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Consent Item: Naming Opportunity

First 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
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Next Academic Senate Meeting:

April 4, 2017

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

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

1. **Call to order**

2:05pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 28, 2017 (**distributed electronically)

Approved.

1. **Introductions**

Scott Davis, Dave Evans, Jake Myers, Faimous Harrison, Oddmund Myhre, Michele Lahti, Julie Johnson, Amanda Theis, Kristin Dias (Signal), David Lindsay, Helene Caudill, Gitanjali Kaul, Lisa Bernardo, Harold Stanislaw, Jim Tuedio, Ann Mary Macias, and Lauren Byerly.

1. **Announcements**

Demers announced that ASI has sponsored Turlock Transit for CSU Stanislaus students. To be able to ride to downtown Turlock, students just need to show their ID. Flyers were distributed for faculty to share with students, as well as a sign-up for information for marketing promotions to organizations, clubs, and for folks who have never ridden the bus. Sign-up if you’d like ASI to come to classes. The flyer also provides information on the food pantry. Turlock Transit is free to ride anywhere in Turlock if you have a student ID.

Carroll said that on March 17 the History Honor Society Phi Alpha Theta will be showing Suffragette at 7pm in Bizzini 102.

Alvim passed out a flyer about a University Studies Abroad Program (USAC) that he’s teaching in Brazil this summer. Encourage your students to take the course in the summer. There’s a booklet with scholarship information for students being distributed.

French said on behalf of Academic Affairs, the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and the University Library, they are pleased to sponsor the inaugural Stanislaus State Biennial Author Recognition Event. There will be a call for submissions to recognize faculty, administrators, staff and emeriti professors who have published a book, chapter, etc. in the last five years. Get more information from the flyer that will be sent via email. Submissions are due by March 29th. We look forward to celebrating the scholarly and creative accomplishments of the campus community on Thursday, April 27th, 4-6pm, in FDC 118. It will be a big party for all who submit and their guests. Thanks for creating new knowledge.

Gerson said that they had good conversations at the Affordable Learning Solutions event today, and this will be held again tomorrow at 7:45am. She learned about alternatives to textbooks in the classroom to reduce costs to students. No RSVP needed to attend.

S. Davis, Faculty Director of General Education stated that the GE Assessment Council continues its work implementing the new GE Goals and Outcomes and designing certification and assessment of outcomes. Currently, we are aligning the Outcomes with the GE Areas, using course proposals and other documentation to describe these areas in terms of the work we’re actually doing. Our next step is to visit with department faculty to confirm our findings and offer the opportunity to make any adjustments to our alignment. Look for an email invitation from me and Erin Littlepage, and we do hope that faculty who actually teach these GE courses are part of these discussions, however they unfold.

Eudey made an announcement in her role as the Faculty Director of Advising Cohorts, she will soon share a call for applications for roles which were originally named as Meta-Major Advisors when conceived of, but they’ve changed the name to Academic Success Center Academic Fellows to better reflect the diverse roles these faculty advisors may take on. Each of four fellows will get 3 WTU’s each fall and spring of funded reassigned time for a total of 6 annual WTU’s. These fellows will work with her in the academic success center and will help with developing advising materials, staff development and providing advising to undeclared students, assisting with the CA Promise program and learning cohorts. The call will go out in the next few days.

Sims said to please encourage colleagues to apply. This is a shift in advising practice. We are looking to have substantial collaboration between staff and faculty advising, building collaborative efforts, especially helping students who don’t know what direction they might go. We are getting students talking to faculty as well as staff advisors in that process. Eudey’s role is unprecedented in collaboration. We’re creating something unique in the system with our ASC and the faculty fellows. Whomever you know, who are the best advisors you know, are on it, always have time for it, seem to understand how the forms work, those are the folks, if we can get them on this team I think our students are going to experience a dramatic shift beyond what we do in teaching and learning. This comes with real release time, for real work that will be consequential.

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

FAC – Davis noted that the report will come with information and first reading items.

FBAC – Wooley noted that they are not meeting this week, they haven’t had a lot to talk about yet this term.

GC – Garone said that they will have a packed meeting on Thursday and he will have things to report next time.

ASCSU – Strahm noted they are meeting tomorrow.

UEPC – Thompson noted they discussed feedback from AS about the academic calendar draft and decided not to make any formal response until they are able to go over the approved minutes from the meeting, so this will be discussed next time. They discussed the exception request for course time modules that will be needed. They thought it would be a good idea to distribute this to chairs and Deans to look over. They will send that out for feedback and look at it one more time. They had a lengthy discussion about CA Promise that will be discussed later in the agenda here.

