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**First Reading Items**

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

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

8/AS/18/FAC/SEC Editorial Amendment to Article V. The Academic Senate

9/AS/18/FAC/SEC Editorial Amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

**March 13, 2018**

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

Minutes submitted by:

Gerard Wellman, Clerk

1. **Call to order**

2:00pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 13, 2018** (distributed electronically)

Approved

1. **Introductions**

Sarah Schrader, Jovonte Willis, Matt Collins, Gitanjali Kaul, Oddmund Myhre, Victoria Cortez, Rita Asher, Lauren Byerly, Stuart Wooley, Ron Rodriguez, Jake Myers, Harold Stanislaw, Betsy Eudey, Dave Evans, Helene Caudill, Ellen Junn, Nina Palomino, Shannon Stevens

1. **Announcements**

Davis – On behalf of Marina Gerson, Wednesday, March 14, 2018 from 3:00-4:00pm, in FDC# 118 Dr. Elmano Costa will be delivering a workshop on 6 strategies to enliven classroom discussions. There will be refreshments at 2:45pm.

The Athletic Department will be hosting a crab feed on March 10, 2018. Social Hour 5:30pm and dinner will be at 6:30pm. Proceeds will benefit Warrior Athletics scholarship fund.

The Music department has opera workshops on Wednesday, February 28, 2018 and March 1, 2018. It is a good introduction to opera. The performance is a little over an hour long and students will be performing.

The Sociology Club is doing a feminine hygiene kit drive. If you’re interested in donating, they will be excited. They partnered with the Gospel Mission and will be delivering the kits there. If interested, e-mail Jey Strangfeld. The kit consists of tampons, pads, hand wipes, sanitizer, and maybe some snacks.

ASI is partnering with Chartwells to disperse pantry-safe items. Half of the proceeds go to the Warrior Pantry and the other half goes to a non-profit organization in the area. ASI will be constructing those.

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

FAC - Met last week and will be meeting again on March 7, 2018. They will be discussing the same things as earlier – the range election policy and the memo for departments regarding the role of contingent faculty in department decision making.

FBAC - Met two weeks ago and discussed recommendations to UBAC priorities and if we want to put those forward.

GC - Met and discussed comments made by senators regarding the selection of GC representatives. We discussed responsiveness to EO 1071. GC also approved the graduate education assessment plan.

SWAS - Meets in two weeks. In the meantime, the AAUP has released an open letter to Chancellor White regarding EO 1100 and 1110. Strahm read from the document:

*The CA-AAUP views Chancellor White’s procedures in issuing EO 1100 and 1110 as a direct assault on the principles of shared governance, principles that form the very core of AAUP values. We call upon Chancellor White to refrain from taking further actions that undermine the principles of academic freedom and shared governance enshrined in that document, which values are reified in California state in case law. Passing from process to substance, CA-AAUP supports CFA’s October 29, 2017 resolution in support of rescinding EO 1100. CA-AAUP joins with the Academic Senate of the California State University and eighteen of the CSU campus Senates in calling for immediate rescission or, barring that, delay in implementing Executive Order 1100 (Revised), so that our colleges “may continue to provide the breadth and quality of education that our students deserve.” Turning to Executive Order 1110, CA-AAUP supports CFA’s October 29, 2017, Resolution in Support of Rescinding California State University Executive Order 1110. CA-AAUP condemns that order’s attempt to eliminate the English Placement Test and the Entry Level Mathematics Test. Elimination of these examinations will dramatically disadvantage poor students, students of color, students for whom English is a second language, and students entering college with educational deficits. We agree that these examinations are “the baseline for providing our students the academically responsible quality education our faculty seek to provide and our students deserve.”*

They describe things we’ve taken issue with the Chancellor over this.

