

**Academic Senate
February 13, 2018**

Present: Alvim, Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, Crayton, C. Davis, Demers, Dorsey, Drake, Edwards, Erickson, Filling, Foreman, Garcia Gerson, Gibson, Frost, Hall, Hight, Nagel, McNally, Mokhtari, Mayer, Montero-Hernandez, Morgan, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Sarraile, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, Weikart, Wellman, Williams.

Excused: Davies, Geer, Jaycox, Johannsdottir, Randol, Webster and Zong.

Proxies: Petrosky for Panos, Matthew Lopez-Phillips for Espinoza, Dave Colnic for Nancy Hudspeth, Eric Broadwater for DeCure, Strahm for Strangfeld.

Guests: Jake Myers, Lauren Byerly, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Dave Evans, Helene Caudill, Nina Palomino, Julie Johnson, Scott Hennes, Susan Drum, Koni Stone, Stuart Wooley, Betsy Eudey, Shawna Young, Sarah Schrader, Amanda Theis, James Tuedio, Jovonte Willis, Shannon Stevens, Rita Asher, Victoria Cortez, and Marsha Kuan.

First Reading Items: 1/AS/18/SEC Resolution in Support of Hiring Tenure Track Psychological Counseling Faculty (Sense of the Senate) **Passed**.
2/AS/18/UEPC – General Education (GE) Program Assessment Plan – **Returned to UEPC**.
3/AS/18/UEPC – Batch Recertification Process for Existing General Education (GE) Courses (Sense of the Senate) **Passed**.
4/AS/18/UEPC – Structured Exploratory Emphases (SEEs) **Passed**.

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:
February 27, 2018
2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118**

Minutes submitted by:
Gerard Wellman, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:00pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

**3. Approval of Agenda Approval of Academic Senate Minutes January 30, 2018
(distributed electronically)**

Approved.

4. Introductions

Jake Myers, Lauren Byerly, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Dave Evans, Helene Caudill, Nina Palomino, Julie Johnson, Scott Hennes, Susan Drum, Koni Stone, Stuart Wooley, Betsy Eudey, Shawna Young, Sarah Schrader, Amanda Theis, James Tuedio, Jovonte Willis, Shannon Stevens, Rita Asher, Victoria Cortez, and Marsha Kuan.

5. Announcements

The Faculty Development Committee needs to write a report for the Academic Affairs Support Unit Review, so they will be gathering information from faculty on the use of faculty development programming. There will be a survey, please share it with colleagues. It's short and will provide useful information so please complete the survey.

Morgan – With the union adjustment and the student club movement to utilizing a lottery for student to get club tables, Greek Life is separate from student clubs, and student clubs only got 6 spots while Greek Life got 12. Several clubs representing underrepresented students no longer have spaces.

Junn, Suzanne Espinoza is being represented by the AVP of Student Affairs & Dean of Students, Matthew Lopez-Phillips today, he will look into this.

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

FAC – Foreman: FBAC discussed the second reading we'll be voting on today. Also discussed range elevation and voting rights.

FBAC – Weikart: FBAC meets tomorrow and will be discussing UBAC's charge and discussing budget priorities resolution

GC – Dorsey: We'll be discussing representative selection and the revision to the constitution. The Grad Ed Assessment Plan and Dual Degree policies.

Statewide – Filling: Interest in tenure-track psychological counseling faculty are of interest to them.

UEPC – Thompson: discussed questions from the first readings. Approved program changes for Liberal Studies.

CFA: - Filling: Distributed a copy of their comments. There is a case before the Supreme Court on whether unions can charge employees who don't belong to the union. This is a neoconservative attack on public employee unions. The handout has a much greater description.

CFA Stanislaus Statement to the Academic Senate, 13 February 2018

Thank you for the opportunity to address you on the important matter of changes in labor law because of the Jan us v. AFSCME Supreme Court case. The likely decision in this case will have broad implications for our contractual relationship with the university and for public higher education. I felt it my responsibility as President of our CFA chapter to speak to you because of these broader implications for the CSU, for faculty participation in governance, and for faculty's economic standing.