CoC – C. Davis noted that they met today to look at the committee preference forms, and they also looked at the list of faculty in general. CoC tries to have at least two names for any position. CoC requested her to come here today to note that they only have one nomination for Speaker Elect and that they would like there to be two. Also, they do not have a nominee for Clerk and would like one or two names. They realize that it may not be clear that many of these positions come with assigned time. For instance, the Clerk comes with three units of funded reassigned time. CoC will start calling people so if you’re interested call C. Davis or Pierce for interest in either of these positions.

Sims noted that having served as Speaker he feels better about where he works than ever before. He knows the institution better. During meetings he hears folks talking from units he normally doesn’t get to engage with directly. He has a tremendous appreciation for the hard working people throughout the university, which was not fully visible to him as a faculty member prior to this. He feels more a part of the institution, and has a lot more comprehensive pride in the university. He now knows more specific people and their projects. It is a privilege to work in this capacity. If you’re inclined to do it, but feel it might be too much, you’ll grow into it. The Speaker gets 12 WTU’s assigned time. If you’re interested in the Speaker position or in being Clerk, contact C. Davis or Pierce.

With regard to the Clerk positon, Sims noted he was in a SP meeting needing to look up an issue from 4-5 years ago, and within 3 minutes he was able to pull up the Senate minutes, read the conversation, and knew where the issue had been left. We have had a succession of outstanding folks in this role. You don’t notice the minutes until you need them. It’s very important that they’re accurate. Minutes are critical. If you have that skill set, we’d be happy to have you serve.

**7. Information Items**

a. GREAT Team & Graduation Initiative update (M. Gunn, S. Young)

**Revision of Our Graduation Initiative Student Success Plan**

As a result of the last Steering Committee meeting on Monday, March 6th, we established procedures for seeking campus input on the revision of our Graduation Initiative Student Success Plan. Detailed information was distributed Wednesday, March 8th to chairs/leads of key stakeholder committees, including Senate Executive Committee, ASI Board of Directors, President’s Cabinet (for VPs to distribute within their divisions), Student Success Committee, Deans/Chairs/Program Directors/Coordinators, and individuals who submitted project proposals to GREAT. This solicitation is the first round of input/feedback, which is due back to GREAT Friday, March 17. A second round of input will be solicited during the period of March 30-April 14, where a first draft of the plan will be distributed back to those groups. The revised plan is due April 28, 2017.

**Response to the Request for Next Year’s “On-the-Cusp” Cohort Graduation Evaluations**

At the last Senate meeting, a request for graduation evaluations for next year’s “on-the-cusp” cohort was made, to enable intrusive advisors in the academic departments to be able to reach out to next year’s cohorts and begin advising for Fall 2017 registration. A team representing Institutional Research, Enrollment Services, and the Provost’s Office met soon after, and discussed a strategy to meet the intent of the request and the president’s affirmation of that request. Institutional Research is currently working to identify next year’s cohort, and degree audits will be conducted once the cohort is identified. This doesn’t provide the same level of precision as what will be provided in the fall when there is sufficient time to conduct full graduation evaluations, but it does provide the faculty advisors an opportunity to reach out to the new cohort earlier – so as faculty are working with this year’s cohort to cross the finish line, they can start to reach out to next year’s cohort.

**Summer Waiver Letters**

73 students from this year’s on-the-cusp cohort were identified by their Graduation Initiative faculty intrusive advisors as eligible for summer waivers. These 73 eligible students may only apply the waivers toward degree-plan courses that will enable them to graduate this summer. Graduation Initiative “on-the-cusp” students were provided waivers for a maximum of 9 units across winter and summer sessions combined.

Wood asked in terms of getting students out quickly, there were promises made to departments and faculty that if we could get some Intrusive Advising students into summer classes they would go through regardless of size. Now we’re being told you’re not sure how big the classes need to be before they’ll be allowed to go forward. Does the AVP office have a minimum number of students before a class gets canceled? This question was redirected from Young to Caudill as this is under UEE.

Caudill said in winter they used the 23/22 scale, and in summer it’s a different pay scale. We need to come up with something. We don’t want to offer waivers and not be able to have the class. It has not been decided upon. There is no minimum, but summer must break even according to contract.

Wood said some students in CJ have been told that if you sign up for summer you’ll get the waiver and we’ll get you out. If you sign up for summer you’re good to go. But now are finding that it could be 2-3 students in the class. If they only have 2-3 students, now they’re not sure if the class will be offered so this is causing chaos in CJ. Faculty may have been making promises they are now going to break.

