

**Academic Senate  
January 30, 2018**

**Present:** Alvim, Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, C. Davis, Davies, Demers, DeCure, Dorsey, Drake, Edwards, Erickson, Espinoza, Foreman, Garcia Gerson, Gibson, Frost, Hall, Hudspeth, Jaycox, Johannsdottir, McNally, Mokhtari, Mayer, Montero-Hernandez, Morgan, Petratos, Petrosky, Randol, Renning, Sarraile, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, Weikart, Wellman, Williams, and Zong.

**Excused:** Geer, Filling Nagel, and Webster.

**Proxies:** Annie Hor for Maryann Hight, Diane Katsma for Diane Crayton.  
**Guests:** Amanda Theis, Betsy Eudey, Lori Hay, Rebecca Sharkey, Kristin White, Francisco Marmolejo, Julie Cardoza, Harold Stanislaw, Jovonte Willis, Corey Cardoza, Shawna Young, Jennifer Devlin, Ron Rodriguez, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Helene Caudill, Julie Johnson, Jim Tuedio, Dave Evans, Jake Myers, Stuart Wooley, Julia Reynoso, Rebecca Sharkey and Jennifer Devlin.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

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

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:  
February 13, 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 December 5, 2017 (distributed electronically)**

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Amanda Theis, Betsy Eudey, Lori Hay, Rebecca Sharkey, Kristin White, Francisco Marmolejo, Julie Cardoza, Harold Stanislaw, Jovonte Willis, Corey Cardoza, Shawna Young, Jennifer Devlin, Ron Rodriguez, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Helene Caudill, Julie Johnson, Jim Tuedio, Dave Evans, Jake Myers, Stuart Wooley, Julia Reynoso, Rebecca Sharkey and Jennifer Devlin.

**5. Announcements**

Carroll – Thursday, Feb 1<sup>st</sup> begins Black History Month. The History Department, with support from the Presidential Commission on Diversity and Inclusion, the Office of the Provost, CAHSS, and University Athletics, is hosting Dr. Clayborne Carson from the Stanford University's MLK Institute, on February 1, 2018, at 7 pm in FDC 118. Carson will give a talk called "Where Do We Go from Here? King's Unanswered Question."

Bettencourt – Psychological Counseling Services has workshop and group offerings for the Spring term, including “Embodiment,” a 7-week book study on healthy body image; a 4-week series for “First Generation College Students,”; and an “LGBTQ+” group. Students can sign up online at the PCS website – <https://www.csustan.edu/counseling>

Stanislaw – The reaccreditation writing team has been drafting essays, building on input from the various workgroups. The draft essays will be distributed to the Steering Committee next week. Once the contents have been validated and the text polished a bit, we'll circulate the drafts more broadly for feedback, starting with the Senate Executive Committee.

Demers – Tomorrow is Club Fair in Quad. ASI has a partnership for Dreamers and is planning a DACA advocacy event from 10-2pm in the Quad on 1/31/18. T-shirts will be available while they last.

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

**FAC – Foreman:** They will meet on Feb. 7<sup>th</sup>. Three things that we will be working on includes the range elevation policy for contingent faculty. Reviewing editorial changes to the constitution to smooth out language and ensure accuracy. Have questions from departments about necessity of bylaws and changing voting procedures. We've been asked for examples on how to do this, and the English department has an example available. If your department has enfranchised contingent faculty, we'd like to see that policy so we can provide more than one example.

**FBAC – Weikart:** We have not met yet; tomorrow's meeting was cancelled due to a lack of agenda items.

**GC – Dorsey:** Since we last met, the dean and faculty of educational leadership has decided to table the resolution for co-authored dissertations due to their search for a new leader. Discussions in GC continue regarding the Graduate Assessment Plan and the second and dual degrees' policies.

**Statewide – Strahm:** We met yesterday after the CSSA and the ASCSU statewide stated that we did not agree with a budget fee increase, and asked that the trustees not to ask to raise tuition. We have a first reading item in which the ASCSU is asking the system to fund appropriate and adequate psychological counselors which are tenure track. We have support for a project rebound program for the formerly incarcerated to help them get a college degree.

