**For**

**Academic Senate**

**April 4, 2017**

**Present:** Alvim, Bettencourt, Bice, Carroll, Chan, C. Davis, Demers, Dyer, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garone, Geer, Gerson, Gonzalez, Greer, Guichard, Hight, Huang, Nagel, McNally, Nainby, Odeh, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Sarraille, Sims, Strahm, Stessman, Strangfeld, Strickland, M. Thomas, Thompson, Wagner, Webster, Wellman, Williams, Wooley and Zhang.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Azevedo, Broadwater, Espinoza, and Steve Wood.

**Proxies:** MaryAnn Johnson for Diane Crayton.

**Guests:** Marcy Chavasta, Horacio Ferriz, James Tuedio, Helene Caudill, six delegates and one interpreter from Ukraine attending from 3-4pm, Darrel Haydon, Corey Cardozo, Amanda Theis, Harold Stanislaw, Shawna Young, Jake Myers, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, Gitanjali Kaul, Lauren Byerly and Scott Davis.

 Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Second Reading: 3/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendments to Article IV. Sections 1.0, 2.0, 2.1 and Article IV. Sections 4.0, 5.0 for editorial changes to committee membership descriptions. Passed.

Second Reading: 4/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendments to Article VI. Sections 2.3, 3.0 for changes to committee membership designations. Passed.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

April 18, 2017

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

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

**1. Call to order**

2:05pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Petrosky moved to get to 9B moved to a first reading item 7d. Seconded by Gerson.

Filling said AB 21 was approved by the California Legislature and that speaks to these issues. It’s important to speak to this issue and share our thoughts with the Pro Team for Dr. DeLeon Gray if we need it.

Carroll asked if without moving to a first reading if there is no chance to get this approved this year? Petrosky said there is a chance for it to be orphaned if we put it off. Carroll said that he has an ideologically diverse dept. and this raised considerable discussion over the past few days. He had noted it was a discussion so there would be more time to work out kinks. The nature of discussion might be different if it were a first reading. He does agree about the importance, and personally is in support, but not convinced yet it will be a wise move.

Eudey said that if we move to first reading it doesn’t ensure that the next time it has to be a second reading. We can extend it for more consideration if needed. If it’s a discussion item, this time it would be a first reading item next time. Either way works but the question is if we want to expedite the first reading part which would potentially expedite the second reading. We do have two more meetings but this doesn’t address the issue Filling mentioned sharing this beyond our campus.

\

Sarraille is worried that we may not be able to get to it this time and it’s been neglected and is at the bottom of the agenda. If we move it to a first reading we will likely get to it this meeting, but if we don’t move it we might not get to it. We didn’t get to it at the last meeting. It has been neglected for some time, if it stays there he fears it won’t be discussed today, or at all. Urges people to vote to move it up as a first reading. It was noted that it was a discussion item last time but we ran out of time, that was the first time it was formally on the agenda.

Carroll agrees this is a good point. In addition to maintaining as a first reading status next time. He’s good with moving ahead today.

Vote to move discussion item XX/AS/17/SEC Right to an Education Free of Fear and Harassment to 7d for a first reading. Result of the vote, 27 yes, 6 no, 3 abstained. Passed.

Amended agenda approved.

**3. Approval of Agenda Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 14, 2017 (distributed electronically)**

Sent electronically, send changes to Eudey/Pierce. Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Marcy Chavasta, Horacio Ferriz, James Tuedio, Helene Caudill, six delegates and one interpreter from Ukraine attending from 3-4pm, Darrel Haydon, Corey Cardozo, Amanda Theis, Harold Stanislaw, Shawna Young, Jake Myers, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, Gitanjali Kaul, Lauren Byerly and Scott Davis.

**5. Announcements**

Caudill announced that Modesto is the sister city of Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine and is hosting visitors from this sister city since this morning. Many are administrators and faculty from the Ukraine, and they would be happy to meet with faculty after the AS meeting.

**Additional Information about the delegation:**

Adrian Harrell, the President of Modesto Sister Cities International is managing the project and thought this would be an opportunity to get the university more involved with these types of activities. The theme that the group will be focusing on is the “Role of Integrity in the Education System.” If you feel that you can make a link to the theme during your demonstration/tour, please do, but I don’t have any more information other than the title.

