

**Academic Senate
March 13, 2018**

Present: Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, Crayton, C. Davis, DeCure, Demers, Dorsey, Drake, Espinoza, Foreman, Garcia, Greer, Hight, Hudspeth, Jaycox, Nagel, McNally, Mokhtari, Mayer, Morgan, Petrosky, Randol, Renning, Sarraille, Scales, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, Webster, Weikart, Wellman, Williams, Zong

Excused: Alvim, Davies, Geer, Gibson, Edwards, Erickson, Filling, Johannsdottir, Montero-Hernandez, Rossi, Webster

Proxies: Martha Cuan for Lee Bettencourt, Al Petrosky for Panos Petratos

Guests: Sarah Schrader, Amanda Theis, Victoria Cortez, Stuart Wooley, Harold Stanislaw, Shawna Young, Suzanne Espinoza, Victoria Cortez, Sarah Schrader, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Oddmund Myhre, Darrell Haydon, Matt Collins, Betsy Eudey, Stuart Wooley, Christopher Claus, Rita Asher, Noor Miqbel, James Tuedio, Ellen Junn, and Nina Palomino

Second Reading Items

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

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, Passed.

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

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

First Reading Items:

10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan

7/AS/18/SEC Stanislaus State Student Success Definition

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

March 27 2018

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

Minutes submitted by:
Gerard Wellman, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:04pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 27, 2018 (distributed electronically)

Approved

4. Introductions

Sarah Schrader, Amanda Theis, Victoria Cortez, Stuart Wooley, Harold Stanislaw, Shawna Young, Suzanne Espinoza, Victoria Cortez, Sarah Schrader, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Oddmund Myhre, Darrell Haydon, Matt Collins, Betsy Eudey, Stuart Wooley, Christopher Claus, Rita Asher, Noor Miqbel, James Tuedio, Ellen Junn, and Nina Palomino.

5. Announcements

Nagel – I attended the 3rd CSU lecturer's conference on shared governance with Steven Filling and Martha Cuan. There was some information provided about tenure track counseling faculty to us recently. Discussed pathways to tenure for qualified lecturers in departments. Also information about AAUP principles about shared governance and inclusion of contingent faculty was provided.

Rodriguez – Tomorrow is the collection development meeting in the Library at 1 pm. This is covering lots of important items like the state of the budget and print online options as well as a wish list needs. There will also be a deselection update and discussion about storage and access during the library renovation. Refreshments will be available. People have had questions about the study space options and access to computers and this will be discussed as well.

Eudey – The anticipated changes to GE are going to cause confusion and challenges with advising. The Faculty Fellows and Stuart Wooley have reached out to department chairs to share information on advising and supports that are available. Mistakes will be made and we'd like to reduce confusion as much as possible. We will try to provide as much clarification as possible and learn your questions as we transition as smoothly as possible. If you haven't heard from your department chairs, please encourage them to schedule a meeting so we can catch all of you in March or April. The new GE advising will be important during summer orientation as well. Please make sure you bring someone who understands the new GE requirements.

Carroll – A week from Friday at 7pm in FDC 118, a professor from UC Merced will be talking about water issues in western Fresno County as they relate to migrant workers.

Strahm – The university and the CFA will be hosting an Unconscious Bias Workshop on March 23rd from 11:15-4:30. Please let me or Steve Filling know if you're interested. Secondly, on March 24th from 1-3pm, there will be a March For Our Lives against gun violence. We'll be meeting at Geer Rd. and Monte Vista Ave.

Morgan – I met the web services librarian. In April she will do workshops on the updated Library workshop as she makes it more streamlined and usable. She'd like to hear from faculty and students. It will be updated soon and she'd like to do things that are impactful and helpful to us.

Strangfeld – April 4th faculty and students are going to Sacramento for the Free the CSU rally to encourage the governor to support more funding for the CSU. We're concerned about the impact of the budget proposal on our students as there are real possibilities for a tuition increase. We are pushing to increase funding. There'll be a bus that leaves here on the 4th. We have water bottles. We hope you'll come if you're in town and show support for students. The bus leaves at 8 am and the rally goes 10-1, the bus will bring us back.