#### **UEPC – Thompson:**

The UEPC met on January 25th and discussed preparation in concert with Academic Affairs, the FDGE, and the GE subcommittee for forums about changes to the GE program called for by EOs 1100 and 1110. The committee suggested two open forums and consideration of a separate forum for students, all in mid-February with prior distribution of the EOs and the recent letter from EVC Blanchard, a brief overview, and a website to post information and seek input.

AVP Myers visited to discuss and seek support for an Academic Affairs proposal for a Technology Enhanced Classroom/Active Learning Classroom dedicated to the mathematics department and to suggest that a new scheduling policy for TEC/ALCs may be in order as well as a review and revision of the campus technology plan. Discussion will continue on questions including: What are the scheduling issues that arise when more classroom space is scheduled through the OIT or UEE? How is it determined that a program merits a complete claim to a

classroom? Focus on a technology-based enhancement that only one program can secure rights to. How calls for creation and reservation of such rooms can afford equitable opportunities to programs across campus.

The committee endorsed a single curriculum deadline in late fall, continued discussion of the reporting required in the Instructional Materials Accessibility Policy, and had its initial discussion of the New Subprogram Proposal: B.A. in Liberal Studies Integrated Teacher Education Track.

A new item under discussion at the February 8th meeting will be the Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs Policy as revised by the Technology and Learning subcommittee.

## **7. Information Item**

- a. Library Renovation Presentation (Dean Ron Rodriguez, Julia Reynoso, Rebecca Sharkey and Jennifer Devlin)

Jennifer Devlin – We’ve been working on campus since October. We are part of a joint contractor/architect team. You’ll see members of our team a lot. We are working closely with a library consultant who has done a lot of planning for library renovations and is familiar with changes in library structures. We have partners on the contractor side too. We’d like to go over the project goals as these are the baseline for how we make decisions during the project. The decisions are vetted with input from the campus community.

Rebecca Sharkey – These slides are the series of goals that we’ve developed.

### **Memorable library experience and a design that celebrates the Library collection and services, student population and region**

*Rooted in Place*

*Deeply reflective of student population*

*Art + Imagery*

*Nature/Biophilia*

### **Welcoming environment that is accessible, comfortable (nurturing) and supportive to all CSU Stanislaus students**

*Academic heart of campus*

*Brings students together*

*Clear wayfinding*

*Variety of spaces and seating options for students can call their own – for socialization, studying, listening, making connections*

*Fun*

### **Environment that fosters scholarship support and enhanced learning for student success**

*Visible, accessible technology*

*Learning Commons– hub for students, staff, resources and tools*

*Place to open minds - exposure to new ideas*  
*Public access point for partner program services*  
*Graduation Initiative 2025*

**State of the art learning environment and technology hub for the Campus**

*Ubiquitous Technology*  
*Ability to adapt spaces for future technologies*  
*Destination Campus*

**Flexible design that can grow with the evolving needs of the Library/Campus**

*Meeting needs of anticipated future growth*  
*Planning for Masterplan addition*  
*Planning for future changes in program and technology*  
*Multi-purpose and shared spaces*  
*Flexible spaces and furniture*

Carroll – Regarding compact shelving, how likely is it that there are 4 or 5 people in the stacks, and I have to wait to get to the portion of the stacks that I need to access?

Rodriguez – It is a possibility, but I'm not sure how many open aisles there might be in a given bank. It depends on how many aisles there are per bank. Judging by what I saw at Fresno, there weren't lots of people in the compact stacks.

Carroll – I noticed the non-assignable spaces went up by 2,500 sq. ft. Why is that?

Devlin – That's because some spaces have to be brought up to code, especially given the age of the building. Gender neutral bathrooms take up more spaces. That space will be as efficient as we can get, but it also includes space for clarity of organization. We'll have to evaluate the benefit of that to the overall use of the building.

Morgan – Regarding the compact shelving, I've had to jump out to avoid being crushed by a malfunctioning sensor. You made the comment that there would be a chance for contraction and expansion. How will we decide what gets held in our resources, and an upper limit of what we can expand due a lack of available shelving?

Rodriguez – We do deselection routinely. Books that are outdated in their subject area are routinely deselected. We will have a meeting in mid-March with library/department liaisons where they can learn more about that process. We also have a large collection of government documents which are now online. The print government documents are no longer necessary when there are online full text equivalents. All of those activities free up quite a bit of space to grow adequately in the years ahead. We don't want to be locked out in the years ahead.