**Rationale for the program provided by A. Harrell:**

Ukraine is a highly literate society with a strong and proud history of education at all levels, although the level of education in metropolitan areas is generally higher than that in rural areas. The country has made it a priority to ensure equal access to a quality education for rural and low-income students and to enhance the professionalism of educators, and has made great strides in its standardization of testing to fight corruption in this sector. As of this school year (2016), Ukraine has opened 24 “hub” schools with the goal of improving the quality of education for children in rural areas as well as to improve the effectiveness of the use of public funds for education. In the course of the project, one school was selected in each region to receive funding for new equipment and additional material supply. These hub schools shall receive resources for the renovation of their class rooms, learning equipment and IT applications aimed to provide high quality of school education for children living and going to school in rural areas. In support of these initiatives, these Open World delegations will explore best practices in educational systems development during their visit to the United States and will have the opportunity to compare and exchange information with leading educational administrators at all levels. This could be achieved by working with charter schools, private schools, or with the public schools.

**Open World Delegation from Ukraine (attendees)**

Roman Mykolaiv Male 36 English: Basic Conversation

Head of Education Administration, Khmelnytskyi City Council

Valentyna Leonidivna Female 36 English: Conversational

Vice Rector for Scientific and Pedagogical Work, Lutsk National Technical University

Oksana Sydorenko Female 40 English: Conversational Associate Professor at the Department of Urgent and Emergency Healthcare, Ternopil State Medical University

Yuliia Ovchynnykova Female 31 English: Fluent Acting Dean of Biology Faculty, Associate Professor of Zoology and Ecology Department, National University of Donetsk

Serhii Babak Male 38 English: Fluent

Head of Laboratory at Scientific-Technical Center for Innovative Technologies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Oksana Shabas Female 31 English: Fluent

Facilitator of Group, Regional Manager, US Peace Corps Ukraine

Petrosky wished happy Easter to all.

Shawna Young offered an update on the GREAT and Graduation Initiative 2025

After the GREAT Steering Committee meeting yesterday afternoon, where we reviewed our first working draft of our Graduation Initiation 2025 Student Success Plan (which will be distributed to the campus community for comment in its next draft version), I met with Enrollment Services to get refined information on our process for providing early Degree Audit Reports to the academic departments for next year’s on-the-cusp cohort, and I want to share an update with you today.

In response to the request for early graduation evaluations this spring for the next on-the-cusp cohort made at Senate two meetings ago, Institutional Research has identified next year’s on-the-cusp cohort, comprising 487 students – our 4.5 and 2.5 students who are anticipated to be 1-9 units shy of a Spring 2018 graduation, assuming enrollment in 15 units Fall 2017 and 15 units Spring 2018. Enrollment Services is currently working to ensure that the Degree Audit system is updated for those 487 students, including the posting of all transfer coursework. Enrollment Services anticipates having the system updated by the last week of April, before priority registration (May 1).

Rather than Enrollment Services printing 8-page reports for almost 500 students, we are proposing that we provide this new list of students to the departments, and the faculty intrusive advisors then run current on-demand Degree Audit Reports. To facilitate efficiency and ease of this proposed process, Enrollment Services has offered to visit any departments who would like a refresher training session on Degree Audit. Enrollment Services will follow up this fall, providing departments with graduation evaluations.

Eudey noted when the draft ballot for 2017-18 elections was distributed there were no candidates from COEKSW for a position on CoC. She announced that we have a nominee for this position and distributed a petition for Suzanne Whitehead from COEKSW to be added to the ballot, asking those who desired to do so to sign in support of her candidacy. The petition will be given to Whitehead.

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

FAC – Davis noted their main issues will be addressed via resolutions addressed later in the agenda.

FBAC – Wooley announced that discussion of the fiscal impacts of electronic RPT files will be underway.

GC – Garone provided the following GC Report.

1. In response to an invitation from Graduate Council, President Junn met with the council to discuss the possibility of re-institutionalizing a Dean of the Graduate School. We had a wide-ranging discussion of the issues and financial constraints, in terms of baseline budget, for doing so, but both President Junn and Provost Greer support the idea, as does SEC. Graduate Council has drafted documentation in the form of a resolution to reinstitute the Dean. After a final round of discussion on that resolution in our April 20th meeting, we will forward that documentation to SEC to bring to FBAC and UBAC. The goal is to bring this resolution to discussion in Senate in early fall of 2017, while we continue to work with the president and provost to try to find a way to make this possible.

2. Grad Council completed drafting the guidelines and procedures for the new Graduate Equity Fellowships that I have previously spoken about. We established the eligibility qualifications, the application procedure, and the means by which programs will choose awardees of the fellowships from among their applicants. We will shortly initiate the application process for fellowships to be awarded for 2017-2018.

3. Grad Council has nearly completed a revision and clarification of the procedures for non-academic disqualification of graduate students, including the appeals process. After a final discussion in our April 20th meeting, we will be providing the new university catalog language on this matter to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Shawna Young for review and approval.

4. At the end of the last Senate meeting, a question was brought to the floor by John Garcia about reconsidering the composition of the membership of Graduate Council. I have some follow-up to report on that matter.