Tuedio – I want to thank the Music Department for putting together a renovation of Snider Hall that includes a nice theater screen with a high definition projection system. Next Tuesday at 7 pm we'll be showcasing our first film by Stephen Arounsack. It's a film that has been officially selected at three film festivals. It's a beautiful film about

Laotian youth who have cultivated music. Two weeks from tonight, the second film will be in conjunction with Cesar Chavez day, *Delores*, a documentary. Following the film Pablo Rodriguez will be speaking.

Hight – I want to echo Paul’s comments about the Library website. We need your help to make sure it’s meeting our students’ needs. The Library is also a repository of free stuff for students. The last few years the Library has cultivated free resources. Next Wednesday 4-6 pm we’ll have an informational party about the efforts that we’ve worked on that are in place with Affordable Learning Solutions.

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

FAC – Met last week. We discussed the same issues I reported on last time. We continue to work on them.

FBAC – Met two weeks ago. Provost Greer laid out budget priorities that will be presented to UBAC. We’ll continue discussion of these priorities.

GC – We meet this Thursday. We’ll review course time module scheduling policy, dual degree policies, initiate review of Genetic Counseling self-study substitution, and certain WASC essays.

Statewide – We’re leaving tomorrow. I wanted to let you know that we’ll be working on a resolution to support faculty who are attacked by outside groups who don’t like the content of a course or their ideological position. We have a very long history of attacks on faculty in this country. We’re seeing a ramping up of more organizations who are focusing on students and getting them to go to classes and report on them and create lists. We’ll work on a resolution to see if the CSU system can develop a policy that would help campuses work through these kinds of issues when they arise.

UEPC – They did not achieve a quorum.

7. Information Item

a. WASC Report

Claus – Our team has done a lot of work and all of our draft essays are available to everyone on campus. They’re available on the website and there’s a feedback forum for your comments on anything in the report worth mentioning. The draft is 165 pages, and it will not be that long when we submit it. The report will be about 65-70 pages. Why is the draft so long? We need to make sure that we explicate and vet everything that we need to. There’s a process that we deal with where I edit down the draft. If WASC asks us to elaborate on something, rather than having to vet new content to the entire campus, I can know that all the content is approved. I can pull from that larger document when I need

to. On April 9th there will be an all-day open forum where individuals can come in and comment on different essays. The conversations will be facilitated by different administrators and faculty members. We'd like as much feedback as possible before we submit it on Sept. 20, 2018.

- b. Resolution of the California Conference of the American Association of University Professors regarding California State university EO 1100 (Revised) and 1110

Davis – SEC thought this should be shared with Senate and it can be shared with departments. Steve Filling was a writer of this document.

Carroll – Are they expecting a response from the Chancellor?

Nagel – I am taking this to the National Council of AAUP in June. The national AAUP sent a letter to the Chancellor regarding these resolutions. The California conference used this as a means of leverage to get the national council to do something. I'm hoping the committee on shared governance will be investigating the way EO 1100 was promulgated.

8. Second Reading Items

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

Dorsey – Since our last Senate meeting, GC incorporated suggestion by Petrosky as a revision. The change transposes the second and third sentences with the fourth and fifth. We think the resulting paragraph s more coherent. If possible, I'd like to recommend an editorial change that was intended. This is changing the language in the second sentence such that “individual department” is stricken and replaced with “sponsoring unit.” The difference is that programs like the MBA program which is sponsored by the College would be included in that representational flexibility.

Foreman – If we say the selection is made by department, there's a definition of department in the CBA. When we say sponsoring unit, what does that mean? Does that mean graduate faculty of a particular program?

Dorsey – That's language that's inherited. I don't know if that's limited to programs and departments

Foreman – The language is problematic until we know precisely what it means.

Petrosky – We define who votes for those types of things and we don't limit it to graduate faculty.

Nagel – There’s nothing in the CBA about making recommendations for a program coordinator or director, so I’m not sure that would really be a problem.

Sarraille – Maybe the wording could be sponsoring department or college.

Davis – The term sponsoring unit is used earlier in the document. That change should’ve been made before coming here today. That’s why we’re allowing the change.

Tuedio – I think John’s suggestion is worth considering. If it’s intended to point to either departments or colleges, that feels like a more solid way of expressing it.