Strahm – You mentioned you were using Fresno as a model. Are the compact shelves at Fresno used less than other stacks? Do they only have 8% of their books in fixed browsable stacks?

Rodriguez – I'm not sure of their percentage. We're going to use compact storage more broadly. The children's collection which has high usage and recent acquisitions over the last two years, those will be in regular stacks because they're the ones used the most.

Annie Hor – We're hoping it will be five years down the road. We acquire about 5,000 books a year. The compact shelving will be the lower used and the older books. The technology has changed so this is the only way we can generate space for our students.

Eudey – Thank you for all the consultation you've done. This is important and I appreciate it. You didn't mention in the student services section how much access to electrical outlets is planned, and I hope that's being taken into account. You didn't mention how the library faculty and staff spaces will change? One of the slides didn't mention that the spaces were to support students, and I think you should reframe that to support the work of faculty and staff.

Rodriguez – They've been deeply consulted because we have an opportunity to relook at our workflow. Technical services should be by the loading dock. The reference desk should be near the front. The checkout station should have space for two people. Students should see physical evidence that this is a library. The library faculty are very cognizant that this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create space for decades to come. The architects have been talking a lot about numbers, but you'll see renditions in the near future; you'll spaces fleshed out that work for those that use and work in the library.

DeCure – Will the collections be deselected to mean that books will no longer be held? I'm concerned that students aren't using the library efficiently now. Will the collections be placed in thematic areas? And when you deselect will departments and students be able to purchase those books?

Rodriguez – We have a council called a point of need. If you need a book that relates to a class, we can get those relatively easy. Our goal is to support the curriculum. We follow the Library of Congress subject heading, that's standard organization. When we looked at the compact shelving we will look at the signage on the side so that it is thematically visible and organized.

DeCure – Did you get any feedback from students about the PCDI being in the library? The intent of having it in the library is to make it accessible, but if the students don't feel comfortable using it due to confidentiality concerns, they won't use it. What is the plan for soundproofing for students to gather and play music?

Rodriguez – We have taken that into account. We have groups of students that meet, talk, gather, make noise, and that's fine. We're trying to offer absolute quiet, more noise, and everything in between. We're look at adjacencies. We're going to have an event center that will generate noise,

and that could be next to other functions that generate noise as well. We're trying to take into account all the different ways people use the library. But we don't want to miss the faculty that people will be studying too. We're trying to do it the best way for everyone. We want to get the most use in all the possible ways. This library is going beyond other academic libraries. We have more partners than any other library in the CSU system, and it has student success as a goal. We're doing something different, and that comes with challenges.

Dorsey – In terms of a timeline, when will you have finalized floorplans for this?

Devlin – We're in a process now, 90% of the way done. We're looking at issues which are pre-floor plan. We'll be in that process for the next couple of weeks, then share that and vet that. Over two months we'll have a much more refined plan and make decisions around that.

Dorsey – will we have the opportunity to comment on that stage of the plan?

Rodriguez – We will have open forums for the campus community. We're planning specific outreach to students to get their feedback and bring them up to date. We are going to be out there. I'd love to come back again to Senate and present where we are in a month or a month and a half.

Strahm – Where will PCS and OIT be going, and where will the 4% growth come from?

Rodriguez – ASC will move into the library. OIT will go into ASC's current space. PCS will go into the surge space and will be there longterm. It will not go away when construction is done. They will be there.

Davis – PCS will be close to the Health Center.

Reynosa – they will be planned into a new health building.

Chvasta – In terms of the semester when there will be overlap when the library is closed and the student center is closed, where do we advise students go? Has there been more thought toward that issue and campaigning to let students know where to hang out?

Rodriguez – We've been having early discussions about creating a plan for the books and their access. Second, what about access to computers, and we'll be working with the new OIT head on that. Our best guess has been to identify spots to tell students to go. Life will not be as it is right now, it will be a challenge.

Chvasta – In terms of services, yes. But what about where students can go for study spaces? Will we have a hangout tent?

