practice suspended Service Step Increases over a decade ago; and

Whereas: Temporary faculty employees are unable to qualify for a range elevation in salary until they have reached the SSI maximum for their current range, thus trapping them in a cycle where it is impossible to qualify for range elevation; therefore

Be it Resolved: That the attached policy become effective immediately on recommendation of the Academic Senate and approval by the president; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy supersedes the previous Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy (2/AS/08/FAC); and be it further

Resolved: That this policy shall expire on May 31, 2018; and be it further

Resolved: That FAC shall be directed to develop and recommend a permanent policy during the 2017-2018 academic year.

Rationale:

Range elevation is a salary increase lecturer can apply for once their base salary reaches the SSI maximum for their current range, and they have been in that range at least 5 years. Because of the lack of SSIs in multiple years, many lecturers have been stuck without any opportunity either for in-range salary increases, or the chance they would have gotten for range elevation had SSIs been paid. To address this, CFA and CSU administration bargained a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that provides for opportunities for lecturers facing this salary issue to apply for range elevation *one time only*.

The lecturers can apply only with the cohort designated in the MOU. The first cohort includes lecturers who have been in the same salary range for 12 or more “Full-Time Adjusted Service” years (i.e., the equivalent of 12 years full-time). That cohort may apply for range elevation *only* in Fall 2017. The second cohort includes lecturers with 9 or more years of such service, who may apply *only* in Fall 2018. The third includes lecturers with 6 or more years of service, who may apply *only* in Fall 2019.

The current policy for range elevation at CSU Stanislaus was passed in 2008. It is out of compliance with changes in the CBA since then, as well as out of compliance with an arbitration ruling from 2010 regarding evaluation criteria for range elevation. A policy that complies with the CBA is needed, for lecturers in the first cohort to be able to apply in Fall 2017.

Because of the urgency of needing a workable Range Elevation Policy, FAC is bringing forward this policy as an interim measure. In order to provide for a robust process of shared governance to form policies, the resolution stipulates that the proposed policy expires on May 31, 2018, and calls upon FAC to develop a policy in academic year 2017-18.

**Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy, 2017-2018**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this policy is to establish a means by which lecturers may be granted range elevation consistent with the CSU Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (Article 12.16 to 12.21).

**Definition:** Range elevation refers to movement on the salary scale schedule for lecturers to the next range. Faculty awarded range elevation move from their current salary range to the next higher range (for example, from A to B), receive a salary increase consistent with Article 31 of the CBA, and become eligible for Service Salary Increase (SSIs) in the new range.

**Eligibility:** Lecturers and temporary librarian faculty unit employees who have served at least five (5) years in the current range and have reached the SSI maximum shall be considered eligible for range elevation. Any additional eligibility shall be according to the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement and relevant Memoranda of Understanding or amendments thereto.

**Notification:** On or before September 1, 2017, the campus shall notify lecturers eligible for range elevation. Failure to notify an eligible lecturer shall not be cause for automatic granting of range elevation. An eligible lecturer not properly notified may still apply for range elevation.

**Effective**

**Date:** Range elevation, as well as applicable salary increases, shall take effect at the beginning of the first appointment in the academic year following review.

**Criteria:** Criteria for range elevation for temporary faculty (excluding coaches) shall be appropriate to the lecturer’s work assignment (CBA Article 12.19). The basis for a recommendation to grant range elevation shall be a positive assessment of the overall quality of faculty performance in assigned work. Lecturers whose primary assignment is teaching will have demonstrated excellence in facilitating student learning by maintaining currency in their field and by refining and improving teaching practices based on self-reflection and assessment.

**Application**

**Process:** Each applicant shall submit a letter to the appropriate department chair providing a rationale for range elevation, including reference to documentation in the applicant’s Personnel Action File (PAF) to justify that rationale (e.g., CV, evaluations of work assignments, student comments/letters, and any letters demonstrating participating in faculty development or professional activities). Application letters shall be submitted by October 1, 2017 for review. The department chair shall submit the letter to the department committee charged with evaluating fulltime Temporary Faculty.

**Review**

**Process:** The department committee charged with evaluating Temporary Faculty (i.e., lecturers) shall review the application letter and contents of the applicant’s PAF for the relevant period of review (employment in that range). Applying review criteria above, the department committee shall make a recommendation regarding range elevation by November 1, 2017. The recommendation shall be in the form of a memo to the university Provost. The Provost will render a decision and notify the applicant by November 30, 2017.