Caudill said this is a pedagogical issue. If the faculty members think that with 3-5 students that’s a comfortable class to teach, they’ll try to make it work. She will come back with some parameters for the summer. Wood asked about a timeline. Caudill said that we should have it within the next week or two.

Tuedio said with regard to the 70-some eligible for the waiver, is it possible to see what courses they need, and could we commit to keep those courses in the schedule? Young said in the Provost’s letters this morning, it states that they must be degree plan courses and they are directed back to their advisor to confirm the courses. We would have to collect the information thru depts. and deans to compile such a list. Tuedio said we could set parameters for courses to offer with low enrollment. It wouldn’t be related to other classes that are just general summer classes.

Garone followed up. A couple months ago Caudill said she would review the pay schedules; could you explain the two faculty pay terms? Caudill noted the 23/22 scale is used for special sessions based on faculty rank and the number of students enrolled, and this scale is used in winter and special sessions. For summer, it’s pay based on your individual WTU rate. The number of students doesn’t make as much difference in the summer, but as self-support we are required to break even. We can make exceptions because of the graduation initiative. In the past as long as fees coming in are equal to the instructor cost, we let the class go. It could be 5-10 for some. It depends on the rate of pay.

Sims said we need to be as flexible as possible to get the class to go. Caudill said sometimes they let some go in the past even if the enrollment was smaller than break-even. Some could be well-enrolled. Not all courses in the summer schedule to support the grad initiative will be low enrolled. We will see in the first two weeks of the schedule about enrollment rates.

Sims asked if the pay scale information is posted on the website? Caudill will send the pay scale information for the minutes. Normally, they pay the normal WTU rate for stateside, term courses. 1/30 of the pay per WTU. She will share the article 21 information for the minutes. This follows the contract, as negotiated between the faculty and the CSU administration.

Information shared by Dean Caudill:

For Winter Intersession, UEE uses the Classification Code 2322 Salary Schedule: <http://online.sjsu.edu/docs/CSU_salary_schedule_per_unit_2322.pdf>

For Summer Session, UEE uses the Classification Code 2357 Salary Schedule (1/30 WTU rate) as described in Article 21:

<https://www.calstate.edu/hr/employee-relations/bargaining-agreements/contracts/cfa/2014-2017/article21.pdf>

b. WASC update (H. Stanislaw)

The workgroups that will help draft the essays for the self-study have started to meet. There are three workgroups: Student Success; Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degree; and Quality Assurance and Sustainability. Even though the workgroups have started to meet, newcomers are welcome – just contact anyone on the WASC Steering Committee for more information.

At the previous Senate meeting, Mark Thompson and I mentioned that three Faculty Learning Communities are being formed. These FLCs aren’t just for WASC; they will continue their work after the reaffirmation team has visited our campus. Each FLC will explore one of three core competencies, namely critical thinking, oral communication, and written communication. There has been an extended call for participation in the FLCs, but the deadline to express interest is tomorrow. So, don’t delay – reply today!

Stanislaw reported that work is tied to CFRs, and they will be exploring the issues behind them, and will compile the story to tell about the university. They are still assembling the evidence, will see if there are holes, and then see what the evidence is telling us. They will review for the rest of year. Then they’ll move on to drafting essays, revising them, and then put a draft self-study out for consultation.

Sims noted that lots of times people miss calls for participation. What would faculty get out of being on the workgroups? Stanislaw said familiarity with the broad underpinnings of the university. This is community-wide exploring, not just domains we are familiar with, but broader. For example, different people have different views on student success, we get to see this in a broad context, where to do improvements, are we doing all that would benefit our students, and these groups will include people with different levels of expertise. Members will solicit more information and learn more.

Sims said that he knows we have too much to do, but these are opportunities to look at what we done, and how well are we doing what we intend to do. This is what that it looks like when you have the opportunity to ask these questions and be a team member and say something consequential. Especially for our junior faculty on campus, reach out and make them aware of these opportunities, and for faculty that have been around for longer this is important too. This will connect to GE outcomes and assessment long term. These are big pieces to put in place. We have great processes; we need people to show up to join the team. We need to get more participation.

Chavasta asked about concerns for representation from each college. Stanislaw said that we want one representative from each college. Stanislaw said that in the call it indicated there should be some from each college, but we will take those who are willing. Sims said that currently we have 12 applicants. CBA and COEKSW should shake the trees harder. Stanislaw noted the FLCs do provide compensation.