 First, I should say that when the question was raised, I misunderstood the thrust of it, and interpreted it as suggesting that we make membership on Grad Council subject to university-wide election, to which I objected. After further reflection and correspondence with John, I realized that this was not the point of the question. Rather his question was about individual programs having autonomy to choose their representative to Graduate Council from among their own graduate teaching faculty, which is of course a rather different matter.

 After the Senate meeting, I reviewed the Constitution of the General Faculty. Section 6.1 does explicitly state that the Graduate Director of a program shall be that program’s representative to Graduate Council [with the one exception that graduate programs that have multiple concentrations and multiple directors may choose among those directors whom their representative to Graduate Council will be]. This is the policy we currently follow. However, John’s point has merit and is worthy of consideration and, if there is faculty support for it, the constitution can be amended. Therefore, in consultation with the Speaker, in Graduate Council I raised the matter of individual graduate programs being allowed to choose their own representative to the council from among their graduate teaching faculty, and asked all the graduate directors to go back to their programs and solicit input from their faculty on this question. We will take the matter up for discussion in our April 20th meeting. If there is substantial support among the faculty of the various graduate programs for changing the membership requirement, then Graduate Council will advance the matter to FAC for that committee’s consideration and then for possible discussion back here in Senate in fall 2017.

ASCSU – Strahm said that there is nothing earth-shattering from the last plenary, and will address at the next meeting since we have a packed agenda today.

UEPC – Thomas noted that the issue on the agenda for years now is about a new policy on change of major. A need for a new policy is not supported by the data they’ve received. UEPC will take this off their agenda unless some new information becomes available. They approved a name change for Ag Studies, approved the calendar for 2020-21. They’re working on forms and processes for Individual Studies. Next time they will be discussing GE Pathways/Meta-Majors, and affinities stuff.

CFA – Filling noted that he received an email from CFA noting a dues increase of .003 that will be consonant with the raise coming at end of June. There will be a membership meeting in a few weeks to discuss this fully. Members of the Assembly who voted for this didn’t do so lightly. Filling was not a member, but confesses to be part of the Board of Directors who recommended consideration of the increase. Meeting information will be coming out soon. He distributed CFA stickers to attach to devices.

Thompson has a question about the GC report. Do we not have previous resolutions from GC or FBAC that support the idea of the graduate leadership? Having a history of the support would be good to show. Garone said that the resolution notes the history and the president and provost are aware of the history.

**7. First Reading Items:**

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

Strahm moved, Eudey seconded.

Strahm is trying to reaffirm the idea that a fourth year of QR is a good thing to have, students should have a fourth year, but not replicate a mini-apartheid system in some schools. We want to support EVC Blanchard who discussed this and said CSU system needs to move slowly and be sure schools without resources are not adversely affected, or students adversely impacted. We want to make sure that all of our students have equal access to the 4th year of QR and don’t leave anyone behind if they come from a school with limited resources.

Eudey said that this is really important to do. This is a necessary conversation occuring at other CSU’s. This will provide information to other CSU’s and the CO, and meets all the things we claim to care about.

Thompson says that he supports ideas of moving slowly and ensuring that the worrisome issues are addressed, and language in the rationale indicates a need for protection. Generally, we have the initiatives that are raining down from above, and are questioning if they will provide equal access for students. This might worsen the situation. When we look at it in the second reading, he would like to know more about the roll out time and assurances of this providing equal or better access for students.

Strahm is hoping you’ll look at the QR Task Force report link. She’s hearing that you want some specifics about how fast the CO intends to move this. Thompson said that is a part of it. He knows from high school teachers that it is not easy to waive a wand and make all offer a fourth year, so what will they offer? Will it be something more useful to the student?

Sims asks if the worries are about the statewide senate resolution. Thompson wonders if we should support the statewide resolution at all.

Nainby has comments similar to Thompson. He works with school principals, shared in context of discussion of organizations and leadership and communication, these kinds of requirements not carefully structural in terms of specific coursework. He gave examples of courses that a fourth year requirement doesn’t align well to the curricular needs of students. It could be a requirement that is insufficiently articulated with regard as to how schools should act. He’s struck by how much his comments echo Thompsons. He wants more clarity as to how schools should cooperate to best meet student needs.

Filling said with respect to timing, expeditiously is what the CO claims, and they’ve moved forward with the Center indicated in the recommendations. There is a duplicate center at CSU Northridge targeting that, working with K-12, and they know that 50% of people entering CSU already take four years of QR.. It may not be such a big hurdle. The idea in a sense is that QR is like riding a bike – muscle memory involved. If engaged in it every year, skills mature and develop. It’s better than if taking time off. QR is not only math. The intent is not to create another math to make things higher and deeper. The idea is to have coursework to enable QR. It could be CHEM, CS. Intent is to help schools decide what coursework makes sense for students. The intent is to be the opposite of prescriptive. It could be retaking of a course, but also allows for any QR related course. Finally, he’s had several conversations with the State Board of Ed. They are very interested in making this happen and finding ways to make sure this is funded.