Nagel – Sponsoring unit is defined in the second sentence. The primary locus of control over the program is department level, but if it’s the college, it refers to the college rather than the department

Foreman – In the third sentence, a director could only take a semester off and must signal they’ll return in one semester?

Dorsey – Subsequent is a synonym for following. It seems to me that’s a decision that could be made after any given break.

Morgan – To me, it asks for clarity in terms of how much advance notice must be given.

Davis – It means before that semester.

Foreman – I mentioned this before. The way I read it, that means a minute before that day, and that might be problematic. I think it’s the word “the” that causes the issue.

Thompson – The subsequent process if this is passed by the Senate, what then happens?

Davis – This and our other two resolutions go to an all-campus vote within 20 days. At the point at which we vote, we have a maximum of 20 days to send the ballot out to the entire general faculty.

Thompson – Is there time to do that if this isn’t approved at this meeting?

Davis – Yes. It does mean that it has to go out within 6 days of our next meeting if we want one ballot.

Thompson – This is a constitutional amendment and SEC still had questions. I learned recently that it's a possibility to refer back to committee. While I would never do so, I wonder if that should be considered in this instance.

Davis – Would GC make changes?

Dorsey – We've spent a lot of time on this. When I read these sentences, they seem clear to me. We discussed the issue of forewarning. Most programs, all are represented on GC, and everyone wanted the flexibility to assign that job at the last minute.

Results of the Vote: 28:5:0 The resolution passed.

- b. 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 – No changes have been made. As I mentioned last time, the co-directors have consulted with the representatives of several graduate programs including MPA and MSW. As far as I'm aware, those programs that desired consultation are satisfied with that process.

Scales – I'm sitting on the interdisciplinary studies committee and we unanimously support this and we feel it will support the students.

Results of the Vote: 31:2:0 The resolution passed.

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

Foreman – We made no editorial changes from the first reading, and we continue to support it.

Results of the Vote: 33:0:0 The resolution passed.

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

Foreman – These remain the same from the first reading.

Results of the Vote: 33:0:0 The resolution passed.

Davis – Please remind your faculty when they see the ballot to click on the link and vote.

9. First Reading Items

a. 10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan

Dorsey – moved; Wellman seconded.

Dorsey – As I mentioned last time, this is an update on the previous graduate assessment plan. The primary change with respect to this new plan has to do with institutional level assessment and closing the loop on assessment and bringing a perspective at the institutional level that will enhance student learning. It's still a draft document and speaking with AVP Young, we decided that there are some revisions that might enhance the clarity of the existing document. Typically, we'd work through that in GC, but we haven't met since we last spoke. On Thursday we'll convene and discuss those changes. I'd like AVP Young to speak to some of the changes we contemplated.

Young – As Andy said, normally I'd prefer to have this conversation within GC, but we think it's important enough to share some of these observations, given the discussion last Senate, that it might help clarify and inform today's conversation. I want to share some thoughts. They all relate to content on p. 3 of the current document. The first suggestions that we'll take back to GC relate to step 6. I will share that this comes from me in that I've been listening carefully and intently to conversations related to assessment and especially institutional-level assessment. These suggestions hopefully clarify the intent of the institutional-level assessment plan and allay concerns. In step 6 it would be useful to use the word "observations" in place of the second place "findings" shows up in the last sentence. "Observations" better reflects the work. The college FLCs are not doing primary analyses to arrive at findings. Findings are made at the program level. College FLCs are simply making observations. That exchange of words helps clarify the intent of the work from the FLCs. The second suggestion is also in step 6. We should consider ending the sentence after "Provost" and striking the remainder of the text. I don't think that's appropriate for this step of the process. It goes back to the fact that this is an information-sharing stage where the college FLCs are simply sharing observations. We shouldn't assume that that's connected to decisions, and I don't want people thinking those decisions impact specific programs. Third, eliminate step 7 and subsume that step into what's currently step 8, which would become step 7. With that merge, we should revise the first sentence: "In early fall, the faculty fellow for assessment and GC review the college FLC reports from previous year and write an annual institutional graduate assessment report summarizing observations across colleges and make recommendations

regarding graduate education at the institutional level.” That mirrors language you saw in the graduate education action plan document. This document would have the exact same language reflective of 6c in the Graduate Education Action Plan. In Step 7, I recommend replacing “findings” with “observations.” Last, in what is currently step 9, in the first sentence, strike the phrase “for decisions in support of continuous improvement in graduate education” and replace it with “regarding graduate education at the institutional level.”