**Salary**

**Increase:** In accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, a successful range elevation award shall be accompanied by a salary increase of at least 5%.

**Authority:** The President shall grant range elevation based on recommendations from the university Provost.

**Denial:** Denial of range elevations shall be subject to appeal as specified in the CBA, Article 12.20.

Davis said there are a lot of contingent faculty, not Tenured or Tenure Track, stuck in a certain salary range without SSIs, and without SSIs, they can’t get the big step increase. They had to exhaust SSIs before being qualified for a range elevation, but there have been no SSIs for years, so there was no way to qualify for a range elevation. They were caught between a change in practice and policy. We have a cohort eligible for one-time only range elevation due to a side letter, but they will only be eligible in the fall. If they don’t do it in fall, they get stuck again. Our current policy is out of compliance with the CBA. The AVPFA, CFA rep, and FAC have put together a policy to cover just 2017-18 with the understanding that FAC will return to this in fall to make a new/permanent policy. This has a twilight date of May 31, 2018. This allows the cohort to apply for range elevations assuming they’re eligible for them.

Bettencourt notes in the eligibility language that counselors weren’t included, is there a reason? Davis said the policy would cover whomever is eligible according to the side letter. It appears that it’s because none in PCS is eligible.

Nagel said the side memorandum mentions lecturers and temporary librarians, not coaches and there is not a specific mention of counseling faculty, but believes in terms of range elevation, counseling faculty are treated the same. Until 2 weeks ago, it’s been about 12 years since a range elevation was granted on this campus.

Nainby is in favor for the simple reason that it will provide clarity for those who could use some, such as lecturers who haven’t had an opportunity for raises, and for dept. chairs who can’t support lecturers under the current policy.

This will go back to FAC in preparation for a second reading next time. This will be circulated more widely before it’s back as a second reading to see if there is something we missed. This is corrective, bringing local policy in line with the CBA, with sunsetting to make it more effective, but we want a short term policy that is as effective as we can make it.

c. 10/AS/17/UEPC Campus Implementation of SB 412: The California Promise

Sims noted this is tied to Senate bill 412. We discussed this a couple of meetings ago. Those with experience with timelines, this passed the legislature in September, and we need to be ready for fall 2017 implementation. This was a very short timeline. We’re trying to get this done.

Thomas moved the resolution. Eudey seconds.

**10/AS/17/UEPC Campus Implementation of SB 412: The California Promise**

Whereas: California State Senate Bill SB-412 “The California Promise” was approved by Governor Jerry Brown on September 21, 2016; and

Whereas: California State University, Stanislaus, has been designated by the Chancellor’s Office as one of eight CSU campuses mandated to implement the transfer student portion of the California Promise Program, for students transferring in Fall 2017; and

Whereas: A fundamental required component of campus implementation of SB-412 is priority registration, making timeliness an essential concern; therefore

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommends adoption of the implementation of the California Promise program as outlined in the attached document; and be it further

Resolved: That this program is made available to qualifying transfer students starting in Fall 2017.

Rationale:

Since the California state legislature has discovered that it can attempt to reform the CSU by

legislative mandate, our campus is compelled to respond to required initiatives, benchmarks and

timelines that are not of our choosing. The short timeline for implementation of the California

Promise program is an example of this, especially since it mandates priority registration.

To implement this essential, required program component while serving both the desired

outcomes as well as all of the other, myriad needs and priorities extant among students, an ad

hoc work group was formed from the University Education Policies Committee, who have

formulated and recommended the attached outline. The outline, and the concomitant practices it

suggests, represent a fairly limited initial implementation of the California Promise, to allow for

adjustment as the program grows and develops, and to limit possible negative effects to the

general student body while also serving the goals set by SB-412 and the needs of the students

who choose to participate in the program?

This proposal was affirmatively reviewed by both UEPC and SEC prior to presentation to the

Academic Senate.

**The California Promise Two-Year Graduation Pledge**

The Stanislaus State Two-Year Graduation Pledge is a program designed to guarantee graduation within 2 years for California resident students with an Associate Degree for Transfer.

To qualify, students must:

* + Be a California resident;
  + Have completed an Associate Degree for Transfer;
  + Declared a major deemed similar by Stanislaus State.