Thompson said that with the different courses you named it gave the idea that we could assume that it’s likely that all HS in CA. would be able to meet this distribution without having to add additional coursework. Filling said yes. Center for Instruction will design modules to put into science and other coursework that could help meet the standard. There should be no need to hire new people to address this.

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

C. Davis moved, Nagel Seconded.

C Davis gave lots of background last time. The impetus for this resolution came from AAUP and ASCSU and discussions on this campus. FAC is proposing to change the definition of GF to include PT faculty who have been here for at least two years and are teaching 12 units (or equivalent) in any particular year. This number of PT faculty changes from year to year, and if it were in place now, it would include adding 72 PT faculty to the definition of GF, with 300 Tenure Track and 119 non-tenure track FT faculty. This is not a huge number included. FAC asked other campuses what they thought. This is included in the background information, and they’ve added more campuses to the list since the last presentation. No campuses have reported any problems other than difficulty finding PT to serve on committees. This is why FAC didn’t require more PT to serve on committees or vote, but we are opening up the possibility to do so. They maintained that those with MPP status are in the definition, but excluded them from being on a committee as a GF representative. Those faculty who are not given voting rights as GF still have the privilege of debate, their voice is still present.

Sims notes that we’re asking for the recommendation on these amendments. Amendments sent from FAC will go to the GF for a vote. Only a GF vote can change the constitution. FAC is requesting recommendations prior to this being sent to the campus. FAC may still send it to faculty without the AS recommendations, but certainly it is helpful so we can have a successful amendment sent to faculty. There has been lots of work completed by FAC, hopefully addressing most questions.

Thompson will vote for it. Referred to the last paragraph on the first page: “*On this campus, there are a small number of administrators who maintain retreat rights to specific departments.”* It is possible that some of these administrators also teach on a limited basis and are therefore included in the definition of General Faculty?

C Davis noted that on this campus the description within the constitution is employees. The president is a member of the GF. The president gets a ballot, but the president is not teaching. So the wording of the rationale is incorrect. This detail needs to be corrected.

Nainby said if he is hearing Thompson right, the objection is to the structure of the sentence. Not contingent upon whether or not they are teaching.

Thompson said in the following sentence, if MPP are included as members of GF, and we are passing a resolution which is an asset toward greater inclusivity, we are at the same time removing members of the GF from eligibility to serve. There’s a lot in that paragraph.

C. Davis said that this is removing MPPs from serving as faculty representatives on committees, but not excluding from vote. FAC saw a conflict of interest if MPP’s served as chair of faculty committees. They realized that they are removing some rights, but FAC felt that was appropriate. Sims noted it seemed to be a conflict of interest issue.

C. Davis noted the background information and all three resolutions. Information will be sent out to the GF today or tomorrow. If departments have questions, they will be able to read all of this. This information will also be added to the Faculty Handbook on the Senate website as soon as the PDFs are written. Please share with faculty in your departments. Some faculty are unaware of this discussion, so please bring this to their attention and tell them to vote.

**c. 6/AS/17/SEC Revision of University Mission, Vision and Values Statements to Include Statement on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice**

Sims moved the resolution as a first reading, Eudey seconded. This is coming from the Strategic Planning Council. Changes were led by a workgroup that was led by Horacio Ferriz who will tell us the recommended edits to our current MVV statements as well as a comment why the statement of DEQJ is part of those statements.

Ferriz said that the USPC is busy putting together ideas from all the consultation that occurred. They held big meetings including members of community, chairs talked to departments, and they received a mountain of information. They wanted to frame the information in the SP that honored our mission and values and vision, and felt strongly about our commitment to diversity, equality, social justice, etc. They spent hundreds of hours of discussion and thoughtfulness and are making recommendations for adjustments respectfully. They are looking for consistent changes in self-naming in the document. In the mission they have added the new bullet about diversity, added in the last bullet as well. The MVV was approved by the AS, so they felt strongly that it had to come back here. There was a separate group that worked on the statement of diversity, which they would like to rename to be diversity, equity, inclusion and justice. They want this commitment not only at the table but part of the fabric. The diversity statement was approved by President Sheley, but it did not go through AS approval. He brings it here for that purpose.

Sims said that they looked at AS notes, statements at the bottom of the statement of diversity, and investigated back, and affirmed that it was in formal consultation with FAC and AS in spring 2014, but not submitted as a resolution for formal recommendation, and sometime in May it was approved by Sheley and appeared on the campus website. They’re trying to close the gap on that. As far as they know, there’s no problems with the statement, no complaints, that are known of, but they want it to go through a consultation and approval process, in addition to changes to include issues in MVV. USPC is now making it a four-part statement rather than a three-part statement.