Carroll asked how often and for how long are they meeting. Workgroups each had an initial two-hour meeting. Some will be one hour every other week. All work is not done in the committee.

c. Strategic Plan update (K. Greer, S. Sims)

Sims said that they are still continuing the work. Greer is at an advocacy day in Sacramento today. Sims noted that they are still outlining and identifying pillar goals. The Council has settled on addressing cross-silo goals. It’s been especially valuable to have G. Kaul involved, as she has great acumen in this area. The energy in the room is terrific. One item coming to the next AS meeting, is the SPC is deciding to take a crack at revising the Mission/Vision/Values statement for the university, and will be running the statement by the Senate before the rough draft of the SP is completed. It will be coming for consultation before other rough draft portions come forward. Horacio Ferriz is leading that group. Primary to revising the statement is that the SPC feels strongly that we need to incorporate our diversity statement fundamentally into the MVV rather than have it separate it from our central mission. They’re taking language about diversity and inclusion from the statement and incorporating it into the MVV. As he understands it, that’s the main change. The cultural moment certainly warrants this change.

d. California Promise SB 412

Young reported that this past September, SB 412 was signed into law, resulting in the CA Promise. CA Promise is a pledge program that enables 4-year graduation for freshmen, and 2-year graduation for ADT transfer students. Students pledge to maintain eligibility criteria to stay in the CA Promise program, and the University commits to providing certain benefits to students in the program.

The benefits that **must** be provided to the students, per the SB and CO policy, are:

1. priority registration; and
2. academic advisement that includes monitoring the student’s academic progress.

Per CO-mandated catalog language, the following regarding the program is mandated:

“*…The program is limited to students who are residents of California. Students who commit to enter the 2-year or 4-year pledge will be given a priority registration appointment for each state-supported enrollment period and will be provided with routine and thorough academic advisement. In order to remain in the program, students must meet with their advisors as prescribed, develop an enrollment plan, and complete 30 semester units or quarter equivalent within each year, including summer. Participating campuses may stipulate other important requirements as well.*”

Also per the coded memo, each campus is expected to appoint a dedicated advisor to the program. As an initial response to this, our Faculty Director for Advising and Learning Cohorts (FDALC) was asked to serve, at least initially, and has been appointed as the dedicated advisor, until we learn more about how this is going to evolve and what it will entail.

A workgroup was tasked in the fall with responding to the October coded memo, and that workgroup has evolved and changed over the course of the last several months with all the transitions that have occurred. In February, the new workgroup met to review and discuss a second coded memo that was issued February 3, requiring campuses take action by March 1 (which resulted in the appointment of our FDALC as the dedicated advisor for the program). As a result of that February meeting, we asked UEPC to add this to its agenda, and UEPC had an initial discussion last week. Our workgroup asked to be on the UEPC agenda, as we are seeking consultation with faculty governance in two areas of program implementation where there is room for campus authority to make some decisions within the mandate. Those two areas are:

1. **Implementation of priority registration.** Specifically, what degree of priority registration should be assigned to the CA Promise Program? The coded memo allows for campus authority within its priority registration procedures, and our campus registration procedures do have variation – either priority ahead of student class (for ADT transfers, that would be ahead of juniors), or priority ahead of all students (before all classes, such as is provided to veterans, students receiving disability resource services, and foster youth – all of whom receive this highest level of priority registration by federal mandate).
2. **Eligibility requirements to enter and stay in the program and receive its benefits.** Per the mandated catalog language, the minimum criteria/requirements are, beyond being a CA resident, the following:
3. students must meet with their advisor;
4. students must develop an enrollment plan; and
5. students must complete 30 units per year.

The coded memo allows for additional criteria/requirements, and based on a scan of other campuses who have already published information about those programs, additional criteria vary across the system.

You noted that the bill and the coded memo call for “local review” of these requirements/criteria by the campus “graduation initiative advisory committee” or by a committee with “similar functions.” I believe the initial thinking in the fall was that the workgroup was functioning as a subset of Enrollment Management Committee, but I’m not sure on that.

Also, it’s important to point out that the expectation is that all campuses have the pledge program in place for the Fall 2017 ADT transfer students, and we are awaiting more specific timeline instructions from the CO regarding when our campus would be required to implement the 4-year pledge program.

We asked to add this as an information item so that we could give folks a heads-up that this is underway, but also to solicit any input and feedback in terms of process, as we do need to move on this sooner rather than later. Specifically, what we were discussing in UEPC, and afterward via email among some of us as we were continuing to brainstorm, are some basic questions we are looking to address:

* Which group should be making recommendations about criteria for this program?
* Which group should be making recommendations about priority registration?
* Which group should be approving each of those recommendations?