Rodriguez – That goes hand in hand with the computer spaces. The surge space won't be able to accommodate all that. I've been talking to the provost and CFO and we all know that is a big

topic and I will come back and report where we are on that plan. I know this is on people's minds. That will be a critical six months. For some students, half their career here will be without a traditional library.

Morgan – Shunting PCS off to temporary surge spaces is problematic for student support. That concerns me for resource allocation. It seems like it's in a quiet part of the library in a neutral spot. The idea it's in a gray area is a huge problem considering the massive need. Also, the library staff are losing 1,500 square feet of office space. What implications will that have for them down the road?

Rodriguez – We have built in growth and projected future library faculty and staff and a slight adjustment for future students as well. There have been areas like technical services which could be made more efficient. It's about having space that works rather than being large. The task has been how to fit everyone in the building in the space that we have. We don't have more space to build out. There's still more fine-tuning to go.

Morgan – Who loses if that footprint doesn't work?

Rodriguez – We don't know that at this point. We've been talking with library partners and Cabinet because we're trying to arrive at a consensus about how future aspirations may not all be accommodated. If our building was bigger, we might be able to do that, but that's not possible. We don't want to shortchange students in terms of their spaces, because they're the ones we're trying to serve. We don't want anyone to lose function, but we're going to have to share more space in the library. We're going to have more shared space. For example, we have a second library instructional room and that room could be used for student study when it is not scheduled for instruction. When the event center isn't being used, that could be used for student study as well. We're trying to find maximum flexibility, but we know we need to work together to make that happen.

Sarraille – The surge space – will something be built? Someone used the word “tent.” Will you truck in mobile homes?

Rodriguez – It'll be a modular temporary building. They won't be tents. They won't have wheels. It will be something akin to the honor's building.

Reynosa – We're cognizant that we want to build adequate space for our occupants. But we also know that whatever funds we use on the temporary spaces is money we can't spend on the permanent space. Everyone who's going into surge space is being brought into the conversations to ensure that they're getting adequate space for their functions.

Strangfeld – It was my understanding that the reason that office was moved out of MSR was because of allowing students to enter without everyone knowing they were going into PCS. I'm

concerned that with a modular designated as PCS, then we're back to people being known to enter that space. Is that being considered when we think about their moving?

Rodriguez – I can't 100% answer that question. But I can say that the entire PCS has been consulted and know in a detailed way what they need, the factor of anonymity, the workflow, and exiting in a different way.

Bettencourt – Our director met with the architects and explained our needs and we had the opportunity to be heard.

Espinoza – There is some savings going on and future thinking about a partnership to build a health and wellness building. We're talking about campus master plan. Dr. Hennes would like to see more space for a health center and what we envision is acquiring something like The Well at Sacramento State which incorporates a lot of different spaces.

Davis – SEC will follow up on that as well. Thank you to our presenters.

## **8. First Reading Items**

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

Foreman moved; seconded by DeCure.

Statement from Chris Nagel:

1) There was a prior Sense of the Senate Resolution, 41/AS/13/SEC-Resolution in Support of the Mental and Emotional Health of CSU Stanislaus Students.

The present resolution differs significantly in that it focuses specifically on the need for tenure-track counseling faculty. And the rationale differs substantially in the same regard.

2) The present resolution is timely because of the new campus administration; because no tenure track counselors have been hired, and because the counseling faculty have in each of the last two years sent memos to administration requesting tenure-track hiring and/or "conversions" of positions to tenure-track.

DeCure – this is my fourth semester here and I see urgency here to enact this. I've had a multitude of students approach me for counseling and other advice which I've directed them to a professional me. They return to me because they say they don't have the appropriate amount of people. This becomes taxing on diverse faculty to be meeting the needs of students who need a professional. The time for this has already passed.

Eudey – I strongly support this. We need more counselors and we need TT ones who can stay here and serve the students. The TT counselors can serve on governance and bring their insights

into issues that are needed. I suggest we add a resolve clause that distributes this to ASCSU and the chairs of AS on other campuses.