Thompson noted this is one package of documents, not a Sense of the Senate, but will go to the President for a signature. Correct. Thompson thinks it’s important that it goes through this with the signature.

Sims says that we are moving in advance of the Strategic Plan since the work of the Strategic Plan is tied to what is here. It’s its own piece.

Eudey thinks this is very important. We had the diversity statement discussed at the AS a couple of years ago. It’s important for faculty to vote on it and the infusion of this language in the MVV with the more detailed language. She likes that it’s a four-part statement. In the past, the Diversity Statement was in different place and she likes that it will all be in one place and seamless. She strongly supports this.

Wagner has an issue with the term Social Justice in the mission statement. He did not sign up to be a Stanislaus State Social Justice Warrior. We are Stanislaus State Warriors. This makes Stanislaus State Social Justice Warriors, almost officially. The term, Social Justice, has bad connotations for some. There were riots in Berkeley on February 1, and there was a social justice warrior protest. People got hurt, pepper-sprayed, fires were set, buildings damaged. Why don’t we condemn that? He does not want to hitch his train to that action. Sims says social justice is a well-established term in academia. It may have been co-opted by others, but that’s not the intention reflected here.

Thompson said on the first and third bullets, or first three bullets, he thinks that some from disciplines had a hard time thinking how intensive a discussion of diversity would fit in or be important in their classes. This is a different discussion, but he is concerned with the first few bullets if this was policy, what effect would this have on hiring and hiring preferences. Some felt like they would be put at a disadvantage. He’s not sure who could tell us this. It would be nice to know the impact or leverage of this, will position descriptions be written in response to this?

Sims said this came up in the committee discussions. In the Strategic Plan, this is an articulation of what is already in place in practice and policy in the CSU and other places, so there is not a sense that this is saying something that isn’t already a priority in other ways. To try to agendize what we do in the classroom would be an obvious violation of curricular processes and academic freedom and couldn’t be leveraged. They looked at points raised in the AS in 2014 to address concerns.

Greer thinks Sims is characterizing this correctly. There is an awareness that this had been discussed thoroughly in other meetings. Sims noted that none of this sounds prescriptive. We are not saying every course will be required, but we should have a value to infuse diversity where appropriate.

Sims can’t say if the characterization is false or true but can see where the worry came from as reflected in the FAC, AS, and SEC notes. But he sees how this is listed as aspirational or policy, so this is not something new. Sims does think Thompson characterized prior concerns well. Faculty were worried they would be told what they could and couldn’t teach.

Strahm thanks all for working on this and appreciates the way it’s presented. Her only question, and she’s hoping that she’s not opening up a can of worms, but justice by itself sometimes has a problem in terms of how it’s used in the title of the Statement. Justice is the quality of being just, righteousness, equitability. As a sociologist, “social justice” is something looking at human rights and equality. Wondering if social justice is better, or if with the other terms addressing the word justice needed. Doesn’t know, just tossing it out.

Ferriz was thinking of social justice in terms of diverse groups, and not one burdened or forgotten in the discussion. As a scientist, this is outside his realm, but in his profession sometimes they see actions that burden some sectors more than others and they need to purposely avoid this. His only concern with striking this out is that it has to go back to the committee. Trying to make few changes, but they may need to review it.

Greer said the statement was initially Diversity and Inclusion, and that came from the Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee. They can check to see if they changed the name and ask their thoughts and if they are open to including “social” before justice.

Nainby sees diversity and inclusion, people carefully trained to use words to guarantee a voice in context that allows them to use voice in oppressive ways. Equity helps in certain ways to frame it differently, even if all understand it. From that perspective, he likes the idea to include mention of social justice, as justice may be too vague to do it by itself. He thinks that diversity and inclusion in particular have been abused in public settings, so the additional clarifiers may be one dimension for doing that.

Wellman drew off of Strahm and Wagner, and he does agree that justice alone is a bit problematic. He also is aware that there are many different social justices that one might consider. Going back to Rawls, we might include fairness rather than justice. Looking at the equitable relationship of costs and benefits across different groups.

Carroll noted a change to last bullet under values “We, as staff and administrators, contribute to an inclusive learning environment” He noticed a range of words to convey commitments – diversity, equity, justice, otherwise. With regard to inclusive environment, why was that word chosen and not others? He’s not sure what the line means and how this is demonstrated by knowledge, skills, whatever. The new focus is on an inclusive environment, and he’s not sure how one contributes the other, and why the term is inclusive and not equitable or diverse.