The division of labor between Senate and CFA is established by law. In 1978, Governor Jerry Brown signed AB 1091, known as HEERA, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act. I recently read through the "Principles and Policies of the Academic Senate of the CSU," which has an enlightening history of our division of labor. Among many items of interest, I found the following passage in the 1985 document, Collegiality in the CSU:

"The Academic Senate of the California State University does not believe that the shared decision-making of the collegial model and the shared decision-making of the collective bargaining mode are inherently incompatible. They represent *different* approaches to *different* types of decisions. By outlining the types of decisions appropriate to the collegial process and the usual steps involved in the collegial process for these decisions, the Academic Senate hopes that this

statement will help to keep separate the two approaches to decision-making and simultaneously will help to maintain and improve the collegial process of shared decision-making."

As faculty we are simultaneously imbricated in two co-equal structures, one the long tradition of shared governance by faculty and administrators, the other the tradition of collective bargaining between faculty employees and administrative managers. These two decision-making processes mutually support each other, and if one process is weakened, the other may be as well. This would be significant as CFA and the Academic Senate collaborate on matters of shared concern: Academic Freedom, Intellectual Property, Workload, and Tenure Density. CFA has also been at the forefront demanding genuine joint decision-making which has been violated in recently developed Executive Orders.

On February 26th the Supreme Court will hear arguments in the Janus case. This case was instigated initially by the billionaire governor of Illinois, Bruce Rauner, in his fight to shrink public services by crippling public employees' collective bargaining. If the Court sides with the governor and the anti-union Liberty Justice Center representing Mr. Janus, they would reverse established law, the 1977 Abood case. That earlier decision ruled that public employees whose contract is negotiated by a union must pay for the representation and bargaining provided by the union, whether they are a member or not. These are known as agency fees or fair share fees.

In the name of free speech, the Supreme Court may well weaken the unified voice of employees. They will enhance the opportunity for public employers to be more autocratic by limiting employees' ability to exercise voice in the workplace and in public policy. As we know, the workplace is more of an autocracy than a democracy, except where a union protects workers' voice. In the absence of that collectively erected platform, the employee's free speech disappears under the authority of employers. As recently as 2006 in *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of employers limiting speech. Writing for the majority, Justice Anthony Kennedy argued: "A government entity has broader discretion to restrict speech when it acts in its role as employer," and a public employee "must accept certain limitations on his or her freedom."

The purpose of this case is to weaken public employees because they are the main advocates for public services and agencies. Let me remind you that CFA has successfully protected faculty from the attempts to erode our current pension and benefits. As representatives of the CSU faculty, CFA regularly visits Sacramento to lobby for more robust funding of the university, to advocate for students and their families on fees and tuition, and to help legislators craft legislation such as Assemblyman Ash Kalra's bill AB

21 that protects DACA recipients. CFA has a long record of promoting a CSU that provides a high quality, accessible, and affordable education to the people of California.

The Janus decision will change all of this. If Janus is successful, CFA will be less effective, legislators will see professors less often and faculty will have a weakened ability to defend the gains we have achieved in the last thirty years of collective bargaining.

The University of Wisconsin is the horizon that shows us the desired outcome of the people behind Jan us. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed* have been documenting the assault on shared governance and the tenure system in that state.

I come before you, therefore, to ask the faculty senators, first, to exercise your full rights for transparency in university budgeting and to vigorously defend shared governance. Remember that CFA's origins are in the provocations of Chancellor Glen Dumke's "intransigent resistance to collegiality" and his disrespect for shared governance. Second, as leaders on this campus, we ask you to actively advocate for CFA with your colleagues, to discuss with them the threats Janus poses to our profession, and to protect your working conditions, your pay, your pension, and your healthcare. Once Janus is decided, our persistence will be dependent on the voluntary efforts of members to sustain a formal organization that has power and standing in our collective bargaining with the CSU. We will no longer have the luxury of being passive members and indifferent non-members.

7. Second Reading Items

a. 23/AS/17/FAC/UEPC- Amendment to 11/AS/89/EPC – Policy Regarding Final Grade Reports

Foreman – No changes have been made. One concern was that this doesn't cover winter or summer, and we'd like to send that question to UEPC. The current policy deals with financial issues, and UEPC should weigh in on academic issues raised by the policy. We're happy to take a look at their recommendations.

Morgan – The end of the term is automatically three workdays? Foreman - Yes, we have been assured there will be three workdays following each term.