Qualifying students sign a pledge to meet the following program requirements:

* + Meet with an assigned California Promise major advisor to develop an enrollment plan.
  + Enter the enrollment plan into StanPlanner.
  + Enroll in classes and pay fees by the required deadlines.
  + Meet at least once per semester with the assigned California Promise major advisor to monitor and modify the enrollment plan as appropriate, and update the plan in StanPlanner accordingly.
  + Complete 30 semester units that count toward the enrollment plan within each academic year (Winter Intersession and Summer Session included).

As part of the pledge, the University commits to providing the following:

* + An assigned California Promise major advisor who will assist the student in developing an enrollment plan, meet with the student at least once per semester to monitor academic progress, and who will help to modify the plan as appropriate;
  + Prioritization by student level classification of second pass within the Two-Pass Registration System.[[1]](#footnote-1)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

‘Prioritization by student level classification’ means that—*during second pass registration only*—CA Promise students will be prioritized within their level classification, i.e., seniors will get second-pass priority over other seniors, juniors only over other juniors, etc.

Sims said this was drafted by an appointed workgroup out of UEPC. They did a lot of work very quickly. The group included Mark Thompson, Shawna Young, Betsy Eudey, Scott Davis, and Lisa Bernardo. These members were best positioned to know the changes we could feasibly make. He hopes it’s clear in the language that priority registration is a contentious topic, but it’s mandated by the bill, and we worried how to implement it. The workgroup offers a savvy implementation which serves the CA Promise members and our need to serve that in addition to support our other students. For transfer students who enter into the agreement, they get priority on second pass only within classification. Seniors before other seniors, juniors before other juniors. Other priority that is mandated by federal law still stands as before. Those are still at the front of the line. This recommendation is judicious and minimally disruptive while fulfilling the spirit and letter of the law.

Wood said in reference to CA Promise major advisors, does every program have at least one major advisor? Will each have a promise advisor?

Young said those implementation details haven’t been fleshed out. What they attempted to do with the language included was in fact to decentralize advising within the academic programs and not have a centralized designated advisor advising out of their area of expertise. What we are hoping is that it doesn’t become additional effort, but becomes embedded with advising already going on. We’re meeting expectations by ensuring advisement, but we don’t feel that means additional advisement beyond what normally occurs.

Sims said this is more like intrusive advising. CP Advisors are to monitor academic progress, not simply conversations with a faculty advisor about emphasis in a program, when to take what courses.

Wood says he has concerns with CJ. There are five concentrations, each student advised by a faculty member who is quite familiar with the concentrations. In theory they could have promise students in each concentration, and require 5 CP major advisors. Who are going to be those advisors? One could be an advisor in forensic science, but not expert in law enforcement. Wondering if one of the CP major advisors would have to advise students in all five concentrations. Sims says yes to first, no to second.

Eudey clarified. We noted in the working group that some CSU campuses have students going to two different advisors, one in the major and one addressing CA Promise. This gives potential for conflict and is too much time for students and work for faculty and staff. It is important for advising to happen within the major. What we want to make sure that anyone who is advising a California Promise student has the information and resources they need. The language isn’t here to tell each department what to do. Each department will have the opportunity to determine how to meet the intention of the legislation and campus policy within the advising structure best suited to their major(s). The good news is that students will not be being enrolled until early fall so we have time to offer training and recourses. We want to be working with what already exists.

Petrosky says in this resolution we are being asked to offer cool things, but there is no commitment to providing or addressing resources for those things. If this starts working, we will be working toward an accelerated graduation rate which changes demand and likely calls for more sections of classes. He wants noted in the policy some commitment to resources, and that is not there.

Sims said this is not our idea. This is not from within. It’s a mandate. Petrosky said the resolution should still indicate a commitment to resources is needed to enact it.

Filling would like to see a commitment to communicating with Blazer and the Governor as we try to implement this stuff. He thinks the CO is shy to share info on challenges. We need to send a message that says we’re glad you care about our students, here are some implementation issues the well-intentioned plan indicates.

Giventer agrees, it seems to be an unfunded mandate.

Carroll has concern with priority second pass. One concern raised was fundamental classism. What is proposed is a campus-level idea. He assumes that the limitation to second pass and within class was intended to minimize the classist impact. He still needs to be convinced that the impact is rendered negligible. Sims notes law mandates priority registration, so there are some choices we can’t make. We are under the strictures to have priority registration, and this appeared to be the most fair to all within the letter of the legislation. Carroll said this was an attempt to find the fairest possible way to implement it.