Sims said the resolution isn’t editing the document in total, but offering specific changes related to diversity issues. Is it a weak statement in general, or one made weaker with the modifications? Carroll said it’s both.

Eudey clarified the process. What Sims points out is important. This resolution is specific revision of a statement to include aspects of the diversity statement to the strategic plan. It is not being brought forward as an overall revision of the MVV statement. According to the rules of the Senate any modification to be made is only around the adjustments of areas addressing diversity, inclusion, etc. If we think larger changes need to be made to the MVV we need a different resolution to do so. If we don’t like the revised sentence Carroll has addressed, should we leave as it was before or modify and have that language instated so diversity statement is more appropriately infused?

Wagner asked if it is okay to delete the word justice from everywhere? Sims said the feedback can be brought back to USPC and SEC. Wagner would especially request removal of social justice. Not all of us wants to be a social justice warrior, it forces people to be advocates, not all want to be that. This says I have to do things in my classroom. Sims says it does not. Sims does not see that it says all professors must do these things in every class. Wagner says that he reads is as all must be social justice warriors. We are Stan Warriors; we are now Stan State Social Justice Warriors.

Sims noted the resolution is on the changes proposed, that’s the frame on the question. Anything that is within the proposed changes can be adjusted, so it is possible to remove mention of social justice.

Wagner has an issue with the term Social Justice. It has bad connotations that there were riots in Berkeley on February 1, why don’t we condemn people who got hurt, buildings damaged. Some of us don’t want to hitch a train to that action. Sims says social justice is a well-established term in academia. It may have been co-opted by others, but that’s not the intention reflected here.

Carroll is unclear on the purpose of the resolution itself. Its title is *University Mission, Vision and Values Statements to Include Statement on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice*. The Title” suggests adding the component. Not in the title but also proposed but is also changing to MVV statement, which is fine, the language is clear, but the title of the resolution should be adjusted to “include” in a more extensive manner. Sims will make the edits.

Thompson noted issues raised earlier in light of Wagner’s statement. An example he has is that it may have been a misreading, but the 4th bullet addressing recruiting, *“We embrace diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice as vital components of educational quality”* ends with an action related to human dignity and worth. After reading this he can see how Wagner thinks the document will have an effect on recruiting and hiring faculty with such passion, and how it could bear on his classroom in a way that conforms with what he characterizes as social justice warriors. Sims thought that was something raised earlier. But that’s a matter of policy from the CO. There’s nothing here that’s not already practiced in the CSU system.

Thompson asked if the CO statement on dignity and worth is a requirement tied to hiring faculty. Sims noted there is a directive to have more diverse faculty pools is directly there. Sims will return this to committee.

Filling said even Ayn Rand focuses on human dignity and worth. The notion this is a leftist, socialist plot is incorrect.

Wellman is horrified that we are having a conversation about the dignity of human life in the classroom. Third bullet point uses and/or before controversial number 4. If we are unable to discuss the value of human life, can we perhaps discuss bullets 1-3.

Feedback will be shared with the USPC and SEC, and it will come back for a second reading next time.

**d. XX/AS/17/SEC Right to an Education Free of Fear & Harassment**

Sims noted that there seems to be a misperception. This was on one prior Senate agenda on March 14 on which this was mentioned, and we didn’t get to it during that time. No business was conducted after 4pm. This is not a question of opinion. On February 28 this was included as a discussion item to ask if there was a desire to write a resolution and what it should contain. The purpose was to get feedback to be brought back for the next meeting but we ran out of time. It’s here for a first reading.

Strahm moved the resolution. Eudey seconded.

Strahm notes this is frankly symbolic. They are asking the university and administration to support the wide range of students, faculty, staff and administrators who are here as both undocumented, documented immigrants, green card holders, refugees, religious minorities, sex and gender minorities. We believe in everyone’s right to be educated free of being fearful and harassed.

Filling noted this in large part echoes the bill before the assembly now, and puts into statute some of these strictures. It helps administrators to stand up to the vagaries of the national political environment.

Nagel noted on page three of the resolution, the following clause:

*RESOLVED, THAT STAN STATE should annually offer training to all employees (permanent and adjunct) and students on immigrant rights, laws and policies related to antidiscrimination and immigrant rights relevant to the campus, and in de-escalation intervention techniques for campus police, faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Employees, including police and public safety personnel, should be well-trained to ensure they do not behave in ways that replicate or reinforce ideologies of marginalization, oppression and hate; and be it further*

It says offer training to all employees. Contingent faculty movement don’t like the term “adjunct” perhaps change to temporary.

In the next resolved, in the last sentence there is mention of “sanction,” which is a bizarre word since can’t be given permission or punishment. Asked to consider changing to “administration to avoid adverse action against” or not to engage in adverse action against employees. Administration is emphasized, not the university.