UEPC - Discussed the referral of the General Education Assessment Plan and referred the plan to the GE Assessment Committee along with the feedback from Senate. The committee reviewed feedback from the open forum on EOs 1100 and 1110 and, in consultation with the GE subcommittee and Academic Affairs will hold another open forum to continue the discussion and present draft ideas for changes to the GE program. The committee also continued discussion of technology enhanced active learning classrooms, and specifically discussed plans for a 60+-seat version. Discussion of input for room design, notification of programs on campus, and scheduling issues continues with Academic Affairs. The committee approved program revisions: B.S. in Biological Sciences, and B.A. in Biological Sciences.

CFA - There will be a faculty lunch on March 6, 2018. Everyone is invited to RSVP and attend. The oral arguments on Janus were heard yesterday. If you are interested, there is a transcript available on the SCOTUS website. On April 4, 2018 there will be an event in Sacramento making the case to the governor that the CSU needs to be funded, and that funding should not come from students.

Nagel – IDEA Ad Hoc Committee – I think we shouldn’t call them student evaluations, but student opinions of instruction. We’re an ad hoc group established to investigate and make recommendations for conducting opinion surveys. The IDEA preparation is going to 100% online in 2019. We’ve met a couple times and we’re framing this as a broad set of ideas about the role of the student opinion surveys and how they will play in faculty evaluations. We will be releasing recommendations by the end of the semester.

1. **Information Item**
	1. WASC Report

Stanislaw – The essays have been drafted and are circulating among workgroups, compiling feedback. The plan is to respond to that feedback and get the draft essays posted for general feedback by Wednesday of next week, we appreciate feedback from everyone. Right now we have more content than the final version will allow and we’ll be compiling most of that into exhibits which will be hyperlinked in the document itself.

Davis - We’d like the essays to go to governance committees for feedback in addition to it being open to the entire campus. We discussed bringing them to Senate and we decided rather than trying to put everything into a full resolution, we’d like to bring the full WASC report to Senate as a Consent Item which means if there are no objections it will be approved without a first or second reading. The forms that are currently available are your chances to provide feedback. By April 17, 2018 the forms will be final drafts in terms of content, but there will still be some editing done. If WASC has questions, we include more content that was approved earlier, but not able to be in the final document.

Young – There will be an open forum and it will be announced in the next couple of days. The draft will be posted online and there will be opportunities for anonymous feedback there. We’ll be holding an open forum series throughout the day, and there will be a special session on the WASC recommendations from the last visit. There will be an opportunity to ensure that the way we are presenting our response to the previous WASC visit is how we all feel that we ought to be responding.

1. **First Reading Items**
	1. 5/AS/18/GC Amendment to Article VI. Section 6.1 for the Graduate Council Membership

Dorsey – moved; seconded by Weikart

Dorsey – There were concerns raised and comments were offered on this amendment. The comments were brought back to GC and they considered them. Ultimately, the council which represents all graduate programs decided the amendment takes into account the flexibility of representation, and that coordinators unable to serve can choose someone to serve in their stead. The current language accommodates that flexibility. The current amendment allows latitude with regard to the resumption of the coordinator’s duties.

Weikart – I’m in support of this resolution. There are departments where the graduate directors have a large load and thus want to be able to have other members represent them on GC.

Petrosky – A comment, under 6.1 in the proposed language, I suggest taking the new language underlined and making that the third sentence. In that underlined text, changing the individual department to the sponsoring unit. That means any school that has a sponsoring unit other than the department would be directly referenced.

* 1. 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 – moved; seconded by Jaycox.

Dorsey – As you may recall with respect to the CDEV proposal, there were questions about the adequacy of consultation. In light of those comments, Cortez and Asher (Co-Directors) have solicited feedback with regard to curriculum and curriculum overlap and received responses from several programs including the MPA program. That’s where it stands.

Morgan – What sort of feedback did they receive?

Asher – Last week, we weren’t entirely sure who requested consultation. Isabel Pierce forwarded that. The program was reviewed within the College of Science and GC. We sent it out additionally requesting further consultation and Umar Ghuman and Katrina Kidd participated in that. MSW received the proposal as well. They remembered the proposal from GC. Umar Ghuman asked about one of our elective courses in administration. The consultation with Katrina Kidd said that she was satisfied with our discussion in GC. That’s what we’ve heard from the additional consultation.