Strahm – I agree with everyone so far. I’m in support of this resolution. Three weeks ago we were in a conversation with President Junn and AVP Myers can describe the meeting. In the meeting some of the counselors were talking about how they were the third person that someone had seen in the course of a year or so. I raised the issue of continuity of care in different issues that people you have, you can’t just go to a new counselor and open up the wound again relaying the story. You can’t just start over with a new counselor every six months and expect to have your needs met. Part of the issue is that we don’t pay as much as you can get elsewhere, so these people are being hired as “temps.” So I strongly support this; it’s needed. We need continuity of care for the issues our students have, and faculty too, and these are people who are here for all of us. I support this and I want to point out that we have a first reading at Statewide. Essentially it recognizes student mental health and wellbeing as critical student success and increased services are needed. Strahm read from the following SWAS resolution.

AS-3317-18/FA  
January 25-26, 2018  
First Reading

#### COUNSELING SUPPORT SERVICES AND STUDENT SUCCESS

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize that student mental health and well-being are critical components for student success and a healthy and safe learning environment; and be it further
2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU underscore the urgent need for increased mental health and counseling services on our campuses, especially given mounting challenges to public health and safety emerging nationwide on college campuses today; and be it further
3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU affirm the critical value of in person, face-to-face counseling, with consistency of staffing and availability of in-person on-site services on all campuses; and be it further
4. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees (BOT) to secure sufficient funding from the legislature to ensure that such mental health services are available on all campuses; and be it further
5. **RESOLVED** That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Vice Presidents for Student Affairs, and relevant campus administrators to increase support for student mental health services, and specifically, for increased staffing levels of full-time tenure-line Counselors, and for ongoing and sustainable budgetary support beyond student fees; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that this resolution be distributed to:

- Academic Senates of the California State University,
- CSU Chancellor,
- The CSU Board of Trustees,
- CSU campus Presidents,
- CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs,
- California Faculty Association,
- California State Student Association,
- CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association, and
- The Mental Health Advisory Committee.

**RATIONALE:** *Students face anxiety, depression, and stress as they confront challenges of campus life. Suicide is the second leading cause of death among college students claiming more than 1,100 lives every year nationally.<sup>1</sup>*

*26 % of Americans over the age of 18 (including students) has a diagnosable mental illness and 40 percent of students do not seek mental health services when they need it. <sup>2</sup>*

*Almost one third of all college students report having felt so depressed that they had trouble functioning <sup>3</sup> Mental health issues in the college student population, such as depression, anxiety, and eating disorders, are associated with lower GPA and higher probability of dropping out of college<sup>4</sup>.*

*Among the many benefits of mental health counseling are lower college dropout rates, improved academic performance, and reduced legal liability for campuses.*

*The California State University System is woefully under staffed with mental health counselors to address the needs of the campuses.*

*Adequate mental health services support the systemwide goal of timely graduation and is cost effective for the system and the student.*

*FOOTNOTE REFERENCE: AS-3123-13/AA (Rev)*

*(<https://calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2012-2013/documents/3123.shtml>)*

*BELOW IS THE RATIONALE TO THE 2013 RESOLUTION REFERENCED ABOVE: an updated rationale is needed possibly using the info below as a starting point*

*CSU took a proactive approach by establishing the Select Committee on Mental Health in 2009. The committee had wide representation from CSU constituents: Vice Presidents for student affairs, provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, counseling and psychological services directors, student health center directors, services for students with disabilities center directors, counseling faculty members, ASCSU representatives, California State Student Association representatives, housing directors, and campus police.*

*Following the committee's report to the Board of Trustees (BOT) in 2010, Executive Order No. 1053 was established. The newly established Student Mental Health Services Advisory*

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.collegedegreeseearch.net/student-suicides>

<sup>2</sup> Kessler RC, Chiu WT, Demler O, Walters EE. Prevalence, severity, and comorbidity of twelve-month DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 2005 Jun;62(6):617-27

<sup>3</sup> American College Health Association. *American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment II: Reference Group Executive Summary Spring 2013*. Lanthicum, MD: American College Health Association; 2013

<sup>4</sup> Eisenberg, Daniel; Golberstein, Ezra; and Hunt, Justin B. (2009) "Mental Health and Academic Success in College," *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 1 (Contributions), Article 40

