**For**

**Academic Senate**

**November 15, 2016**

**Present:** Alvim, Azevedo, Bettencourt, Bice, Brandt, Carroll, Chan, Crayton, Davis, Demers, Dye, Espinoza, Eudey, Firch, Frost, Garcia, Garone, Gerson, Gonzalez, Guichard, Hight, Larson, Odeh, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Sarraille, Sims, Strahm, Strangfeld, Strong, M. Thomas, Thompson, Wagner, Wellman, Wood and Zhang.
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**Proxies:** Strahm for Strangfeld.

**Guests:** Mark Grobner, David Lindsay, Shawna Young, Martyn Gunn, John Tillman, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Ted Wendt, James Tuedio, Marcy Chavasta, Scott Davis, Michelle Johnson, Amanda Theis, Neisha Rhodes, Cory Cardoza, Christina Stamper and Matthew Lopez-Phillips.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

**First Reading Item:**

14/AS/16/FBAC Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of the Senate)

**Announcement:**

FAC Survey – Results of the November 8th Survey

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

December 6, 2016

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

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

1. **Call to order**

2:06pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 18, 2016 (**distributed electronically)

Approved.

1. **Introductions**

Mark Grobner, David Lindsay, Shawna Young, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Ted Wendt, Marcy Chavasta, Scott Davis, Harold Stanislaw, Janice Curtin, Amanda Theis, and Bridgette Hines.

1. **Announcements**
   1. FAC Survey – Results of the November 8th Survey

C. Davis noted FAC is exploring enfranchisement of faculty. For context, we have 347 FT faculty, lecturers and TT combined. There were 190 responses, so 55% of FT faculty completed the survey. The first page shows the various options they had to select from. Two are above the others. “After a certain time in service” got most of the agreement, and “those teaching a half load” was second. FAC will pursue this to figure out a constitutional amendment. The second page shows general thoughts about whether PT faculty should get some type of vote. FAC continues to pursue this, so please let FAC know if you have comments. The following were the Qualtrics survey results.

Agree:              83.16%  158 votes

Disagree:         16.84%     32 votes

Total votes 190 out of 347 full time faculty is 55% of full time faculty.

Strahm said we have 65 signatories that Strahm and Eudey collected to nominate Steven Filling for Faculty Trustee. They needed a minimum of 33 signatures. Strahm sent the petition around for additional signatures if anyone else wished to sign.

Strahm noted that in the back of the room, if you are interested, there are door signs from CFA that are meant to provide support to the diversity of students we have among us. You’re not required to take one, but they are there should you wish to have one.

Strahm noted there is a Social Justice Conference on campus Thursday and Friday of this week with lots of great speakers and activities. You should have received an email about this. There are lots of things for different interests. Go to whatever you’re able to attend.

Garcia is not the creator of this event but is a supporter. Tomorrow from 11-2pm on the Quad, there will be a rally for solidarity. Students in the Social Work graduate program, with their mission of social justice, are working long and hard and engaging in dialogue and critical reflection related to the election and felt the need to come forward and engage people across campus in a discussion and rally for solidarity. They are inviting everyone to the event. There will be speakers and this will be a true rally**.**

Tuedio reminded all of the Social Justice in the Central Valley Conference scheduled for November 17th and 18th. He distributed an updated program, and the last sheet of the handout includes the schedule for this two-day program. They added one more keynote speaker, Dr. Hayes-Bautista from the UCLA chapter of the Latino Medical Student Association and the pre-medical group Chicanos/Latinos Medical Association. Tuedio also distributed a card for an art exhibit in the University Art Gallery. This is part of social justice conference with an evening art talk on Thursday by Dixie Salazar from Fresno who is addressing homeless issues in Fresno.

Provost Strong is pleased to report that retention and graduation rates for the most recent cohorts have improved from last year’s cohorts for key rates. Thank you for the outstanding efforts you continue to make to enhance students’ progress toward degree and graduation.

Returning 1-year Freshman Retention Rate – 2014 Cohort, 81.6% vs. 2015 Cohort, 85.1%.

First-Time Freshman 4-year Graduation Rate – 2011 Cohort, 11.4% vs. 2012 Cohort, 14.4%.

First-Time Freshman 6-year Graduation Rate – 2009 Cohort, 55.0% vs. 2010 Cohort, 57.4%.