Strahm responded to Young, noting that none of this is directed at her, but at the legislation. One of the things that bothers her off the top of her head is that it’s classist. It’s giving priority to students who already have the means to get through. If you have the ability to sign a pledge, take 15 units a semester in four years, you have no other obligations if you can do that. Also, what that does unless she’s hearing wrong is that leaves out students who need remedial education. So most of the students who tend to need remedial education are those who came from those more segregated schools that didn’t have access to all the resources, at school, in home life, and didn’t have access to things that would make them educationally successful so have to do remediation. So those are left out of the equation. Priority registration, what you’re doing is taking a group of people who have the ability to say yes I can do this, and putting them in front of others who can’t do that. Basically, the very people who need our support the most it seems are the ones receiving even less of our support because that support and resources are going to be directed toward those who can commit to doing the four years. Am I hearing you correctly? And are all doing the four and two year programs?

Young said we’re mandated to do the two-year program, not the four-year program. The system is still seeking some who will do the four-year program now, and there is no written communication about requiring beyond the eight for the four year.

Sims said there is a state law that says we must provide the CA Promise where students who are entering can enter into an agreement to finish in 2 or 4 years, and we have to provide additional support services. One of the few that is specifically named in the bill is priority registration of some kind. They leave it to us to decide how to implement it. We decide how to fit this with local policy.

Thompson thinks this is more important when it starts to apply to first time freshmen. There’s not a quick solution to points that Strahm raises. Legislation says that we must accept students if they are eligible and if they’re from underrepresented schools. There is some requirement in the mandate to accept certain students in the program that counterbalances a little of it.

Strangfeld wonders what is meant by a CA resident. How does that impact Dreamers? Young doesn’t know but will find out. It was determined that this follows the same criteria as currently used to be eligible for in-state tuition.

Carroll said Strahm’s point is that some are less likely to want to take the pledge even if they’re qualified. This only partially addressed Strahm’s point. Will students needing remediation have a longer version? Will we be free to do that? Can we say that our students will have a 5 yr. review? Not according to the bill that Sims read. It has to be 2 yrs. for transfers and 4 yrs. for new freshmen. He recommends everyone reading it. It is unclear where to improvise or innovate. This is of a piece with the graduation initiative – trying to force accountability from the CSU as a whole. For good or ill.

Eudey noted that applicants who have completed ADTs has increased exponentially over the past four years, and we have to recognize that large numbers of our transfers could be able to participate in this program. We have to put policies in place that can apply to whatever number of students chose to participate, especially when we need to include freshmen. The criteria listed in the legislation would allow a majority of our students to be eligible, if they’re willing/able to take 30 units a year. We may need to be creative about priority registration. Maybe it involves giving CA Promise students the opportunity to enroll in 15 units in the first pass, but doesn’t change when they get to register. Some campuses are giving highest priority to these students, and this is not something she supports.

Bernardo noted that even though we have increased to 240 applicants who claim to be on track for ADT completion, that we have not verified their eligibility but these numbers are increasing. This may bring more ADT to our campus. They are increasing as CCs are getting the word out to their students.

Strahm highlights the fact that if you can kick students out if CA Promise for not meeting the requirements that is going to reinforce the idea that they don’t belong in college, especially first generation, underrepresented, marginalized students. We all have lived through the big giant recession, and there were so many things people were trying to push on us. At the end of the day, nothing changes, nothing improves if you don’t have classes for students when they can take them. If we can’t offer classes, no amount of anything else resolves that. To answer Sims, if we want our students to be able to get through in 2 or 4 years, we must provide them with resources. Not sure how we’ll do that. They need resources so they don’t need a fulltime job off of campus, a major inhibitor to getting through. If we’re going to do this, we have to provide something to students so they can be engaged in their coursework and focus on education as opposed to everything else.

Sims noted back to Young’s questions, where will we land this?

Sarraille said the cat’s out of the bag. This sounds like it is encouraging lots of people to sign up for this program because they get priority registration. Are we rationing classes? You get more if you sign up for this program. We need to gear up so that there is more left over for the part time students if possible. We don’t want the CA Promise students to snap up everything and leave crumbs for others.

Nagel would like UEPC and/or FBAC to look at this. One possible version is to provide access to register for classes an hour early or two minutes early.

Sims said there is a lot of latitude in the bill, and this is not prescriptive of implementation. This is just parameters and outcomes and they will let campuses tell them how we’ll implement them. This is why Young, Eudey and Thompson wanted it on the Senate agenda right away.

Thompson would take the comments made to heart. This is one of those times you wish you were in the UC system. He thinks it’s unfortunate we have this mania for 30 units per year and the idea that it’s beneficial to our students is misguided.