*Committee provides valuable advice to the CSU system, as evidenced in its recent report to the BOT on January 22-23, 2013 (<http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jan13/EdPol.pdf>). Recently, the Chancellor's Office received a grant of \$6.9 million from the California Mental Health Services Authority, which was made possible by the Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63, led by Senator Darrell Steinberg). The added funds will help advance the CSU in three main strategic directions: curriculum development and training, peer-to-peer support programs, and suicide prevention. Most CSU campus Counseling Centers have inadequate funding to meet certain significant professional standards such as counselor ratios (<http://www.calfac.org/counselors>) as promulgated by the International Association of Counseling Services (IACS). Just 14 of the CSU campuses have counseling centers accredited by the Accreditation Association for Ambulatory Health Care (AAAHC) or by the IACS. Only a few of the CSU internship programs are accredited by the American Psychological Association, or hold membership in the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Programs (<http://www.appic.org/>), or are accredited by the California Psychology Internship Council (CAPPIC). Finally, the cited grant monies do not represent continuing and sustainable support.*

Bettencourt – I acknowledge that there have been improvements, and President Junn is in tune with the needs of our students. In terms of gaining additional positions this is moving in the right direction. But this is about stability and being able to meet the mental health needs of our students. This has been ongoing for decades, and the need is going to increase. To have effective resources for our students, tenure is an essential component of this.

Greer – This is a serious topic and an important conversation. Over the past year I've participated in conversations around this issue. As an update, there was a meeting that president Junn, VP Espinoza and AVP Myers attended with other administrators. There was a follow-up letter that was an attempt to address the concerns raised short of hiring TT faculty. Salary has gone up. Professional development funds have gone up. There's been great concern about how to address turnover and we have proposed moving to a three-year contract. We haven't seen anything that indicates being temporary faculty precludes involvement in shared governance. There was a meeting and a letter and I think the addition of two counselors that we have on our campus. We have contacted other campuses and we are not atypical from them. There are only two other campuses in the CSU that are still hiring TT counselors. We are working to address these issues.

Morgan – The idea of shared governance being thrust upon temp faculty is an overstatement. I do this because I care. I don't think every single temporary counseling faculty is in the same boat. They are still temporary faculty. The overwhelming sentiment from this room has been supportive. I don't think using sister campuses is a valid critique. Davis – this is a Sense of the Senate, and this is the faculty stating their view.

Mayer – My students just did a research project on this related to other campuses, and I totally support this resolution. TT counseling faculty support the campus as a whole. Other campuses

are moving to contract workers, and this doesn't meet student need. We could be sacrificing student services for contract faculty. There is a limited amount of budget, and we have partners to help meet this need.

Garcia – MSW is in full support of this resolution. We'd like to add this is not just about stability, it's also about voice and protection and faculty members who are central to our mission. We talk about a student ready university. A student-ready university would embrace this resolution. We've done these resolutions a number of times, but we need a response why this is not needed.

Thompson – Rather than thinking of PCS as something different, they are Unit 3. They have a history of advancing people through the tenure system. They have elaborations. When we think about arguments, we should think about if people are arguing about our own program not having tenure track counselors.

Wellman - We should be careful with this resolution. This is not about supporting counselors but instead about TT lines. We can all agree that the counseling center needs more support and resources, but that's not what this resolution is about. We should be careful about rewarding tenure protection for people hired on at will bases, and a student-ready university needs physicians and counselors who are evidence-based and serving students well. A student-ready university has physicians and counselors who are retained because they are good at their job. What they do matters greatly to the student body, and we need to make sure we have people there for the right reasons and not simply because of our past history which gave these positions tenure protection.

Sarraille: Using the argument that many other CSU campuses use temporary counselors does not make a lot of sense to him as a way to rationalize or justify the practice. This is an initiative that started up recently throughout the CSU at about the time that we got our new chancellor. To say that the CSU is doing it systemwide does not justify it. He wasn't going to say this as Mark Thompson said something similar. However, he'll reiterate because someone disputed Mark. The need that we have for tenured faculty is the same need we have for tenured counselors. When we have someone here that is not tenured, they tend to not be as invested in their job. Temporary workers are always under pressure to focus on what happens if they not rehired. If you want someone to have good relationships with your students etc. they should have the option for tenure.

Chvasta wanted to give a shout out for all the people that are temporary and don't have tenure yet still really care about this campus.

Any changes to language on this resolution are to be given to Isabel Pierce.

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

Moved by Thompson; seconded by Jaycox.