Morgan – MSW requested further communication on this?

Asher – Isabel Pierce forwarded us a name, and we reached out, but I haven’t heard any additional requests. This was thoroughly reviewed at GC.

* 1. 8/AS/18/FAC/SEC Editorial Amendment to Article V. The Academic Senate

Foreman – moved; seconded by Nagel

Foreman – This change is necessary due to administrator title changes. This change accommodates the new titles.

Davis – This came up as a discussion last year in Senate so we’ve decided to bring it as a first reading.

* 1. 9/AS/18/FAC/SEC Editorial Amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty

Foreman – Moved; seconded by Sarraille

Foreman – These changes all have to do with the ways that students are selected representatives for Senate and Senate committees. Presently, the constitution says something different in every case, and many are inaccurate. We took the most general language that allows the student government to select their representatives how they choose. This was shared with Demers and maybe he can update us on their process.

Demers – We looked at this in ASI and we think it looks fine.

Morgan – What are the procedures you’ll use?

Demers – Currently in our bylaws, the vice president selects students to sit on committees. We select based on class schedule primarily.

Carroll – Is it intended that the one-year term be done away with? There’s no new language that suggests that’s being retained?

Foreman – In our discussions of this, we decided it wasn’t faculty’s purview on how they select their members and should be covered by their procedures.

1. **Discussion Items**
2. 10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan

Dorsey – the document under discussion is an update of the 2008/2009 graduate assessment plan and describes the process at programmatic and institutional levels. What’s new is that there are FLCs and a Faculty Fellow of Assessment, both of whom will facilitate institutional-level assessment. This plan will be a more streamlined and effective plan because it will use already-existing mechanisms and data sources to assess programs and institutional graduate education. It is also intended to be coupled with a graduate education action plan which will be coming to Senate and intersects with this assessment plan. There’s an issue regarding curricular authority which needs to be resolve first. If it’s permissible, Stuart Wooley is here and he’s an architect of the assessment plan and he’s willing to help me field questions.

Wooley – As you look through this, you’ll notice not a lot is new. It’s an update. The guiding principles on pages 1-2 are rewritten and that’s a lot of what we already had. You’ll notice there are APRs and accredited program updates. On #1 under program level assessment, you’ll see that follows the current process we already have. Programs assess themselves, and it goes through our process in terms of program review at the college level and deans level. The new stuff is my position, starting with #5. The relationship between the faculty fellow of assessment and GC is not to do program level assessment, but looking at all of what programs have done at an institutional level. What are we doing as a group? Not comparing programs, but what’s happening in graduate work through the university based on your reports. To make it clear, it’s not a way to reassess programs, but a way to see how programs have assessed and presented themselves, and what the graduate studies are like. We will work with GC to look at that and provide an institutional level report.

Dorsey – One of the features of this assessment update, you’ll notice that GC is allowed to make recommendations regarding the effectiveness of the process. If the process is flawed, we can address that on a regular basis and make revisions as needed.

Filling – Do some of those involved care to respond to the *New York Times* op-ed regarding the poverty of assessment of student learning? Projects like this are fundamentally misguided in terms of education and learning outcomes.

Wooley – This plan isn’t focused on a particular program or group of students. This is really summarizing what graduate programs are already doing. Each program assesses how well they’re achieving their goals. They report on those either to an accrediting body or through their APR. This plan looks at that from a global perspective and reports on that to the campus. Then the campus can evaluate that.

Carroll – I’d like to thank Steve for bringing up the *New York Times* piece. It applies to this discussion and the points it raises are common-sense. Do we as the Senate do something to act on this?