First-Time Undergraduate Transfer 4-year Graduation Rate – 2011 Cohort, 74.5% vs. 2012 Cohort, 81.6%.

An updated report reflecting these statistics will be posted to the following website soon. Additionally, more statistics on URM rates and differences with non-URM students and other more detailed rates will also be posted soon.

The link to First-Time Freshman retention and graduation rates is as follows.

<https://www.csustan.edu/institutional-research/institutional-data/new-students>

Go to “Special Reports”

“Selected Facts About First-Time Freshmen (FTF), Entering Cohorts, Fall 2003 to 2014.pdf

The link to First-Time Undergraduate Transfer graduation rates is as follows.

<https://www.csustan.edu/institutional-research/institutional-data/new-students>

Go to “Undergraduate Transfers”

“Special Reports”

“Selected Facts About First-Time Transfer (FTT), Entering Cohorts, Fall 2003 to 2014.pdf”

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

C. Davis – FAC Reported on the FAC survey.

Brandt – FBAC The budget priorities resolution will be addressed later.

Garone – GC is meeting with WASC and members of the Strategic Planning Council and is addressing the GC role in those processes.

Thomas: UEPC – No report.

Strahm: SWAS Strahm noted that the Academic Senate system wide is reviewing a policy change which would require a grade of C or better when completing courses in written communication in the English language, oral communication in the English language, critical thinking, and mathematics or quantitative reasoning. They have forwarded to the Chancellor’s Office a recommendation for grading of the Golden Four. They are hoping to see what the Chancellor has to say about that.

Strahm also noted that they’ve had a first reading about a lactation policy for the CSU. They are wanting to identify locations that aren’t toilet seats to express breast milk, lactating into a bottle or breastfeeding.

Eudey asked what is the rationale for a C grade and not C-Minus in the Golden 4? Strahm noted concern about having strictly to say it has to be a C grade which can cause some problems for transfer students from other universities or community colleges where that institution’s GE passing grade is a C-Minus. If we institute a C and only a C, what could happen is some of our transfers from other campuses might find themselves without their GEs and needing to retake courses, and that’s not fair. The purpose is if your institution says a C-Minus is passing, we will accept it for our GE, but if it’s from a CSU, a C is going to be required for Golden 4 to count for GE.

Garone always thought a C-Minus at the CSU is a passing grade. So why not a C-Minus? Strahm is not sure how to state it. She will find out and come back to the body with better information that makes more sense. Strahm is concerned about this too. We’ve had majors that you need a C or better in core, but C-Minus is a passing grade. It seems we’re moving to a higher expectation for a passing grade.

Thomas noted EO1100 indicates that a grade of C or greater is required in Golden 4. We have an EO saying that a grade of C is the requirement.

Garone said now that it’s an EO, how will it be determining which courses qualify for this standard for a C, rather than others. Strahm said it’s GE A1 A2 A3 and D3. The lower grade will count to lower division units, but won’t count toward GE satisfaction. If it’s in the GE category, it’s automatically one of those courses.

Carroll asked if this might have a chilling effect on faculty who prefer +/- grading who might now drop that. Strahm said this is her second year in ASCSU, she spent her first year on committees and learning the bureaucracy. Each resolution comes from a committee to a larger body. It is possible that in a committee meeting they may have had that discussion, but she didn’t hear that on the floor of the Senate either time it was being discussed. The only conversations were those concerned about the impact on students who transferred from other campuses. That was the impact the CO order was addressing. It’s possible and if you remind her, she’d be happy to bring that up at the next ASCUS meeting as a concern we have. She will bring that up with the Chancellor.

1. **Information Items**
   1. GREAT Team & Graduation Initiative update

Shawna Young provided the following update: “GREAT funding proposals are currently under review by the GREAT Budget & Tactical Workgroup and the GREAT Steering Committee. The process is anticipated to be complete within two weeks, with notices sent out to the applicants.

