**For**

**Academic Senate**

**February 14, 2017**

**Present:** Alvim, Bernard, Bettencourt, Bice, Carroll, Chan, Crayton, C. Davis, Demers, Dyre, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garone, Geer, Gerson, Gonzalez, Greer, Guichard, Hight, Nagel, McNally, Nainby, Petratos, Petrosky, Renning, Sarraille, Sims, Stessman, Strahm, Strangfeld, Strickland, M. Thomas, Thompson, Wagner, Wellman, Williams, Wood, Wooley, and Zhang.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Azevedo, Broadwater, Webster and Strickland.

**Proxies:** Elaine Peterson for Odeh.

**Guests:** David Lindsay, Shawna Young, Provost Kimberly Greer, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Marcy Chavasta, Scott Davis, Jake Myers, David Evans, Carolina Alfaro, Noelia Gonzalez, Solange Goncalves Altman, Lauren Byerly, Harold Stanislaw, Oddmund Myhre, Susan Brum, Corey Cardoza, James Tuedio, Darrell Haydon, Dave Colnic and Kristen Dias.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

**Second Reading Item**: 13/AS/16/SEC Joint Statement on Shared Governance Resolution. Passed unanimously.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

February 28, 2017

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

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

1. **Call to order**

2:08pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 6, 2016 (**distributed electronically)

Approved.

1. **Introductions**

Scott Davis, Marcy Chavasta, Oddmund Myhre, Jake Myer, David Evan, Martyn Gunn, Amanda Theis, Shawna Young, Ron Rodriguez, Gitanjali Kaul, Helene Caudill, Darrell Haydon, and Lauren Byerly.

1. **Announcements**

Sims noted tomorrow faculty will receive an email from Whitney Placido for committee preferences for next year for general faculty committees and AS committees. There are two kinds of committees, AS committees and GF committees like FAC, FDC, URPTC, and LAC. The Constitution includes descriptions of the committees, their charge and your role as a member. CoC is eager to increase our pool of faculty members willing to serve in the elected positions. It is sometimes hard to identify leadership, and there are faculty in some programs who have not been actively engaged at the university level. If you know someone who you think would be excellent in any of these roles, please prompt them to submit their name. Or if you would like to get more engaged, please do so. We would like greater participation and to get new folks in on this. Please highlight this to your colleagues. Sims may not have made the jump into governance if a colleague hadn’t said I think you would be good on this committee, and matched what they saw in me with the role they thought I’d be good at.

Filling announced the CA conference of AAUP is having its annual conference Sat March 18, at the CSU Maritime campus. The topic this year has a lot to do with the political world we find ourselves in. The keynote is by our colleague Hank Reitman from CSUEB talking about Academic Freedom in the Trump Reign. Betsy Eudey sent note to Facnet with information about how to get funding to attend. Filling encourages you to attend.

Tuedio distributed two flyers for events. Thursday March 23 in Snyder at 6:30 with formal program at 6:45, a spoken word artist from the Bay Area with a social justice focus. The main attraction is Tia Oso, a community activist now in LA, who was one of the national founders of BLM. Oso moved west to take care of issues in Arizona and LA and the Central Valley is on her radar as well. This should be a very powerful evening.

On March 1, Wed in the daytime, we are lucky to get Dr. Laura Rendon who will meet with students and then for 2 hours in Snyder offer a formal presentation. She is the founder of theory validation, and more recently doing work on contemplating pedagogies. Her work helps to address achievement gaps by helping faculty learn how to work with those populations. She has been very influential in higher education and beyond.

Tuedio noted that the plan is to record and livestream both events.

Sims announced Junn was named one of 25 women who have made a difference in higher education by Diverse: Issues in Higher Education magazine. Ovation.

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

FAC - Davis said that based on questions and comments from AS and other venues, FAC asked for clarity on the location and use of cameras on campus. FAC got an initial response and is continuing to see what more information is needed. Apparently, there is a rumor that in DBH there are cameras behind the mirrors. There are no cameras behind mirrors. Everything else for FAC is just continuing discussions of issues and strategic planning.