Wooley – We should recognize that there are other opinions, and we should think about on our campus what assessment is and how we want to participate at the program level. We all have an opportunity to look at ways we can be better, and that’s assessment. We can conflate assessment and accreditation, but those are two separate things. Each program is doing assessment in some way. The goals you have for your students are being achieved through your teaching. We have assignments for a reason. You can evaluate how they’re doing on that. We can think about assessment from the bottom up level rather than top-down. That makes more sense to me than feeling like we have to respond to outside forces. We all believe in a culture of evidence. We do peer review. We believe in evidence. We argue for evidence. We provide evidence in our programs that are doing well. We do that in our classes. We need to figure out how to respond to articles like that and say we do know assessment. Or how do we want to make things happen so we can figure out if programs are doing well from the bottom-up?

Morgan – To clarify, the graduate program learning outcomes have been mapped to FLCs. It sounds like a standardized assessment model. They weren’t developed individually. So each program is still required to follow top-down rules?

Young – The six graduate learning goals were developed by faculty and approved through GC, Senate, and ultimately the president. Those goals were developed by faculty in the programs and approved by our faculty.

Morgan – A lot of critique of assessment is largely about top-down process that instantiate rules and expectations without allowing for local and department level adjustment. You were talking about departments figuring out what they think matters. That may not align with those six graduate learning goals.

Davis – GC is a group of people from each program, so we can assume that programs had a say in what those are.

Chvasta – Wooley mentioned that we all believe in a culture of evidence. We may not agree about what constitutes evidence, and maybe that’s what we should work on to move forward.

Carroll – Part of the problem is that even bottom-up assessment, we have become so thoroughly steeped in the language of quantitative evidence, even bottom-up measures are problematic.

Strahm – I will add to what’s been said, part of my issue is that the limitations that constrain us about assessment, and part of what I think is frustrating is that assessment has to be done within the confines of the classroom and the time of the class and then it has to be quantifiable because that’s reportable to our overlords. It becomes frustrating when we see students who contact us 10 years later and say I achieved this goal and it was because of what you helped me in the classroom. There’s a lot of education that you cannot quantify and you cannot see the results immediately. Given that we send people out into the world, we may never see the fruits of our labor. Part of the frustration is that we have to be able to put together a matrix that says that we did these things, and our brains become confined to that learning goals and assessment outcomes as opposed to being innovative. New faculty are worried that they’re not going to get tenure. They’re not going to be taking chances that lead to innovative learning opportunities for students. They start to limit their own opportunities out of fear of not getting a good student evaluation. That’s what I see as part of the problem.

Wooley – I appreciate that, Ann, and you hit some important points. I’m a faculty member and I’m in this position temporarily. The way I think about assessment is we’re all doing it. We’re looking at how we’re achieving student goals, and are students getting what we want them to get? You made a great point about quantification. I think what you’re doing to assess is great, so you should report what you’re doing. This position is in place so you can report how you assess sociology which will be different from other fields. At the discipline level there are different ways to assess students. This position is a way you can report your findings. It may not be by check marking. You can write a narrative. Rather than boxing you into the same categories as everyone else. There’s a way to evaluate and assess, and it’s okay if you do it differently.

Young – To the graduate learning goals, in the revision that occurred back in 2011, they emerged from a year-long study that a workgroup was funded through the title five grant that established CEGE. It would be fair to say that a guiding principle of that faculty team’s exploration were the recommendations they made, and they wanted to reflect what was already going on in the programs. Whatever set of goals they recommended to GC was reflective of program learning outcomes already existing across graduate programs. They spent a year looking at programs and literature. I hope that gives context for the approved GLGs. Also, I heard a comment about assessment leaning toward quantitative measures. What I appreciate about this version is that it has the potential to be thematic and qualitative in terms of what’s going on at the institutional level of the process. They’re taking reports that have already been written at the program level, based on what the program determined was important. We’re looking at all the reports for emergent themes. For example, what if GC recognizes by looking at all those that many programs have identified writing at the graduate level as something they’re concerned with. Then we can ask what we could do at an institutional level to address this? Resources could then be put toward increasing support for writing at the graduate level. That’s the intent of the plan, and if that’s not what’s been articulated, that’s the spirit of it. We’d like feedback to be able to go back to GC and refine that.