“And, the five GREAT Workgroups have all had their start-up meetings and have begun work in their respective areas of focus, which include:

1. Improving 4-Year and 6-Year Graduation Rates
2. Eliminating Graduation Rate Gaps for Underrepresented Minority and Pell-eligible Students
3. Improving Transfer 2-Year and 4-Year Graduation Rates
4. Reviewing Special Programs in Relation to Student Success
5. Budget Allocations and Tactical Resources for GRI 2025”
   1. Presidential Transition Team update

Petrosky provided a report. They have had nine forums so far for the transition team, and you’ve probably seen information about them on announcements. The tenth forum is going on as we speak in Stockton. We are going to have several in the near future for most of us here. Faculty this Thursday Nov 17 9-10:30am in the FDC. For staff, tomorrow, Wed Nov 16, 12-1:30 in MSR 130. Two more student meetings Thurs Nov 17 6-7:30pm in Union Game Room, Nov 28, 11:30, MSR 130. One of last community meetings is in Stockton now, and another Thurs Dec 1 6-7:30 in FDC. There will be a preliminary report in February, available on Junn’s webpage. Part of the input will go to the Strategic Planning Council, although formal arrangement for that hasn’t been arranged yet.

Eudey asked about attendance and participation. Petrosky noted that staff are particularly well-represented. Over 50 different people at staff, about 30 in faculty, 11 communities, and very few students which is why they are changing venues. Asked about ways to incentivize students to participate? Petrosky said messages indicate that there will be food present, which should help.

* 1. Strategic Planning Council update

Sims noted they continue to meet every Monday. They are starting extensive in-person consultations with as many governance groups as they can get. They have 30-35 listed to contact. If you’re in a governance group on campus and have not been or are not contacted by the Strategic Planning Council, let Sims know if you’d like to have someone there to meet with your committee or group in this phase of consultation. This parallels the open forum for the Transition Team. There are six workgroups conducting other in-person consultation and data and information gathering.

The six topics are documents and data, matriculation issues from high school thru graduate students into and out of programs, environmental scan, cataloguing and summarizing extant practices (SS, HIPs), business and finance, and institutional communication planning and resource allocation looking at how processes and procedures work on the macro scale. Contact Sims for more information. Again, if you are part of a governance committee that has not been visited by a Strategic Planning committee member in the next month, we can get someone to visit and get feedback.

* 1. WASC update

Stanislaw reported that we are now getting deeper into the first phase of gathering input for the self-study.  During this first phase, various committees and other units on campus have been asked to complete a survey regarding WASC’s 39 Criteria for Review, or CFRs.  That survey is now closed. Members of the Steering Committee are now beginning to meet with those committees and units, to facilitate discussions that are designed to explore the survey responses more deeply, and help gather evidence to support the self-study. In case anyone here is wondering, SEC is one of the groups that was asked to complete the survey and will be involved in follow-up discussions. Academic Senate is a bit too large for this approach to work.  Rest assured that those of who haven’t yet received a survey invitation will get one later and will have ample opportunity to provide input then — as well as through other mechanisms, such as open forums.

* 1. ASI Faculty Representative

The ASI Board needs a faculty representative. They are looking for a representative and COC was not able to find someone, so we are reaching out to the full Senate. If you or a colleague are interested, please let us know. They meet on Tuesdays from 5-7 pm. They would like to fill this position ASAP. We’ll follow up with an email about this. We want someone who is a good fit and would be enthusiastic about it. Please send names to Pierce or Sims.

1. **First Reading Item** 
   1. 14/AS/16/FBAC Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of the Senate)

Brandt moved the resolution, seconded by Eudey. Brandt said the Senate has asked FBAC every year to submit a list of budget priorities. FBAC has worked at a list of issues that gets passed on to UBAC. They went through the process this fall, looked at last year’s priorities and some were supported by UBAC as long term issues. They also added several new things not considered last year that were brought up this fall. The bulleted points on the first page are things that are essentially the same as last year. Raising the percentage of tenured/tenure track faculty was something that UBAC and President Sheley thought were good long term goals. One of the few points of disagreement between UBAC and the Senate might focus on tenure track psychological counselors. FBAC rededicated their support for that in the resolution.

Brandt indicated new items added this year that weren’t considered before include bullet point 6, addressing full time lecturers that would contribute to academic success, psychological counselor’s success and teaching. They also added a bullet point about the graduation rate initiative that we should institutionalize those that are particularly impactful. FBAC usually addresses staffing for graduate programs. Last year we just called for staffing, but this year we call for a dean or director in consultation with Graduate Council.

Sarraille has served a few years on FBAC and chaired it a few times, and from that perspective he wants to congratulate Brandt on a reasoned set of priorities. Brandt noted a lot was taken from last year’s FBAC committee.