Vote: 38 in favor, 0 in opposition, 2 abstentions. Passed without dissent.

b. 1/AS/18/SEC Resolution in Support of Hiring Tenure Track Psychological Counseling Faculty

Nagel – The only change is the last resolved with disseminates this to statewide and the sponsor of a senate bill in support of counseling faculty in the CSU.

Wellman – I would like to again speak in opposition to this resolution. There are a number of reasons I do not feel this is the best path forward for our Psychological Counseling faculty. First,

we should think through the implications of granting tenure to folks without the expectation they have a terminal degree in their field. I cannot imagine being asked to publish in a peer-reviewed journal in my field with only my masters to rely upon. The counseling faculty's elaborations require them to publish original research and we should think through whether this is a fair requirement without a terminal degree. Second, at the last Senate meeting we heard arguments that since they are in the Unit 3 bargaining unit, tenure should be extended since it is implicit in Unit 3 bargaining rights. Coaches are Unit 3 and I have yet to hear anyone in this room propose giving them tenure. Third, tenure is not an expectation in the field of counseling. It's not considered a usual perk of employment, and aspiring counselors in grad school are not trained on navigating tenure expectations. Fourth, if we really want to call ourselves a student-ready university, and if there's anyone on campus we want to ensure engages in evidence-based practice and are retained because they are serving our students well, it is our physicians and our counselors. We cannot claim to be a student-ready university if they are retained for reasons other than excellent service to students. As a university, we can do a much better job of working with our counseling faculty to ensure their jobs are rewarding, that they have the resources they need, and that their physical environment is conducive to the practice of their field. This Sense of the Senate does not do that.

Greer – There are many points in the resolution that we agree on, and there are points that we do not share assumptions. The administration agrees that the counselors provide an incredibly important role on this campus. Their work is appreciated. Stability is important. We can do things to improve their work environment, including moving to three year contracts. We agree that counseling staff should not teach or be expected to do research. I mentioned last time a letter that was sent to the counseling faculty, this is meant to emphasize that we in the administration are attempting to address the concerns. In the academy that tenure is established to protect faculty research and teaching. The roles and responsibilities of counselors are different, and we don't think that the need to protect academic freedom resides there. We've tried to address the issues and concerns of the counselors. I understand the significance of the position that we are taking. This is the first time I remember administration and faculty not agreeing on an issue before the Senate. We respectfully disagree.

Thompson – The conversation sounded like we're trying to establish something and we're not. If we wanted to hire TT counseling faculty, we could do so tomorrow. They have elaborations. It's not new, and the people who've been here for a long time have seen the value of TT counselors. With regard to academic freedom, they're not in academic affairs, and that means they need more protection. The conversation is colored by this is a system-wide resistance to hiring TT counseling faculty.

Morgan – Agrees with Thompson – this resolution is not prescribing elaborations. There are requirements to be granted tenure. They are doing research-activities and going to conferences. Most of our MFA faculty, while it is a terminal degree, are doing RSCA activities. There are counseling faculty with doctorate and masters.

Hight – Librarians are faculty and their terminal degree is a master’s degree. We were required to go through all the same painful steps to gain tenure that everyone else has had to do. I have published in scholarly journals. You can look me up. I’ve also worked in positions in which I was staff. The difference in the way I am treated is much more effective with the possibility of gaining tenure. It makes a huge difference. Our elaborations are clear that we need to do research, and this important in our relations with our students and our peers. I believe it is an effective way to contribute to our environment.

Junn – I wanted to add and concur with Provost Greer. I want to recognize the Senate for putting this resolution forward and support your colleagues. It is a complex situation. Counselors report to student affairs, but only the Provost can grant tenure. When I arrived and learned there were issues with counseling faculty, I met with them, and with CFA too to have a robust discussion about this. We worked through the issues one by one. For example, pay. They could find pay higher elsewhere. I commissioned HR to do a study and we raised their salaries commensurate with regional salaries. I think it’s critical to think about professional development. We need to ensure that their getting up to do date research on student affairs issues. We allocated additional money to provide them access to professional development. The letter you have stipulates this. It’s a complex issue and it’s not easily or quickly make a decision. This is a decision that all CSUs struggle with. We have to consider what’s in the best interest of our students. I sought to increase the number of counseling faculty, and that’s increased by 1.5 FTES, and we’d like to allocate an additional 1.5 FTES next year. We’d like to bring them up to 9 positions. We are already within the regulations for accrediting. We are trying to make progress, and I concur with the Provost.