Thompson wants to give credit. The germ or full-blown idea for this second-pass option was mentioned by Tuedio in a previous senate meeting, and he wants to give him credit/blame for that. As was noted in a breakfast conversation this morning, this is the way the legislature works, setting an expectation with no appropriation, no funding. It’s what they can do instead of providing more classes. We didn’t make it negligible, but made minimal classist impact.

Following the meeting, Senator Petrosky shared the following statement via Asnet:

Members of the Academic Senate:

I wish to clarify my comments regarding 10/AS/17/UEPC from today's meeting of the academic senate. I believe the issue I was making was wrongly characterized by others.

I am fully aware that the aforementioned resolution is in response to a mandate, and that we are required to create an implementation plan. My issue is that the plan provided with the resolution is incomplete, as it is agnostic with respect to resources that will in all likelihood be required to fulfill said plan.

There are parties who no doubt will be served by such agnosticism: the faculty are not among those parties.

No realistic assessment of this program could conclude that it will be resource neutral. We are the creators of this resolution and plan, however, and must defend ourselves by explicitly including an expectation of institutional resource commitment. Without an explicit statement, we are doing ourselves a disservice.

I recognize the authority of UEPC in authoring language to address this missing element, but feel obligated --since I've raised the issue -- to provide suggestions. At a minimum, the outlined process should include an additional bullet to the final paragraph, stating that a) the departments and colleges meet regularly with the Provost to outline the various resources needed for adequate implementation, providing b) examples of likely resource needs (e.g. additional advising, additional sections to meet accelerated graduation expectations, etc.), and developing c) a pool of resources and a process for their allocation.

**9. Information Items**

a. SB 412 – The California Promise: implementation planning work group

Removed from the agenda, as the working group’s recommendations were addressed in the resolution above.

b. Strategic Planning update (Sims)

Sims noted the SPC elected, given what is happening on campus, to publish a revised timeline and this will give more time to consider and discuss the SP. On the new timeline, on April 27 the first draft will be posted online. At the beginning of May will be drop-in open forums, please come to senate for discussion before we adjourn for the year, and as we go into summer a second draft will be posted online. A complete draft will be available to start the semester in the fall. If questions, ask Greer and Sims.

Internally, they are happy to extend the timeline because the writing dynamic is really positive, a good creative space, and the writing is robust, and they are having interesting conversations. More time will be a plus.

**10. Discussion Items**

* + DRAFT CSU Intellectual Property Policy and Recommendations

Sims noted the draft Intellectual Property document has been emailed out a couple of times now, this is proposed system policy. It has been referred to FAC and CFA for review. They would like feedback from any of you and departments with interest in IP and Patent policies. He has sent to senate a SJSU Sense of the Senate response, as they are heavily impacted by this policy. We have until mid-May to get feedback to the chancellor’s office. We are trying to get feedback in order to draft a response. This is a big one, and we need your support. Please review this in your departments. Some concerns have already been raised in SEC. It will be interesting to hear your feedback.

11. **Open Forum**

Carroll appreciates the percussive variety from meetings. He encourages a gong for the final meeting, seconded by Greer.

Rodriguez reminded all of the Stanislaus State Biennial Author Recognition on Thursday, April 27th, from 4-6pm in FDC 118. This is a recognition for authors sponsored by Academic Affairs, the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the University Library.

Rodriguez noted May 26 is the last day to participate in Link+, a new product – CSU+ with all 23 campuses will begin then.

McNally noted a campus visitor, Arsenio Mataka. He will be here in this room tomorrow from 3:30-4:30pm. He was appointed by Governor Edmund G Brown Jr. in December 2011 to serve as Assistant Secretary for Environmental Justice and Tribal Affairs. He is doing great work related extensive outreach and capacity building services to rural and underserved communities.

Young reported that the GREAT Steering Committee is currently reviewing the working draft of our revised Graduation Initiative 2025 Student Success Plan, and later this week, after some forthcoming information is incorporated, it will go out for campus review and comment. The GREAT Steering Committee meets next Monday, April 24th to discuss final revisions. We must submit the revised plan by Friday, April 28.

12. **Adjournment**

4:00pm

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)