Garcia asked about the fourth resolved and brought attention to it. He is concerned about the role of FBAC in the budgeting process and how priorities are given the same attention from those from UBAC. He wonders if there were any questions about this in the rationale.

**RESOLVED:** That the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) is established in the Constitution of the General Faculty and the priorities listed in this resolution should be given the same consideration as those of any other budget advisory committee; and be it further

This language predates Brandt’s involvement. FBAC thought it was important to restate given the history of what went on in the past. Overall, the discussion was more on how pleased we were that UBAC overall dealt with our recommendations, which is why we decided to keep it in. When they analyzed what UBAC and the president said, FBAC felt it was important to restate our role in it.

Thompson said that on the third bullet, he didn’t know of any non-instructional faculty. That can be interpreted in different ways. Some of the rationale for not doing this before was that President Sheley wanted Psychological Counselors to teach a class.

Brandt noted that Librarians do a lot of instruction and he doesn’t think anything is wrong with wording, but it could be interpreted in various ways. Brandt said this is correct how Sheley responded last year. We should get clarification from Wendt, is this a contract term?

Wendt said it’s not a contractual definition but language used within the contract when the contract needs to make some careful distinctions. The contract is largely written from the perspective of instructional faculty. However, because there are other types of employees covered under the contract represented by CFA, from time to time the contract provisions based on whatever topic is being discussed, there is a need then to somehow distinguish from the traditional instructional faculty member. For example, the contract talks about WTU’s to define instructional faculty workload. A WTU is only used in the instructional domain. In the contract, you come across issues when not counting workload – like a coach – by WTU, so we need to distinguish something besides instructional faculty. When the issue arises, the term is used. It is the same for librarians in terms of how we look at issues distinct to them, and psychological counseling.

Brandt almost proposed changing the language to something else, but saw mention of instructional faculty. For example, librarians teach workshops with 30-40 instructional sections a term, so that is the way he sees this used in the resolution. This is an issue based on President Sheley’s response last year.

Sarraille said this is a somewhat muddy area. The term instructional faculty is used per se only in one place in the contract where it refers to workload and what the responsibilities are of instructional faculty. So to refer to someone as non-instructional faculty is logical enough to denote someone who is not assigned to do that particular type of workload, and this is addressed in article 20 of the contract. The contract has moved to use the word “faculty” for everyone under the contract, librarians, psychological counselors everyone is faculty who is covered by the Unit 3 contract.

Brandt said that’s how it read when they wrote it. Because the president’s response used instructional faculty in arguing only those who teach in the classroom should be considered for tenure. Sarraille said this is not a job classification and that’s possibly germane to the discussion. FBAC kept that language to refer to those who aren’t necessarily primarily assigned to teaching credit courses.

FBAC meets tomorrow and will revisit the term “non-instructional faculty.” Any revisions will be reflected when it returns at the next meeting.

1. **Discussion Item**
   1. Facnet Forum

Sims noted that a few more people have logged in and made comments. Thompson’s suggestion in one of the threads was that we keep the email listserv as the open general communication and keep this forum as a private list only for faculty. If you have a thought on this suggestion, there is a thread on the discussion board to which you can place a comment. If there is no further feedback, we can offer the thread to the full faculty.

Guichard said that when she asked colleagues for feedback, one mentioned the email with the mailing list reminders for Facnet and that it includes the user name and password in the text of the email. She deleted hers, so she couldn’t verify that. If that’s true, this is a problem. She’s concerned the user name and password is in the text. Sims isn’t sure what that is but will follow up on it.

Thompson said he got notifications that people responded to his post to the new site but he had difficulty getting to those messages. On the log-in screen he got a message that wouldn’t allow him to get to the site. He’s not sure why that occurred. Check the responses that you’ve gotten to see if all can access them before sending the link out to everyone.

Garone said that happened to him early in this process and if we have to ask permission to access the site it’s not working as it should. Sims noted we’re testing this to address these bugs now, and thanked all for drawing attention to this concern.

1. **Open Forum**

Strahm asked for an update on the food pantry. Larson said that the background is that the CSU and our campus have had an initiative tied to having a food pantry on campus, jointly with the Hunger Network. They have provided a food pantry on campus, and she is meeting with administration and other stakeholders to provide this for our students in an adequate way. ASI and the USU VP initiative is to make sure that this is successful for students. They were offered a facility and to provide food and ASI personnel to ensure students have access in the Union building. They are working with the Hunger Network and Social Work club. They’ve bought food and toiletries and have sent out notices to the clubs sharing that they are opening this week. They’re trying to see if this can be a long term solution to fight food insecurity on campus.