Bettencourt – First, we had 6 TT counselors under Marvalene Hughes, and 4 received tenure. We went through the URPTC, the department and the provost. We have a structure in place. The counselors have elaborations, and there are research expectations. We need to be more informed before making decisions. Without this employment practice, only hiring temporary counselors prevents us from serving on faculty committees. This excludes us from URPTC committee, which we need to be before to be promoted. On our campus, yes we’re masters level. We are not paid enough to get PhDs.

Carroll – 1. Provost Greer, it wasn’t me, but it was my sentiment. 2. President Junn is correct that this is complex, more complex than the Provost or Gerard captured. 3. The Provost’s memo suggests that we’re encouraging counselors to get involved in governance. How we do that without the protection of tenure is an open question. 4. This is a system wide move, the remove of tenure protections from counselors. We should see this as part of a broader attack on tenure.

Sarraille – I’ll add that I know that there are other departments like the arts where faculty do not have PhDs, but they have the appropriate terminal degree. Everything that opponents have said could be made as arguments to turn those departments into temp faculty only. The same arguments could be made to turn all our departments temp faculty. The assertion that counselors don’t need academic freedom is wrong. They speak in defense of students. In some cases,

admins may not be on the same side as the students, in their best interest. Having counselors who can speak in their defense is a good idea.

Filling – I spent an hour talking with Dr. Price about our Psychological Counseling Center. One of his comments was “Wow, I’m really impressed. Usually I have to beg faculty to come to meetings or come to workshops.” The reason for that woke state is that we have experience having counselors as part of our academic community. I remark on the poverty of imagination of my colleagues on their failure to recognize that research, presentation at conferences, consultation with colleagues, publications, all sound remarkably similar to what are the elaborations for my department. The notion that we need to have temp people to get the absolute best is laughable, and I shudder for tenure in my own department. The strength of our university and our counseling program is its deep intertwining with the academy. They share our work, and we need that.

Vote: 29 in favor, 10 in opposition, 1 abstention. Resolution passed.

c. 2AS/18/UEPC – General Education (GE) Program Assessment Plan

Thompson – We discussed the questions that came to us. We didn’t make substantive changes. Some of the things we’d discussed before, and we discussed them again. Look at the first part of the rationale and see the history of this. This has been vetted a lot. If you still have the graphic from last time, one question is the interaction of the assessment plan and recertification. They use the same goals, but those are separate processes. Once a course is recertified for GE, it’s the same status as the GE courses we have now. There’s a sheet I provided that has a response to questions. These are not my responses, but are the responses of UEPC.

Koni Stone read the following statement:

Thank you Madam speaker for the opportunity to speak.

“[Assessment of Student Learning Principles 6/AS/04/UEPC](https://www.csustan.edu/faculty-handbook/policies-faculty-student)” can be found at:
<https://www.csustan.edu/faculty-handbook/policies-faculty-student>

I would like to give everyone a brief review of our “Principles of Assessment of Student Learning” this document was approved via Senate resolution 6/AS/04/UEPC. Some of you were not here in 2004 and many have probably not had the chance to review this important document. Don’t worry, I am not going to read the entire 9 principles to you. But let’s focus on the first principle:

PRINCIPLE 1

The primary purpose of assessment at California State University, Stanislaus is improving student learning.

This is accomplished by the use of assessment information to improve program structure, course content, and pedagogy. Assessment should be primarily formative in nature. Formative assessment is often described as assessment *for* learning rather than assessment *of* learning and refers to all those activities undertaken by faculty that provide information

used by faculty to modify teaching and learning activities.

“Principle 1” from our Principles of Assessment of Student Learning, 6/AS/04/UEPC, states “Assessment should be primarily formative in nature” Formative assessment is for the purpose of faculty learning about their students for the sake of improving instructional delivery and thereby improving student learning.

A random sample of artifacts selected by a GE director to be reviewed by a group of faculty is not supported by this first principle. It is not clear how this GE review process will be used to modify teaching and learning. It is not clear how random artifacts judged by a panel of peers will inform the faculty so as to improve teaching and learning.