*RESOLVED, that we urge STAN STATE to not dissuade any student, faculty, staff, administrator, or community member from acting on their conscience as a private citizen to provide assistance to any immigrant or refugee person or group. And, if someone does so in contravention of the law, we urge STAN STATE not to sanction that person; and be it further*

Greer noted that President Junn sends regards. They talked about this and affirm the intent of this document. Wonders if the group might entertain a couple of suggestions for revision. Page 3, the last resolved, note that they recommend changing it to the “Academic Senate of Stanislaus State will distribute the resolution to.” And some other edits for consideration will be sent.

*RESOLVED, that STAN STATE will distribute this resolution to the California Governor, the Speaker of the California State Assembly, the California Senate President pro Tempore, CSU Chancellor, the CSU Board of Trustees, the ASCSU, the chairs of the Academic Senates at all other CSU campuses, STAN STATE President Ellen Junn, the Vice–Presidents of STAN STATE, the California State Student Association (CSSA), the Associated Students, Inc. at STAN STATE, the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representative, the Majority Leader of the Senate and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the mayors and city councils served by this campus, and to local and national media outlets.*

Sarraille said adding to that, in the final resolved it indicates who will receive copies. He’s wondering if there are some local organizations aside from higher ups we could send it to. Perhaps send to some community groups. El Concilio, and others could be added.

Carroll said that the concerns raised in his department were about two of the resolved clauses. Page 3, first and second full resolved on the page. Second bullet:

* Create special funding sources to provide undocumented students with stipends, which they can receive in exchange for performing research under the guidance of faculty member or other meaningful educational projects.

Concerns were raised about the meaning of the term, would it be discriminatory if funds were available to some students and not others. It could be read to say funding not available to legal immigrants or US citizens. If the idea is to backfill what is lost, that would need to be clarified if that is the intent.

Sims said the intent was the first things said, if DACA is repealed, they lose what they were eligible for, so this is try to replace what was lost. Carroll suggests language to clarify this.

Carroll said regarding training, he believes that the intent was voluntary, but it doesn’t say that. Perhaps adding the word voluntary would be helpful. Sims asked “offer” indicated it rather than “require.” Carroll says the recommendation was to add voluntary.

Filling said the AB is related to DACA funding so this is consistent to what is being proposed in statute.

Sarraille wondered if this is an imagined source for compensatory funding. Likely scholarships or diversion of state funds? Is there a plan there? Strahm said that right now no undocumented student can get Federal Funding. Now in CA. what is left over after non-DACA students are given funding, what is left is given to AB540 students. Basically, this is reaffirming that we should continue that.

Carroll asked what kinds of costs we’re talking about? Sims said folks looking at this at the state level to see what is possible. This is consonant with what the legislature is looking at should the need arise. Single digits of our students.

Carroll asked if FBAC is on board with this. Wooley said FBAC will be talking about it tomorrow.

Strahm reminded that parents of these undocumented students, and students themselves do pay taxes and use a SS# specific to undocumented people. Social security fund knows that these aren’t real SS# numbers, but they lead to billions of dollars each year. These students and their families pay state taxes, sales taxes, gas taxes. Even if undocumented, they’re contributing like everyone else to state revenue.

Gonzalez, noted the manner in which the university is named throughout the document. Referring to us as Stan State is less than professional. Change to CSU Stanislaus throughout. The official, formal title of the campus is California State University Stanislaus, and the preferred nickname is Stanislaus State. The style guide is formal at least the first time. Stan State is disallowed according to the CO.

**8. Second Reading Items**

**a. 3/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendments to Article IV. Sections 1.0, 2.0, and Article IV. Sections 2.1, 4.0, 5.0 for editorial changes to committee membership descriptions**

C. Davis noted the first resolution involves editorial changes only. Changes simply move phrases, change verbs, make all descriptions in the constitution match. They also added back in the sentence about CoC that was cut off in the draft shared last time.

Demers noted that on 2.1 on the UEPC charge, he appreciates that students are included, but this is different from other committees. It is not required on other committees to be a FT student, and it’s the President not VP who appoints. C Davis noted that they did not make any changes to this component of the GF constitution, so this means the constitution does not match the ASI constitution. This was not recognized in earlier reviews of the membership of that committee. That will need to be changed in a future revision to the constitution. We will need to request that FAC review changes for another resolution.

Sims said at this point in the process we can’t change it. But it’s a housecleaning item that can be taken care of early in the year next year. Procedurally they will take this up as a separate item.

Sarraille said last time we discussed this, he asked about phrases in 5.1 about non-instructional faculty and that term has not been changed. Was that an oversight? He thought it was okay to figure out another way of saying that. C. Davis said FAC got caught up on other issues, and skipped over it. They were trying to make as few changes as possible this time, so likely needs to be returned to FAC. It was an oversight this time. It should be adjusted in the future.