Thompson – I pose that real top-down goals and top-down assessment is being talked about somewhere else. Our GE, baccalaureate and graduate goals have all been through the Academic Senate. I don’t know how anyone could hold that as a top-down development. The first year I was here, some other folks and I did an assessment plan for English. We knew nothing would happen, we just did it. Then there was a period of resistance to assessment. Then faculty got the idea that what we needed to do was gain control of assessment. If we’re in a position of defiance and dismissal, we should think about what happens when we lose control of the process. If faculty loses control, and the mandate is still there, we should think carefully about what it does to faculty control.

Stanislaw – We’ve heard some great comments. I have some thoughts. One is that assessment leans toward quantitative methods. In my field, we use mixed methods providing different perspectives. If you’re not putting numbers on it, that’s fine. But we need to have the conversation about where our students are struggling, and is there something we can do to provide resources to them. Another thing is that this body created a document which may be unique across CSUs, the Principles of Assessment, which guarantees that assessment will not be used to evaluate faculty. I think that’s a powerful document.

Sarraille – I’m not quite sure where I’m going with this, but what strikes me is outcomes assessment. That’s what assessment is. I’m mindful of the inputs and incomes. One of the problems is that we increasingly refine what we’re doing in this subsystem of the universe we’re in. I wonder if whether we’re considering the universe enough. One of the patterns I have in thinking is looking at what all is going on. For example, what might be impeding student’s success. You have to think about where you’re going to put your energy and do triage. That’s a perspective I wanted to add.

Randol – I have concerns about developing annual graduate assessment reports. There are departments that have assessments for accreditation. They have accreditation standards that are given to them by other institutions. When aggregating assessments across all graduate programs and their accreditation and assessment reports, you may be comparing apples and oranges. Some may be quantitative; some may be qualitative. The entire endeavor is problematic. What we’re looking at is outputs, which are fundamentally different from outcomes. Outcomes are much harder to measure.

1. 7/AS/18/Stanislaus State Student Success Definition

Davis – This is coming from SEC and from the WASC writing team, the GREAT steering committee, the strategic plan committee, and the WASC steering committee. When writing the strategic plan, we realized we didn’t have a definition of student success. This is a discussion item with an intention to go to a vote and then be placed in the start plan

Young – I’d like to reiterate that this emerged through the self-study process as the workgroup that was charged with examining student success on our campus. Through exploration of how we support student success and measure it, it became apparent to the workgroup that they didn’t see a common definition. That observation came up through the WASC steering committee, and we shared that with USPC, and they put placeholder language in with the intention that the campus would have continued dialogue about what student success means at Stan State and to our students. We are putting a lot of efforts into supporting student success. We arrived at some draft language, the steering committee vetted it, and that’s what you see in front of you here today.

Petrosky – I have two comments, and both have to do with the second sentence in the preamble. First, a wording issue, where it says “success is realized when our students graduate…” having their families in its current form makes me think of medical experiments, and I suggest “the lives of their families.” My second suggestion I’m approaching with more trepidation. One of the things I love to hear is that my former students have changed the way they approach their profession, due to something they learned in one of my courses. Between the first point to transforming their lives and exercising civic rights I recommend something like “inform the practice of their chosen profession.”

Filling – With respect to the second bullet point, I think it’s a god-fearing assumption to make statements about “best version of themselves.” I recommend we pursue alternative language here.

Thompson – I don’t know what level this is at, or what it’ll be used for, but if we’re going to assess based on this, there’s no actual definition. It’s phrased as “when realized” or “is achieved when.” But I don’t see an actual definition.

Davis – It might be helpful to refer to the start plan and see what would happen if this language replaces the placeholder language.

1. **Open Forum**

Thompson – If anyone is using Google Drive or Google Classroom, I’d like to know. I’d like to chat.