This proposed review process has some logistical issues for Chemistry: What type of artifact(s) would be collected from a 96-person introductory science class that is assessed by clicker questions, online homework and multiple choice questions? Would chemistry instructors be required to alter their assignments to generate acceptable artifacts? Also, only one section of General Chemistry II is offered each semester, so the reviewers would know who the instructor was. That could potentially violate principles 7 and 8.

I did a careful read of all of the principles and I was unable to find anything in our Senate approved document that supported or advocated or encouraged a “peer review” process for primary assessment of student learning.

We do have two model assessment review processes at Stan State: the review of Integrated courses for the Libs Studies program and the review of WP courses. Neither one of these review processes involve faculty peers as the primary assessors of student learning. Both processes involve faculty addressing learning goals, describing their assessment of learning and describing how assessment informs their teaching. Faculty construct these narratives and provide evidence to support them.

As this GE learning assessment process is revised, for faculty to use a formative process in their classroom and then departments submit summaries of assessment of GE learning, here are some questions that should be addressed (based on my experience with the WP recertification process): What will be done with the report? Will the results be published? How will the information be used? How will junior faculty be protected from unfavorable findings? What will happen to a class that is judged to not meet the learning goals? (Decertification?) What will happen if materials are not submitted? (Decertification?) Therefore, I recommend voting against this current resolution, so that the GE assessment plan can be redesigned. Please do not vote for a resolution that conflicts with an existing Senate approved resolution.

Thompson – If you notice the insert in the packet, one of the first things we referred to are principles of student assessment. GE Sub, GEAC, and UEPC are very aware of those. They haven’t seen the disagreement with the assessment plan. We don’t agree there’s a conflict there.

There's a mechanism for modifying teaching and learning, and that's feedback of reports in the GE APR. Artifacts are keyed to the assessment outcome that allows that course to be part of a GE area. I thought I heard some connection that they'd be certified but there's no connection. The peer review is by those who teach in GE, so it could be cast negatively or positively.

Nagel – I move to refer this resolution back to committee. There are problems on p. 5 that I don't believe are clarified sufficiently in this document. It seemed to create ambiguities or other significant problems. In the assessment process, #1, the first part of the assessment process specifies that instructors of courses would be notified. The emphasis on course is repeated in #2, and that's concerning because it's supposed to be assessing a GE area, and the connection to courses is a problem. Despite what's being asserted, the FLCs themselves do not take themselves to be establishing criteria and methods for evaluations. Assessing the GE program, for example the UD area 1, through the GE outcomes assessment program, it's not assessing the courses, or even necessarily our GE program, given our transfer students from junior colleges. I move to send it back to committee. Seconded by Carroll.

Thompson – Graduate outcomes assessment, I don't know of this. This is something WASC wants, of goals at or near graduation. There's nothing in this document that points to graduation outcomes assessment. As far as assessment of core competencies, think about how other FLCs came to be. It was a negotiation to set up a charge. What we ended up with is a group completely composed of faculty looking at appropriate assessment measures. The other part is that FLCs are not at the behest of WASC. WASC wants assessment at or near graduation, but from the beginning I have seen that my participation in the FLC is much more about info literacy. As far as how the FLCs see themselves, we have regular monthly meetings of the 6 FLC leads, and our discussion encompasses that this will be linked to GE outcomes assessment. It's still not clear what we'd be referring this back to UEPC for. I'd like to have elaboration of that.

Nagel – I am a member of the quantitative reasoning FLC and that FLC expressly was not trying to come up with GE assessment goals, but aims that would increase quantitative learning among our students. Whether the heads meet together does not seem definitive of whether the FLCs are developing criteria and methods for assessing the GE program. I invite other members of other FLCs to speak of their experiences. The assessment process has ambiguities, you've seen them listed and heard them addressed. We should address those issues now.

Thompson – Responding to the first statement, graduate outcomes assessment, and the statement of FLCs. The AS approved the GE goals and outcomes. Those were passed by the Senate, so the FLCs are not creating goals for us to assess. The quantitative FLC has a long history, and they started in a different manner with different funding. The lead has been involved in the discussions, and he sees the connection and understands it.