Nainby asked about a report on MPPs who are half time. Davis said there was a question if a person is both faculty and MPP, whether they can serve on a governance committee. FAC decided if you have an MPP position, you’re not eligible to serve on a governance committee. It’s a conflict of interest and FAC doesn’t want the conflict to exist. There will be a written memo on this. So a person who serves in a faculty slot cannot have an MPP role.

Carroll asked if the constitution says that, and should it. Sims says it’s not included, and it’s an unusual split in an employment contract. Davis noted that if someone is an MPP but teaches only one class that they don’t count as faculty. We were asked to interpret the constitution on this. Carroll said there could be strict constructionists out there. Davis does not believe there is a statement in the constitution that allows that to occur.

FBAC - Wooley reported that FBAC talked about the reconfiguration of UBAC, and that continues on the agenda.

Nagel had an issue for FBAC relayed to him. A faculty member expressed concern about the way UEE staffing was being compensated or not or not compensated when department staff are doing work for UEE. It used to be the case that UEE compensated the stateside budget for that staff work. Apparently that isn’t happening any more. This faculty member wanted to know what was happening.

Sims noted that this was an SEC agenda item last week. We didn’t get to it last week but we will get to it next week. It’s in the queue for the SEC agenda.

Graduate Council – Garone noted GC meets Thursday to discuss non-academic disqualification procedures for graduate students. It has taken four meetings to work through this. The other large topic is establishing more standardized procedures for distributing graduate fellowship funds that came available again this past year.

ASCSU – Filling said that they met last weekend and there were no responses from the CO to the January resolutions yet. Usually, it takes several weeks for them to filter through these resolutions. Interim meetings are on Feb 24th and he encourages all to join them from 8am – 2pm on the phones. The ASCSU held the second bi-annual academic conference. A guest talk was by Diane Ravitch who noted the disdain for higher education by the government. She gave bureaucracy a wakeup call by asserting that education is a personal activity and smaller classes do work effectively. She gave permission to post video of her talk. If you looked at the January resolutions, one encouraged funding of the ITL summer institute. It is always good to fund people getting better at teaching. He was told that this was not previously funded, it was an annual volitional choice. This won’t happen in 2017, but will return in 2018.

Eudey asked if there is a timeline for the ASCSU making their recommendation regarding the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, for which Filling is a candidate. ASCSU will interview candidates and vote at the March meeting, held the 14-17th.

UEPC – Thomas said that they mostly spent their time looking at the number of students changing majors and when, and how that is impacting graduation rates. Some policies changed so they are unclear what the impacts of these are on the numbers. But, they now have the numbers, and have spent time looking at these and the possible implications. They also discussed WASC self-study feedback with visitors. They still haven’t finished the 2020-21 calendar, but they have forwarded some other work to the subcommittees.

1. **Information Items**
   1. GREAT Team & Graduation Initiative update (M. Gunn, S. Young)

**GRI 2025 One-time Funding and GREAT Steering Committee Budget Recommendations**

On February 2, 2017, we received written confirmation from the Chancellor’s Office that we can carry forward unexpended one-time Graduation Initiative 2016/17 funds. Based on this knowledge, along with additional guidance from the Chancellor’s Office regarding priorities of Graduation Initiative funding, reporting requirements, and performance expectations, the GREAT Budget & Tactical Workgroup made funding recommendations to the GREAT Steering Committee regarding allocation of the approximate $280,895 unallocated funds. GREAT Steering Committee voted on those recommendations at its meeting yesterday. GREAT funding applicants are being notified this week regarding the status of their funding requests; once those notifications are sent out, a more detailed report of the outcome of the funding recommendations will be shared publically.

**Preliminary Graduation Initiative Report**

Also at the GREAT Steering Committee yesterday, our strategy for addressing the preliminary Graduation Initiative report due to the Chancellor’s Office February 24, 2017 was finalized. Necessary data is being collected and organized from Institutional Research and Enrollment Services, which will be incorporated into a working draft report that will be circulated to the GREAT Steering Committee for review and comment next week prior to submission on the 24th.