Carroll wished he had caught this earlier. Under FDC revision, 5.1, correct him if he’s wrong, but originally the idea was FT/TT faculty were to choose 5 members, and PT chose a special representative on the committee. Now as proposed essentially FT/TT can vote on 5, and PT now get to vote on six members if incorporated into the GF.

Carroll said if the other resolution passes, it would be bringing in new members to the GF who would be voting for 6 members of the FDC, and only five now. C. Davis noted this is true now for the full time lecturers already, so we are only just adding in the part-time lecturers.

Thompson noted that we have a VPFA and its AVP now, but that is not changed in this document. Sims noted we will have to purge the document of out of date titles for positions. Sarraille noted we might want to adjust how we name people in our constitution.

Sims noted there is a lot to get through. To this proposed matter specifically, we can craft a resolution that changes all titles in one move, but this needs to be addressed in a separate resolution.

C. Davis said after the next Senate meeting, we will do all three at once. Thompson wondered if FAC would like more time to consider changes to the language. Could defer a vote until the next meeting.

C. Davis noted only one change, and that would be the definition of non-instructional faculty. Not sure if FAC necessarily wants to change that. Doesn’t believe any changes would occur.

Eudey noted that in this resolution we can’t make changes to anything besides reorganizing because of the way the item is framed.

Result of the Vote. 28 yes, 2 no, 3 abstained. Resolution passed.

**b. 4/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendments to Article VI. Sections 2.1, 3.0 for changes to committee membership designations**

C. Davis said this seemed to have less feedback than the first. Any clarifying questions that were not addressed were talked about in FAC in some detail.

No questions or comments.

Result of the Vote 28 yes, 3 abstained. Resolution passed.

FAC will be informed that the AS recommends these to the faculty. Sims noted that FAC does a lot of unsung work. FAC is not a committee of the Senate, it is a standing committee of the General Faculty. Not a part of Senate structure so we don’t always hear about what they’re working on.

**9. Discussion Items**

**a. Proposed switch to online RPT file submission and review**

AVP Myers introduced this issue, and will be joined by a representative from Interfolio who will share information via web conferencing. Approximately 10 other CSUs are using an online system of WPF. The President and Provost asked him to look to moving in a similar direction. Several have begun this with Senate resolutions. He has shared with SEC a draft resolution he wrote, and samples from other campuses. Has a demonstration for a product – Interfolio – that several others are using.

Interfolio Rep. Marshall Hill offered some background on company, which has been around since 1999. Some may have used them when looking for jobs or writing a recommendation letter for others. That’s what they’ve been founded on. Working with faculty, they saw need in recruitment, promotion and tenure. They have grown to over 200 partnerships, building out faculty software and tools to make your processes and shared governance more efficient. The end goal is a single system for faculty from application, committee identification of hires, given dossier upon hire, guidelines around what is needed for career milestones, different review processes over time, and as one matures to sabbatical reviews, evaluation reviews, and other committee decisions made can all be within a single system.

Each faculty member gets a dossier and what is needed for each year of review. You can curate scholarly evidence day one into the portal. When it’s time to submit, all documents are living in one place to attach into the appropriate location and submit the file for review. What that will do for administration is a greater ease, standardization and transparency in the process. It is also good for faculty, as they know they are getting an equitable review. It makes it more clear for candidates what is needed to provide and submit. Administrative staff that supports this process also save time. Committees save time as well.

Interfolio is working with 10 CSUs already. There would be two levels of support. FA will get a single point of contact, and those undergoing review or who are part of committees can reach out to the scholar services help desk.

Hill provided a brief demo on use of the Interfolio site. He showed levels of permission for review, and showed how a committee member would review a file. You can brand the process for a campus. You will only see cases for which you’re assigned. Most reviewers spend time in the reader environment. They created a binder-look to the site with tabs on the left, documents in sub-areas. Main areas have special sections – teaching, RSCA, service. You can go page by page, and can highlight and annotate so when the group comes together notes are aggregated on screen. It can be printed. You can go document by document and toggle between them. You can see reports from prior level of review. External evaluation is possible. You can also request student feedback into the system.

Biggest take away is adopting electronic system won’t require policy change because the other CSU campuses have gone before. They’ve proven it works, and saves faculty time for candidates and committee members. It provides transparency and equity in the process, in way not possible for paper process.

Carry this as a discussion, but in the interim, mention to faculty, give questions to Sims so we know what information to share.

**10. Information Items**

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

Deferred.

b. DRAFT CSU Intellectual Property Policy and Recommendations

Deferred.

Sims will send info on the info items to AS in writing.

**Open Forum**

None.

**Adjournment**

4pm