Morgan – In referring back, from the perspective of contingent faculty, clarity on the notion of evaluation, lecturers can only be evaluated based on their classes. If a class gets kicked back in this process, it can unfairly penalize lecturers. Saying CFA will offer protections is assumptive

and deflects without addressing the actual concern. Further there are also some concerns regarding confidentiality and anonymity.

Colnic – On the narrow point of how FLCs see themselves, I participate in two of those communities. One hasn't voiced a role, the other has explicitly distanced itself from GE on some of the points raised by Nagel.

Vote on referring back to UEPC: 27 in favor, 9 in opposition, 2 abstentions. Resolution returned to UEPC for further discussion.

Strahm – I was wondering about the impact on non-TT faculty in terms of workload because I presume that a lot of GE classes are taught by non-TT folk. One of the things I worry about is from my time on UEPC, a lot of the subcommittees were filled by people who were not TT. I'm concerned – and this is not directed at anyone – about when you do have these kinds of subcommittees, that it makes it harder for them to push back against administrative pushing. If they feel comfortable or confident in saying yes or no to some of these assessment things.

Thompson – To reiterate that there are no administrators on FLCs. Yes, if we approve a policy that asks people to submit artifacts, that is additional workload for those faculty. I don't know how to address that. To Morgan, would a solution be that there must be multiple sections of any course that's being evaluated?

Morgan – Perhaps that would give one level of safety. But this shouldn't be held against faculty in any way.

d. 3/AS/18/UEPC – Batch Recertification Process for Existing General Education (GE) Courses (Sense of the Senate)

Thompson – We didn't have as much feedback on this one. The committee discussed it and did not make any substantive changes.

Vote: 31 in favor, 1 in opposition, 7 abstentions. Resolution passed.

Wooley – We are going to a conference to learn more about how to work the curriculum process to help with the recertification. Curriculog will be a way to manage this. There will be a process trail. There will be checkmarks showing the path of this. We will be as transparent as possible in this. One data point, in finishing up the GE APR, the last 9 years, we had 512 GE courses but only 386 were taught. With EO 1100, if it's not taught for 5 years, it is no longer GE.

Nagel – If they fall out of GE, who falls them out?

Wooley – They become decertified in GE. This will have systemwide issues since students from other campuses can take GE courses.

e. 4/AS/18/UEPC – Structured Exploratory Emphases (SEEs)

Thompson – This has been a lengthy process. An FLC focused on this and we had folks come up from Northridge to present on this. Originally they were called Pathways. This has an extensive rationale on the resolution. Every question we received we discussed.

Vote: 28 in favor, 7 in opposition, 5 abstentions. Resolution passed.

8. Discussion Item

a. 5/AS/18/GC Amendment to Article VI. Section 6.1 for the Graduate Council Membership

Dorsey – We discussed this briefly last time. The issue is whether or not a grad program director or coordinator can find a surrogate rep if they're unable or unwilling to serve. In Advanced Studies, most of their faculty are directors of one sort or another. It's not clear why they wouldn't all have to represent their programs on that committee. A senator commented that it's not clear why GC representatives must be TT.

Davis – GC has not yet met to discuss the things that were raised. This is your chance to raise issues for them to discuss. This is your chance to share your questions and concerns so this can return as a first reading next time. Please send them to GC.

a. 6/AS/18/GC Resolution Elevation of the Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies Concentration in Child Development (UEE) to a Master of Arts in Child Development

Dorsey – This is a program that has been running for a while. There have been 3 cohorts, 2 completed, and 1 upcoming in the spring. It's a 34-unit UEE program. It was being run out of Interdisciplinary Studies. They want to make it a Child Development major program. The catalyst is EO 1071, revised, which does not allow concentrations to be more than 49% of the major program. We might start seeing more of these elevations. It's an accelerated program targeting working professionals. There is an urgency associated with this because it's my understanding they want to maintain their momentum. They have a database of 50 students not yet in the program. The folks in Child Development, their co-directors are here, are keen to move forward on this as expeditiously as possible.

Strahm – Why not bring it stateside? Dorsey – my understanding is that it needs to be a program that's delivered on an accelerated pace for working professionals. They need to move at a quicker pace than would be allowed stateside.

Evans – If you have the opportunity to elevate programs in the future, look at this program application as a model. They were thorough. I've never seen a program proposal constructed quite so well.