Garone said this is a long shot, since this law is pretty clearly classist and denies equal protection to our students. Can it be challenged in court? Could the CFA institute a lawsuit against this law, or somebody representing the university? It was noted that students might be able to sue, but likely not faculty or the university. They’d need to prove damages by plaintiffs and get enough to get class action status, but it’s possible. Such things usually have to happen post-implementation to show real damages.

Tuedio noted if we’re captured by the 2025 graduation initiative, we are looking at a two-year transfer rate of about 67%, which is 2/3 of them. We can look at the CA Promise as a way they’re trying to provide incentives for students to reach the target we’re responsible for reaching. The freshmen rate of 37.5% is even more challenging for us – a practice like this can help us achieve that target. For priority registration, we could possibly put it into the second pass, but not the first pass. Then those under 12 units still get in but at the start of the second pass we could give the CA Promise folks the priority.

Sims noted this will go back to SEC and UEPC.

**8. Consent Item**

a. Naming Opportunity

Sims directed all to the revised version of the consent item distributed in paper at the meeting. This item was discussed at the SEC last week, via Junn and Lahti. It is the intent of President Junn and University Advancement to administer, in consultation with the Academic Senate, a respectful balance between naming of buildings and landscapes as a donor benefit with those named in honor of an individual who has made extraordinary contributions to our campus.

Policy 15501.00 outlines the criteria for naming in honor of an individual:

* Retired or deceased for at least two years.
* Unique distinction in higher education and other significant areas of public service.
* Served in an academic or administrative capacity.
* Made extraordinary contributions to a CSU campus.

The process calls for confirmation that the campus President has consulted in a timely manner with the Executive Committee of the campus Academic Senate.  This consultation occurred on March 7, 2017.

The acceleration of this proposal is to allow for sharing the news with Dr. Hughes when she is on campus for President Junn's Inauguration, scheduled for March 30, 2017.

SEC is asking in consultation with Advancement and President Junn that we consent to naming the Reflecting Pond, the large body of water at the front of campus after Marvalene Hughes. Eudey moved consent item, seconded by Strahm.

**1/AS/17/SEC/AS Naming Reflecting Pond in Honor of Marvalene Hughes**

**Whereas** Dr. Marvalene Hughes was President of California State University, Stanislaus from 1994 to 2005; and

**Whereas** during her tenure on this campus Dr. Hughes led efforts to beautify the campus, including the installation of water features and new buildings, among them Residence Life Village, the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center, the Mary Stuart Rogers Educational Services Gateway Building, Snider Music Recital Hall, and Naraghi Hall of Science; be it therefore

**Resolved,** that the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate supports celebrating these additions to campus by naming of the reflecting pond at the Monte Vista Avenue entrance to campus in honor of President-emerita Marvalene Hughes.

Petrosky thought this was a slam dunk before the speaker spoke. Was SEC told by Advancement to balance donors and non-donors? Sims said that he misspoke if that was said. Their approach to naming is not all about donors, but people to honor.

Petrosky asked is this was a preamble to pushing another name? Sims said not that he knows. Lahti says this is not related at all.

Sarraille asked what specifically is the name that is proposed? Lahti noted the proposal is to call it the Dr. Marvalene Hughes Reflecting Pond. The name is not finalized.

Wooley said pool is maybe cooler than pond. It may encourage swimming.

Tuedio asked why this isn’t a lake like others? The official name is a reflecting pond.

Byerly asked if they considered naming a lake after her since she helped create them and that might be better. SEC discussed this, but thought the pond was more prestigious.

Dyer thought that a plaque would be valuable to show appreciation for not only her contributions to the aesthetics of campus but also her benefits to the students academically and tied to enrollment. Lahti said there will be a ceremonial unveiling of a plaque.

Thompson asked about the status of naming a ball field that was held up. Lahti said the other donor benefit is not moving forward.

This is a consent item. Sims called for members to voice concerns for this to move forward. No objections were raised so this passed as a consent item. Ovation.

9.  **Discussion Items**

* 1. Expansion of Membership of the General Faculty

C. Davis noted that we have been discussing the role of part time faculty in governance for 3 years.

I want to start by giving a brief history of our conversations, for those who were not in the Senate at the time. I wish to thank Mark Thompson, who wrote up a summary and shared it during discussion last year. I have taken most of this from his document.

In 2013, the AAUP released a statement encouraging all colleges and universities to examine the ways in which they include Contingent Faculty. Our statewide Academic Senate then passed a resolution asking each CSU campus to “Review or revise their constitutions and policies” to include non-tenure track faculty.