Thompson – Trying to make sense of all of this, so I made this interactive graphic. Interactive in the sense that you can fill in what I've forgotten. We approved the GE goals and we're looking now at approving a process for GE certification. We previously approved a grid for selecting outcomes. When we go through GE certification, part of that is selecting anchor outcomes for each area. We also have the assessment plan that we're looking at and the anchor outcomes will drive the assessment plan. Part of the assessment plan is to collect student artifacts and have them assessed by an outside group. This is a general outline of what's happening, and we need to remember that EO 1100 and 1110 are still at play. On the resolution, I'd like to say that the assessment plan has been here before. The goals and plan are highlighted in the rationale. On pg. 2 there's a chain of how things will move. There's a specification of that assessment block.

Randol – The faculty director of GE and GE sub will randomly select 20% of the courses in each GE area in an outcome review assessment. What if the outcome review panel creates a report that's not favorable to a department, and the department feels that the course isn't reflective of the overall department? If they object to the outcome of the panel, would there be an appeals process? Would it be re-assessed? Thompson – we need to adhere to the principles of assessment of student learning that are protective of faculty and programs, but we'll definitely discuss this at the next meeting.

Weikart – When selecting 5 students at random, that will look very differently in a class of 120 versus a class of 30. We're trying to assess the students that are passing, but if 2 of the 5 aren't passing the class, they wouldn't meet the GE goals.

Wooley – The goal is not to compare courses or goals, but the assessment is of the area. The focus isn't on whether a particular section of English or Biology are meeting the area goal. Part of the principles of assessment is of that area. The panel will be composed of faculty. Like we have peer-reviewed papers, this will be a peer-review of every class in that area. People won't know if the artifacts are from a particular course or a particular area.

Randol – My concern was for a department. Let's say they only have 1 or 2 courses they offer, what if the outcome is negative? Does that reflect on that department overall, or just that that one class doesn't meet the goal?

Davis – the overall question is whether this is formative or summative assessment. The goal is to identify where we need to improve GE areas. It's not punishment, it's finding places for improvement.

Carroll – To select 5 students at random or 20% of sections, that could compromise people going up for RPT. Random approaches could be unfair for exposing problems that aren't widespread, or missing problems that are widespread.

Davis – We know this is a work in progress. We won't know where the issues are until we do it.

Tuedio – How will the APRs be identified? Will they be targeted to a specific area? Will they have a length of term that would span the assessment of different areas?

Thompson – on p. 5 in the box is what we have so far.

Mayer – I'm not seeing how the issues that arise be addressed? If you're talking about assessment, in the assessment plan there should be discussion about what happens next. It's not clear to me, and in my experience in other settings, when you address that, it addresses other concerns people have. It's an important question because it could help solve other problems folks might have.

Thompson – We talked about inclusion and exclusion, and we're talking about inviting faculty who teach GE, but it could be narrower. We are talking about the correct parameters for that. On the other point, everything feeds into the GE APR and that would be like any other APR as far as signaling any curricular changes.

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

Moved by Thompson; seconded by Morgan

Davis – This is a Sense of the Senate because we're saying we know about it.

Thompson – If you go back to the GE recertification block, that's where we are now. We've approved the distribution of goals for the different areas. Now we're asking departments to submit a syllabus with outcomes that are responsive to their anchor outcome to be recertified. There are a lot of courses that we're trying to get to a semi-efficient process that's valid for recertification.

Morgan – Considering the number of courses we have across curriculum and the idea of shared governance, this offers a clean cut approach across disciplines.

Thompson – It's a Sense of the Senate because it's a one-time process. It's not a standing process.

Wooley – It generally follows what we do already. It's trying to do it in a streamlined way, without creating any new structures or committees.

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

Moved by Thompson; seconded by Wellman

Thompson – This has an extensive rationale. This has been developed. It was originally a Pathways project. We had folks from Northridge talk about their pathways program. It's been with UEPC since last Academic Year.

Eudey – There was a slide in about additional procedures that was referenced in the document that wasn't in the packet.

Weikart – I still haven't seen an actual definition. How many classes make up a SEE? Will courses be able to mix and match? Will sections be open only to SEE students? We used to have a program where we had three classes and students had to take those classes.