Dorsey – It's supported by a survey that suggests that there's a community need for this program, and it will enrich the community.

Garcia – On the survey on p. 4, it says that the report suggests that a move to MA, and found extensive need in the community. Has there been consultation with the MSW program?

Cortez – There has not been consultation at this time.

Asher – The EAB report looked at career opportunities and needs with degree granting institutions with MA in child development programs. They listed all kinds of opportunities and job descriptions, both at undergrad and graduate levels. One of the kinds of career focuses that they suggest is hiring folks with MA in Child Dev or folks with MSWs. We haven't consulted with any particular programs in terms of this program. We have the EAB data if that would be helpful.

Strahm – I would like to suggest that that would be a good idea, in terms of collegiality.

Foreman – MPA should be consulted as well.

Caudill – To explain, EAB is Education Advisory Board, it's a marketing research firm. UEE pays a membership, which gives us marketing research. A survey may be confusing. We ask the EAB to look at the demand for certain programs, and they come back with recommendations. They're just giving us a profile of the types of jobs that are out there that may require a Masters in Child Development. We're just trying to make sure there's a demand out there for this program.

Davis – When a new program is proposed stateside, the expectation is that related programs will be consulted to make sure there isn't a great deal of overlap, and to identify where overlap might exist. This is true for even when a new course is proposed. The question is whether other programs consulted in the development of this program. Perhaps it would be helpful for this new MA program to go that consultation, to get feedback from other departments and to say you have the support of those programs.

Carroll – I'm surprised that on the form itself, there's no space that requires that. If other elevations come along, we should think about changing the form.

Asher – this program is a replacement for an existing program, and it has been reviewed by the college Curriculum Committee and by Graduate Council with representatives from all the disciplines. There have been opportunities for questions and discussions.

9. Open Forum

Thompson – To raise the issue on learning management system selection and academic tech support, I'm still trying to information about this. We're considering Canvas and Blackboard. I'm concerned that there needs to be an explanation about what OIT will provide in support to the LMSs not selected by the campus. For example, Moodle has 12 users, and it gets support. Since the support comes out of OIT, I guess that support will continue. There are other non-selected LMSs on campus that it's difficult to get support for. If we're silent about it, we'll adopt

Blackboard or Canvas, and the support will disappear. I've asked how many users Classroom has. I haven't gotten a response. Davis – faculty will have chances to experiment and play around with proposed services. There will also be a survey.

Eudey – Recognizing your having approved of SEEs, if you have ideas of SEEs that you want to be involved in or have concerns, please contact me or any of the Faculty Fellows. Your ideas, questions, and concerns, the conversation isn't over, but it is ramping up speed. We didn't have an announcement about the GE forum on Friday?

Wooley – This Friday in FDC 118, 10-11:30, is a GE forum for discussion about EO 1100 and 1110. UEPC, GE Sub, Curriculum folks will all be there. It's an opportunity for us to talk as a campus about the issues with these Eos. We can talk about areas e, d, and g, and structuring the F areas. If you teach GE and want to be involved in how that gets structured as a campus, come to that forum. It's really seeking input. This is an opportunity to think about how we can do GE to make sure that we're helping students get a good liberal arts education and fulfill the GE goals that we have and how we can work in that framework.

Strahm – To go back to what he brought up, thank you Speaker Davis for pointing out the opportunities for us to discuss the kinds of LMSs we're interested in. One of the things that concerns me is that even if we have Blackboard, other people use other things, and we need to make sure that OIT is providing service to the alternative LMSs. I'm speaking about Google Classroom, and we were informed they weren't going to help us anymore and that the license is going away. Thompson – there isn't a license we have to maintain. Strahm – if someone isn't using the favored one, we should still have support and access to the things we need.

Colnic – Thank you to the Senate for letting me proxy and participate. One thing important to our students is that DACA is set to expire in less than a month, on March 5th. The Dreamers Committee is having an ally training on Feb. 23rd. It's a good organization and a good chance to get up to date on how this might affect us and our students.

Junn – The *Washington Times* reports that a federal judge has ordered full implementation of the DACA program.

Strahm – From CNN, second federal judge blocks move to end DACA (reading from news article). The program could end up going beyond the March 5th date, but the program won't have to hold the program open to those who never applied.

10. Adjournment – 3:38 pm