Carroll – First, two weeks ago in discussion, what happened is that it became a broader discussion of assessment more generally. I played no small part in that, and I apologize for that. Given that, and what Shawna said, I wonder if it might be wise to take this back to a discussion status.

Davis – Just because it’s a first reading this week doesn’t mean it has to be a second reading. It can stay a first reading at the next Senate meeting. I will leave it up to GC if this comes up for a vote next time.

Dorsey – These are substantive changes we’ve suggested, so it might be wise that it continue as a first reading item.

Thompson – I couldn’t follow all the changes, so I’d like to know when it comes back, what is the difference the set of changes makes. It sounds like it won’t be used to make recommendations; if that’s not correct, I’d like to know. But the language substituted, how does it functionally affect what’s going to happen?

Sarraille – I’m confused because someone said this isn’t something we should be discussing, but it’s open for discussion by us. I’m not qualified to discuss because I don’t do graduate education. I have a question about the process. Does anyone dispute these suggestions on the grounds that they are not merely editorial, they’re not resolving policy? Is there anyone that thinks these changes would substantially change the way it will be done? In view of things that are said, does it change which level does what in assessment?

Davis – In terms of process, a first reading is where we gather information to send back to the committee, and have them decide if they want to make those changes. Whether this is a first reading or a discussion item doesn’t make a difference to me. Those changes will all go to GC and they will discuss and decide which pieces they want to change.

Dorsey – I think these changes are meant to convey the sense that the decision-making authority for graduate programming resides in programs and departments at the

institutional level, the changes are meant to reflect that relationship. Decision-making authority continues to reside in programs and departments and the institutional level review is not to usurp authority.

Junn – This is more of a procedural or informational suggestion, having sat on many academic senates, especially when it comes to policies that are critical in implementation. When it comes to writing difficult policy and implementation pieces, I have seen the Senate committee responsible for that policy invite someone from the Provost's Office to come together with the committee during which they're writing the policy to get more feedback so then you already know you have full support from the administrative side. Second, on your word document, you select track changes so as you went through your ideas to change, no one can understand what those changes.

Stanislaw – Last week I attended my third WASC team visit. The idea is to have financial solvency and second is assessment. I see the word "observation" as a facilitory word. When you say "findings" it's like saying here they are and what are you going to about it?

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

Davis – There were some small changes made, and there's a track changes version in front of you.

Carroll – I think that maybe it was Mark Thompson that said this statement lacked an actual definition of student success. I wonder if the intent is to have a definition of success that only happens after they graduate?

Strahm – I make an argument that on a certain level, yes. It's what happens when people leave that really shows the long-term value of a liberal arts education. For me, when I think about what it means for the vast majority of our students who come from often limited means, we have a greater number of first generation students than most. On a certain level, we need something that says your success isn't only defined by your GPA, but what you'll be doing until your last breath. For me, that is a definition of success. It's squishy. But I appreciate that it's looking long-term at the impact that our students will have on the world.

Nagel – This looks like an ostensive definition. It's not theoretical, but it points to things that are in the family of success. It says it has to do with what our students look like at graduation, which assumes success only if graduating.

Greer – I think it could be opened up to things other than just at the end. Because education is a cumulative effect, the conversations revolved around what students would

possess at the end of their time here. In the essay, we talk about success throughout a student's academic career. We use the term "student success" in different ways, but as a definition, most of the comments were about the end of their time at Stan State.

Junn – If we are defining it, every campus defines student success similarly. But I'm interested in what our campus says about our students. If our definition focuses primarily on what students do after graduation, then I'm not sure we're measuring what they're actually doing after graduation. We don't know what they do after they graduate. And the benchmark is different between 5, 10, 15 years. If this is our definition, we need to take seriously how we'll demonstrate whether our students are succeeding. And we need to determine how we'll measure it. We'll also need to consider what student success looks like while they're still a student. It's a very important question, and whatever the definition is, we'll need to think about how we communicate that to our students. There is a myriad of things that come out of this contemplation, and this is a wonderful opportunity. Depending on how we frame it, then it says something about how we show evidentiary practice about how this lives in the lives of our students.