Nagel – I want to ask people to try to remember to use microphones. Not everyone hears as well as we might. It’s a good practice. Optimum distance is about six inches from your mouth. Let’s get into the habit of using the microphones and make sure shared governance is inclusive of those with hearing problems.

Wooley – Thompson mentioned it. I’d like you to look out in your email for one more GE forum. Hopefully we can get people who weren’t able to attend the last one. This is looking at the draft of what UEPC and GE Sub have discussed. They’re working on forms and you can submit questions. Keep an eye out for that.

Eudey – I’d like to thank you who participated in the Black History events this month. With our new diversity center it’s great to have momentum around this. This week we’re starting Women’s History month. We’ll soon be having interviews with the new director of the Diversity Center. Our support of the center is an important component of that. Another thing that faculty have complained about is career services, and the career staff are trying hard to meet our needs. A lot of folks participated in the Career Fair and events today. We’re excited to have great career staff working hard to meet our needs. On behalf of myself and faculty fellows, we’ve been meeting with students on probation. A lot of these students aren’t able to meet with faculty when issues arise. We’re strongly encouraging them to go talk to faculty in the classes they didn’t do well in. Please remind your students of the resources available to them on campus. Please talk to them. We students on probation who didn’t need to be on probation. We have students who could have stepped out. We also had students who could have had a disability resource referral. It’s hard to overcome bad grades. If there are things you can do to check in with those students, look for those resources, and please touch base with me or the faculty fellows. There are some upcoming events that you should keep an eye out for all of us will have a hard time advising students of the upcoming changes to GE, and we want to work with you, so let us know how we can help.

Junn – Please participate in the hire coming forward for the Diversity Center Coordinator and provide your feedback. Two years ago, there was a university/city summit on diversity and we co-sponsored that meeting. When I came on board, they asked if we’d like to do something similar. We will continue to move forward. We will have banners placed around campus with quotes from students that support diversity and inclusion. The mayor would love to have the banners placed around the city. We’d like to make statements that Turlock and the University stand for inclusion. Please also be looking for an email with information on what to do in an active shooter situation.

Espinoza – On Saturday there was a Suit Up event at JC Penny organized by the career center. They had significant discounts for students and increased their stock of career wear. They had all kinds of sales. We can potentially have that event once per semester. We had 107 people show up that day. Also, we have a food pantry. Over the holiday we added additional food to the pantry. There is a room in housing, and we’re trying to make sure students know where that is. We also have identified space in the student services building and we will have the pantry in a more centralized location that students can access. We have also seen candidates for Athletic Director. We have seen all of them, so please send your feedback sheets to Debra Stannard or Dave Evans. We continue to see candidates for AVP of Student Services.

Young – I wanted to correct a misspeak earlier. The graduate learning goals were updated last in 2016.

Strahm – Everyone received an e-mail regarding the Finance Fair. Please announce this to students. It’s a finance and resource fair on March 15, 2018 from 12:00pm-1:00pm, with people who can help on topics like managing money, getting credit, loans, how to get scholarships, and all that stuff. A lot of first generation students don’t know to do stuff like this.

Davis – You should have received your committee preference form by e-mail. If you don’t fill it out, we have to guess what you’d like to do. If you don’t want to do committee work, leave that in the comments section. We tend to get a small number of responses, which has a small pool, which means the same people are involved in governance year after year. Betsy and I write essays in our comments section, and you don’t have to do that. Encourage your colleagues to identify 1 or 2 things they’re willing to do. We’ve included whether you’re interested in serving on search committees and ad hoc committees. It’s important that everyone fill out this survey and give us information so COC can expand governance and bring more people in. Last week I met with 18 CSU Senate Chairs, and I listened to them talk about governance on their campuses, and I was thrilled to come back here. Our committees get things done. We have people willing to help. We’re actually in a pretty good place, but we still need everyone to provide this information.

1. **Adjournment**

3:35 pm