Thompson – We'll take those back to UEPC.

Morgan – I'm a proponent of this because my sense is that students take GE based on what fits their schedule. I like seeing the universities and what they have and their approaches. This is a good way for students to see linkages across courses and disciplines. It makes a much clearer path for our departments to integrate with other departments. It's a way to give a holistic viewpoint of the liberal arts processes we have at the university. This gives student's guidance and ideas for where they see themselves in the future.

Eudey – To respond to Weikart's questions, one of the elements of what we designed here is to show that there are courses on campuses that have common approaches and methods that students may not realize. This does not lead to a certificate, minor, or major. There is no minimum number of courses. They can take one or eight. There are no special sections. It's more for organizational reasons on the GE site and the schedule of classes. Students could see that a course highlights a topic they might not have realized. If you find four or five courses that are around something really cool, you could propose a SEE. If there are 22, you could propose a SEE. There's no limit on the number because it doesn't lead to anything. It shows that there's some coherence and is meant to draw attention and also maybe to draw connections between faculty and course sections.

Strangfeld – Given the open nature of this, I was wondering if there is a plan for data collection to determine to what extent students are accessing it and meeting goals for it. I understand the benefit of having it open, but I wonder if we can measure its usefulness.

Thompson – Generally not only will they be committing time, they have to commit to participation faculty and programs in the SEE. There are additional learning outcomes and there's also a requirement on faculty to participate in an assessment of those course learning outcomes in the SEE.

Strahm – I'm absolutely supportive of this. It always bothered me since I started at a community college that no one explained to me why I was taking GE. It wasn't until I taught GE classes and got involved in faculty stuff that I saw why GE matters, why it's important. But I don't think we do a good job explaining that to our students. I see advisors say just take that and get it out of the

way. The point of GE is to expose us and our students to ideas that expand their minds, to phenomena they might not have experienced before. The point is to help them be active citizens, for future employers and employees. We've been losing that perspective, and I'm hoping that this will help students see the value of their GE to their lives and help faculty participate in this who will also recognize the value of GE to their students' lives and maybe we can combat the idea that it's checking a box.

Eudey – Ten years ago this conversation wouldn't have led to a question about assessment, and I love that. One thing that's not in this packet is a bit of roles and responsibilities that includes infrastructure issues. We've tried many initiatives that haven't had infrastructure attached to them. That's including GE. One thing that the FLC that worked on this was ensuring there was infrastructure, and this was brought into the FDALC and Faculty Fellows' roles. Because of our work, it felt like we'd be the ones encouraging students to take this, and a Faculty Fellow will be assigned to each SEE. We've talked to Enrollment Services and they will be able to code courses in the schedule. So we'll be able to track students enrolling in these courses. As soon as a course is in a SEE, it will have an embedded code that will track it over time.

Carroll – Under procedures for creating a SEE, there's also creation of course learning outcomes for each SEE. Will those CLOs be distinct from other courses? And what body will be responsible for assessing whether a course meets the goals of a SEE?

## **9. Discussion Item**

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

Dorsey – To give an overview, in GC there is a need by some programs to alleviate the burden associated with representation, so this is something we've been discussing. It would allow representatives to serve on the GC who are not coordinators or directors by designation in instances in which the director is unwilling or unable to serve. I realize the rationale needs proofreading and revisions.

Foreman – I'm supportive of this. But I am concerned that there should be a time certain rather than "prior to the new semester." Second, there should be some language to narrow the scope of the faculty that are eligible to service in this position, I think they should at least teach graduate courses.

Garcia – I'd like to be supportive, but I think the need for the revision is still the result of a flawed membership criteria. GC requires program coordinators and directors to be eligible. I'm trying to figure out why that's the case. I support the need to teach in a graduate program. I'm not sure why needing to be a director or coordinator is necessary. In the charge, I don't see that we need director or coordinators.

Mayer – I represent advanced studies, and we asked for this criteria. One of the things we asked for is that in our department most of the faculty are the director and the only faculty member. So

our entire department would be members of GC. I agree with John that one of our goals in requesting this is asking why this needed to be a director or coordinator.

Petratos – There are faculty that are not tenure-track.

**10. Open Forum**

None.

**11. Adjournment** – 4:00 pm