Carroll – I want to point out that I wasn't opposed to the definition and was looking to get the conversation going.

Eudey – I was trying to figure out if there's a way in the third line if we take out the word "graduate," that allows it to be part of the progression. But there's also nothing about progressing toward graduation and completing a degree they wish to achieve. There isn't anything that's measurable by the graduation initiative here.

Strahm – I'm going to be a contrarian a bit. I'm wondering why do we have to be able to measure success. Can't student success be what people who leave this university think makes them successful? They may not be a captain of industry or an inventor. But they might have children that they raise to be wonderful, thoughtful people. Is that not success? We have people in top-tier PhD programs. We have a former student who is now a professor at Fresno State. We're producing people that go out and do the things that our middle class habitus tells us is successful. But success can also be leading a happy, good life doing the things you want to do.

Strangfeld – Eudey said what I was thinking. I'll add to that that I don't see this definition, other than one sentence, being specific to graduation. It's transformation, empowerment; it's things students can have whether or not they achieve a degree. For students who come here and have a transformative experience that includes that this is not the place for them, that could still count as a successful experience. I don't see this as being tied to graduation; it's creating a much broader concept about what it means to be educated and successful.

Thompson – To me, in the preamble “in the lives of their families,” it seems like an odd fit. I’m not against transforming their families, but I’m not sure why it’s there. The other thing that’s implicit in the document, but not explicitly stated is the ability to entertain multiple perspectives. I think that’s one of the most important things students pick up.

Jaycox – When the graduation initiative first began, we spent a lot of time with students talking about what students thought success was. Students objected that student graduation was seen as success. When we talked about it, every single one of us was talking about the future. We like how this looks toward the future and is not focused on graduation rates. This is how we define our own success.

Foreman – Speaking to Jacox’s point, we would not alter the message, but we could strike “graduate” and replace it with “are” in the third line.

10. Discussion Items

- a. XX/AS/18/SEC Affirmation of Free Speech Rights at CSU – Stanislaus (Sense of the Senate Resolution)

Davis – This came to SEC from the History Department

Carroll – The resolution is in response to events last summer and fall. It took time for the department to get this into a form that we and SEC felt comfortable with. Current events suggest this is still relevant. We seek to recognize free speech rights, but also acknowledge that campuses can be lightning rods for controversies and even violent behaviors and events.

Morgan – One thing I’m wondering about, in the first resolved, diversity is broader than the forms listed. Can those things be collapsed into a broader discussion of diversity? Either make the list longer or use a catch-all term. It’s always debatable how far you go in creating a list like that, but it seemed like some experiences were missing from that list.

Davis – We discussed that list and added things to it.

Strangfeld – I speak in favor of adding to the list. I’m concerned that a catch-all phrase becomes muted and diluted. Even though it’s challenging to add an extensive list, it makes it explicit the things that we value and protect.

Wooley – I like these proposals. I think it’s important that we protect free speech on this campus, and it seems the spirit of the resolution recognizes open and civil discourse.

What struck me is that it hones in on hate speech, and if our list is too broad or too narrow, it might do the opposite of what we want to do. I urge us to be careful that we can recognize that we ought to protect speech that we disagree with, and the fundamental goal is to allow that discourse and allow the conversation. It's important for us because we're a university and we need to respect civil discourse.

Carroll – Thanks for those comments. Regarding the first two, I'm open to word changes. I suspect my colleagues would be as well. One possibility is changing the first resolve to "including, but not limited to." That kind of language might satisfy those two comments.

Wooley – Clearly civil discourse is what this place is all about. One of the kinds of speech we're talking about are the types of speech that are not protected by the First Amendment or the CSU code of conduct.

Eudey – I'm in support of this, so thank you to the History Department and SEC. I note that in 2010 we passed a resolution titled 10/AS/10/SEC Respect for Campus Diversity of all Members of Campus Community (Sense of the Senate), for all members of Campus Community. At the time there was an amplification of anti-LGBT crimes. Knowing we've used that list, we might want to reference it. This resolution is reaffirming and expanding this concept.