On this campus, we then took up that charge. Starting in 2014, the Faculty Affairs Committee added it to their agenda. They brought a discussion item to Senate in spring, and a survey was sent to all faculty. Last academic year, FAC began consulting with various constituents: surveys were sent to committees, part-time faculty. FAC proposed a constitutional amendment including part-time faculty in the definition of General Faculty. The yes votes for this amendment were 64%, but it needed 66% to pass.

This academic year, FAC has continued to gather information in preparation for the amendment that will come as a first reading at the next Senate meeting.

We surveyed faculty in fall, asking two questions. First, when asked if part time faculty should be given a vote of some kind in governance matters, of the 190 respondents, 158 said yes. The other question asked about various ways in which part-time faculty could qualify as members of the General Faculty: when they first start teaching, after a certain time in service, after teaching 30 units, any semester in which they teach 6+ units, or with a fractional vote based on teaching load. Respondents could select as many choices as they wished, and there was a 6th choice of “other” with room for comments. This chart represents the 163 responses that picked from these 5 choices.

FAC also asked Speaker Simms to contact the other Speakers in the system. We asked these 4 questions:

1. Does your campus allow part-time faculty to vote on governance matters?
2. How is eligibility determined?
3. What benefits have you seen from including part-time faculty in governance?
4. What problems have you seen from including part-time faculty in governance?

We will be giving you a fuller summary of their responses in the coming weeks. Very briefly, you can see here that most of the responses indicated that they do include all faculty in governance. Only 1 campus responded with a simple “no” (LA) but they are now working on this. We’re in the “working on it” category but we’re not alone. Vote with limits – Fullerton, Sacramento, San Marcos, Bakersfield, SSU. Vote and serve is voting privileges and serve on committees. Every campus is different, so details are hard to provide.

Some of the benefits include having their voices heard, and making them more invested in governance matters. The problems are, in my mind, small. No system has collapsed, and these problems may work themselves out over time. Some campuses had difficulty getting PT to serve. Some looking at stipends. Every campus working on this. Some administrative problems figuring out who is getting the ballot.

Thompson asked who was surveyed? Davis said full time faculty got the survey. 190 responded. Pretty good return rate, higher than voting rate.

Carroll asked how long the systems have been in place at other campuses? C Davis said they didn’t specifically ask how long. Some are in the midst of implementing; some have done this longer.

Carroll asked if the PowerPoint can be shared more broadly. C Davis said it will be shared after spring break. Sims noted that generally the largest campuses gave votes with the fewest restrictions.

Davis indicated that given all of this, FAC is proposing the following amendment to the Constitution. After two consecutive academic years of service, faculty who teach at least 12 WTUs in the year will be members of the General Faculty. Librarians and counselors are included in this. We have maintained the statement that faculty who teach less still have the privilege of debate.

In response to questions from senators, we have added a restriction that faculty with MPP cannot serve as faculty representatives. FAC also received a question about why the President and some Deans are included. One member of FAC pointed out that this reflects the history of academia, where deans, provosts, and presidents rose from the ranks of faculty. And, on this campus, when we had a vote of no-confidence, it made a statement to the public that the president himself had a vote, and so did some administrators. So FAC felt it made sense to allow them to vote. Some Deans with retreat rights can vote, but this is balanced with restrictions that they can’t be on committees.

So what would this mean? For this academic year (2016-17), 118 part time faculty members are teaching 12 units. Some of those might not have two years of service. But approximately 1/3 of the PT faculty could be eligible to vote if it passes.

Now, how many of those eligible would actually vote? Not many. Last spring, 402 PT faculty and FT lecturer members were eligible to vote for the lecturer representative. 28 voted (7%). And, for comparison, 311 tenure line faculty were eligible to vote for all academic senate committees. 139 voted (44%).

Wood is remembering the spirited debate about the change in the constitution in terms of who would be general faculty, and faculty voted and it didn’t pass last year. What happens if in this next go-round something similar happens, will FAC push for it again year after year until it’s successful?

FAC thinks that after much consultation, based on the survey, we think we have presented an option a majority of the faculty will be happy with. It will be up to the future FAC to decide to continue to pursue it or let it die if it doesn’t pass this time. Sims said that last year and this year FAC was responsive to faculty. When FAC talked in early fall that the last vote was so close, and after the committee got a lot of feedback where full time faculty said they would have voted yes except they thought the condition we put in this time should be there to vote. We got feedback that some wanted to give the vote with more qualifications. There is also a cadre that are opposed, but numbers tell us that there are also strong numbers interested in it.