Strangfeld had a point of clarification. She heard Larson say that they are looking into long term solutions. So is the food pantry in current form just temporary?

Larson said the ASI and USU are in the Union building which will be going under a renovation in a few years. They currently have about 1.5 years to provide a short term, easily accessible site. Currently, the warehouse is in the back of the Activity Center in a secluded area where the food is kept and students can leave thru the back door with no questions asked to ensure confidentiality. This is an opportunity to use the facility to be a part of this and to work out anything that needs to be changed for the future. They have taken information from other campuses, especially CSU Fresno. So long term, their intention is to ensure when this facility isn’t active, where will it go. They have good partnerships with clubs and will provide administration the information they’re gathering. They want to market this to all the student body.

Strangfeld said thanks. Regarding the comments on marketing, how is information getting out to students? We haven’t seen much on this. Larson said that the campus wide meetings on food insecurity trickled down to internal meetings. They reached out to the Hunger Network and the Social Work Club who have active food pantries on campus. We all benefit from collaboration, and this all happened in the last two weeks. They collected food into one facility. By request of leaders of those clubs, they wanted to see marketing tools, policies and procedures a list of who are the first contacts. This will be ready to go this week, and they will be marketing with flyers on A frames on the Warriors Quad event. They all have to come together and the push is we’re trying to change the thinking that you need to hide being food insecure. They want this to be a safe and inclusive, collaborative campaign between the three groups. It takes time to collaborate. Flyers were sent out on Monday, and she heard back today that the food and the pantry is ready. Students will be able to pick up five supplies per person. They will address any lingering questions and open when they can.

Sims asked about the demand for the food pantry. Larson said that there is data from the Advising Taskforce and system wide. Espinoza said that system wide it is 10%, but Gunn did an informal survey of students in the Advising Center, and it’s around that level as well, perhaps more.

Strahm asked about the limit of five supplies for the week, what is meant by that? Larson said that the policy they’re looking at is to look at those types of issues, and they wanted something that other campuses have done. This is something others have done. If enacted, it would have to go through the ASI Board for approval. She’s envisioning guidelines and within these guidelines we need feedback on specific areas from Hunger Network and Social Work. If they think the guidelines aren’t good, they can be changed. She wants it on the ground as fast as possible because they have the resources and facilities. There may be some wordsmithing or changes in the color of the flyers, but she hopes that will happen quickly. She wants to send an announcement on Thursday about availability. The up to 5 supplies, she thinks can mean that you can take one canned good, one toiletry, and not more than one of each item. Feel free to provide feedback to members of the groups.

Garcia said this is not directed to the ASI students and applauds the work of students. The Social Work students are very interested in food insecurity but are concerned about what data is being collected. One tool they found in the CSU is appalling. If you look at the questions being asked, it is very pejorative. Some questions asked were “are the reasons you are food insecure because you spend the money on beer”? he encourages us that if we really want to do something in partnership with students, start with good data.

Larson said that a long term goal is involving interns and have research involved, but we also need to be wary of confidentiality. This is definitely a long-term goal to have interns who are passionate about the subject to have volunteer hours on this project. She wants the campus to look at this.

Eudey thanked Social Work for the good survey. She receives the same emails that students get and got an email from Social Work and thought that language was well written. She thinks that will get some really good data and hopes it can be used in conjunction with other things to expand that knowledge. She thanked the Social Work students for taking that on.

Garone hasn’t seen the survey Garcia mentioned, but it seems that it comes from a position of blaming the victim and if that comes out at an institutional level it seems there needs to be a response to that. He doesn’t know if the Senate might take a position to whatever body put out those guidelines to indicate we find that intolerable. He asked Garcia to circulate that to Senate for our response. Garcia will do so.

Sarraille said that the ASCSU should be apprised if they want to react to it as well as the campus.

Sims asked if the survey was “Survey displaced and food insecure students in the CSU”? Garcia will check this out. Garcia believes it’s a CSU-wide survey. Sims noted that this is a great effort and much needed. We want to make this as effective as we can. Kudos to ASI, the Hunger Network and the Social Work Association.

1. **Adjournment**

3:15pm