Resolved: Stanislaus affirms the basic rights of all members of the academic community of students, staff, administrators and faculty to be respected regardless of race, age, religious or other beliefs, ethnicity, sex, gender, country of origin, veteran status, medical condition, disability or sexual orientation, and be it further

Thompson – On the rationale, when it comes back, I'm interested in a bit more clarity in how these terms interact. The way it's presented it looks like hate speech might contain all those other things, or that hate speech might be defined by those three things, or that only those three things within hate speech present a threat to public safety. It's not clear how those terms go together, and what we're saying is not legal.

Strahm – Last year we did a resolution, 7/AS/ 17/SEC - Right to an Education Free From Fear & Harassment that was oriented to citizenship status. Maybe we want to reference that one as well.

Wooley – Noted the second resolved, I want to make sure we don't get overzealous.

Resolved: That the Academic Senate affirms that all members of the academic community have a right to an educational environment free of fear for their personal safety, and be it further

That's open to free speech we may not like, but it fits within speech guidelines. I can see a possibility that we restrict speech because we think it fits those. We should also be careful to watch out for restricting our freedoms solely for the purpose of providing security. We increase our security, but reduce our freedom. We need to be careful that we don't focus solely on violent things and then focus on speech we don't like and act out in fear.

Junn – I reaffirm that the system office is very concerned about free speech issues and how it affects students and campus safety. The CO put together a discussion among the presidents to share what's happening on our campuses. The legal definition of hate speech only qualifies as hate speech if it's directed at an individual person (general speech does not constitute hate speech), and second it must be within language that specifies an imminent or immediate threat to life. Make sure that you consult with the legal definition because it's very specific. The Campus Code of Conduct specifies that actions can be penalized only if the actions are on campus to one of our students. There are legal parameters that make this issue very difficult. I am committed to always champion diversity and inclusion as a fundamental human right. I recently spoke on a panel about this to capture how difficult it is to communicate these issues on campus.

Carroll – Thanks for the comments. In response to Wooley, I'm well aware of what Benjamin Franklin said on this topic. To President Junn, we're not trying to define what speech is acceptable or not. We let the courts adjudicate the definitions of hate speech. I'd hate to see the resolution get hung up on definitional issues.

b. XX/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Action Plan
Dorsey – This is a plan developed and updates the previous plan from 2009. It identifies priorities for graduate education at Stan State and actions to support them. Unlike previous versions, this new plan is to be reviewed not only by GC, but also by SEC and AS and the President. Our hope is by going through the more comprehensive review process, we are able to encourage members of the community to embrace the plan and for grad education to become a priority and more visible. There are 8 priorities. Two of the new ones have to do with creating and updating the plan, and priority #6 which is linked to institutional level assessment. We've been discussing the assessment and that discussion will continue.

Greer – I want to be brief. I want to express a sincere appreciation to GC for all the work on this plan and the assessment plan. I appreciate what you included in the plan and that you connected it to the strategic plan. This will help us improve our work in grad education across the university. I appreciate the work the committee engaged in in terms

of providing clarity to the institutional assessment component. I'm excited to see both of these documents move through the process.

Carroll – Reading e-mail from department members. Has there been any movement toward hiring a graduate education dean?

Dorsey – As far as I'm aware, I haven't been informed that process has been initiated in any way.

Junn – All the presidents work with the Chancellor's Office to advocate to the legislature. Unless the legislature can counteract the governor's funding proposal, it is predicted that could amount to a 2% cut for each campus in the coming AY 18/19. We hope the legislature comes through and at least funds us at last year's budget. There is nothing I can do to provide more hires until we can close the funding gap and get additional dollars for enrollment growth. Every campus is bracing for the possibility of a cut. There's no possibility to fund new positions at this point.

11. Open Forum

Thompson – I wanted to give my biweekly update on OIT, and this is not directed at Matt. I did an informal survey in English. There were more people using Google Classroom and Google Drive than the total number of users of Moodle on campus.

On GE we're having our second forum and are going to be presenting a resolution soon. The committee believes we can move forward. The areas outstanding are Area E to make a physical education requirement or integrate the 1-unit courses into a single area E and have them attached to something else. The other is Area G and whether it would be a graduation requirement within GE or just a graduation requirement on its own. Area D PoliSci, we're recommending it move outside Area D and continue as a graduation requirement and leave the rest of Area D alone.

12. Adjournment – 4:00 pm