Thompson said if the vote was 30% in favor last year, it wouldn’t be back on the agenda. Get out the no vote if you want this to stop. I’m glad FAC discussed the questions about definition of general faculty as unit 3, and I don’t know that you can say that you know how academic administrators voted on the no confidence resolution, but might speculate on that. Shirvani might have voted. I don’t think that holds water. I keep raising this issue because the requirement is to teach, people in classrooms with students, some get two bites of the apple. That 64% vote was not just 64% in favor of what’s outlined for PT faculty, but also the definition of GF as unit 3 was also part of that vote. If we’re making that argument, we are taking more than a call for solidarity to overturn that preference as well.

Carroll said that it would require 67% not 66% to pass. Without speaking to how things played out last year, he is happy with this process this year. He hasn’t discussed this systematically with his department yet, but in informal conversations, History figured largely in vocal concern last year, and his sense is it’s more favorable this year. He thinks you should be optimistic on this. Finally, what does two consecutive years of service mean? C. Davis indicates this means employed for two years in a row. Some PT who teach 12 units in one term only, so if back-to-back years fulfill requirements. Some are seasonal faculty, so they are not excluded by naming semesters.

Gerson thanked FAC for the numbers. If they are trying to be more inclusive, it’s strange to put people on and off on the basis of one WTU. She’s generally pleased by how FAC has handled this. C. Davis noted the constitution is a living document, this is the best they could do.

Sims noted perhaps a cumulative set of units could be a threshold to keep people on the list. C. Davis said some are uncomfortable that if someone met the threshold they could still vote if no longer on campus. So the continued service piece ensured it was people who were still present.

This will be a first reading next time. Share comments with FAC and C. Davis will share more on Facnet.

**10. First Reading Items:**

* 1. 2/AS/17/SEC Resolution Reaffirming Equal Access to Quantitative Literacy for All California Children Enrolled in High School

Deferred.

* 1. 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

Sims noted these are proposed amendments. These are much more clerical and administrative clean up.

C. Davis noted this is amending descriptions of URPTC, FAC, UEPC, FBAC and FDC. These are editorial changes only, they moved phrases and changed verbs. The intention is to make descriptions in parallel structure so that it’s easier to understand what each committee is/does.

Sarrialle said that it makes reference to instructional and non-instructional faculty in 5.1. We had a discussion about the propriety of using the term non-instructional faculty for librarians and counselors and the outcomes is that it is not accurate and maybe a bit pejorative. There may be another way to word this.

C. Davis will say it will move mention of this committee to the other resolution, as this changes language describing of the committee. This is the language of the FDC and we will work on it.

Sarraille said in the same area, in 5.1 it does not say that the elections will be conducted by CoC . C. Davis said she didn’t type it but it’s still there. Sims said we will get a corrected version out.

* 1. 4/AS/17/FAC/SEC Amendments to Article VI. Sections 2.3, 3.0 for changes to committee membership designations

C. Davis noted changes to three committees that includes changes to the text and meaning of the membership. Seconded by Petrosky.

Nagel said on GE, UW, and CoC, is CoC including potentially PT members of the GF to serve on the committee, but not for GE Sub or UW. He noted a lot of PT faculty do a lot of writing instruction and could be valuable members.

C Davis noted ASL and T&L are not on this list, so they will be open to part timers if we vote to enfranchise PT faculty. She noted that the language presented in the resolution was tied to the feedback received from the committees last year. This is what they told us they wanted for their membership. FAC didn’t come up with this, it’s what the committees offered. CoC said if we are expanding PT representation on other committees, we want someone on CoC to help with this. That’s why they opened it up. GE Sub and UW said that they preferred to remain as it is now, which is FT faculty, and they’ve added the designation to maintain it.

Sims said opening slots on CoC to a part time faculty member would be important whether or not other changes occur. CoC doesn’t just place people on AS committees, but search committees, work groups, etc. Often it’s tenured faculty in the room who are limited to people we know. We need more people in the room.

Garcia thinks the work is good. Thinks GC needs attention to its membership. It’s bizarre the membership is graduate program coordinators, and not to graduate faculty members. We didn’t do this with UEPC, as oversight for curriculum so why are we doing it here?

Sims said he would like to see GC included in this. C. Davis said this is what GC indicated, but FAC can add it in as an agenda item for the future.

Garone noted they discussed this issue in GC, and it was unanimous in the committee that people charged with running the programs should be the people making decisions about graduate policy since they are closest to it and making the decisions.

Sims said there may be selection bias in the room. We may need room for a broader conversation among faculty in the programs.

**11. Open Forum**

None.

**12. Adjournment**

4pm