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

Also at yesterday’s Steering Committee meeting we discussed and established our general strategy for meeting the requirements of the submission of a revised student success plan, due April 28. Essentially, GREAT Steering Committee will be soliciting input from the campus community through governance committees and an open forum, and circulating a working draft for comment prior to submission.

Eudey noted that this April 28th date is very important. When the first campus proposals were due in early Fall there was not time for widespread consultation, and while best efforts were made to develop a sound plan in a quick time frame, even some programs whose activities were named in the plan were not consulted prior to inclusion. We still have a relatively short timeline to develop this revised success plan, but much more than in August. This time she hopes that the faculty and staff take the time to provide feedback and also provide our thoughts into this. You need to show up at the open forums and give feedback. Some of us complained that we weren’t in the process last time. We need to take this seriously as this is a multi-year project that will impact the work we all do.

b. Presidential Transition Team update (K. Brodie, M. Gunn)

Gunn noted that Brodie and he have submitted a preliminary report to the President. At the convocation yesterday you heard the President describe some of the initial findings in some detail. The video of the convocation will soon be available.

As an overview, a number of themes emerged, some good and some bad. The landscaping of the campus is looked upon a beautiful – ponds, waterfalls. Some liked the birds, some don’t. He never heard a good thing about Bizzini Hall. They heard about the foul smells of sewage, walls being too thin, two-way mirrors, the internet doesn’t work well, and classroom technology is bad. They also heard some complaints about the Library which is slated for renovations. Regarding technology, people generally think the internet and Wi-Fi is not good, we need more smart classrooms, and things like that. Students really appreciate the faculty, and this came through loud and clear. Faculty are approachable, and students like the one-on-one rapport. Similarly, for staff, students feel good about staff. Faculty and staff love our students. They think the students do marvelously considering so many are under-represented minorities, low income, first generation students. We should be applauded for our work with students. Complaints were with advising and students felt that they are not getting good advice and it is hard to pin down what this means. We’re working on a campus-wide advising plan. He thinks that in the next few years we will be making an effort that will pay off.

Regarding staff issues, Gunn reported that apparently a few years ago there were summer games and staff would like to have these return. There is lots of camaraderie in offices and MSR, and they like that. Staff also feel that salaries are too low; faculty feel this too. Staff said issues of in-range progression are a problem. HR is making some changes. Those are the high spots. Also, there was a lack of feeling about our town as we don’t have strong connections. The difficulty for students to get downtown was solved because ASI arranged for two bus stops with 30-minute turnaround. We can get more students to downtown on the bus now. Amongst the faculty, there was a feeling of lack of university town atmosphere.

Nagel would like the record to reflect that the IRP has been a problem for staff for at least a decade and adversely affected faculty here and needs to be fixed.

Strahm believes that this body had a resolution to support our staff getting wage increases. Nagel noted we did.

Petratos noted that the new labor law for H-1B Visa may require a minimum annual salary of $150K and we have a lot of Assistant Professors system wide that work with H-1B Visas. He is hoping to see an update on how to resolve this issue. It's a new law that will appear in the next few months. Strahm asked for that information to be sent to her and Sims and that information was delivered.

1. WASC update (S. Young for H. Stanislaw)

Young was given instructions not to be serious, and to be funny. She wants to get everyone thinking about our WASC Launch Event. When you arrive and check in you will get a cool swag bag, with our reaffirmation of accreditation slogan printed on it: “Shared Stories, Continued Success….” We’ll talk more about the meaning of our slogan at the event. The event is scheduled for Thursday at noon in the Event Center. We have a great program lined up, intended to be informative about the process, what to anticipate, how to volunteer and be engaged in the process and help tell our story, while also having fun with table activities to learn about the various work groups, for example the 5 Core Competencies Faculty Learning Communities. Thompson is on the program, and will give an overview of the Core Competencies FLCs. You can play games and get more swag (like the sunglasses Young is wearing, with the slogan on it). Christopher Claus, Principal Writer of our institutional report, will talk about the structure of the institutional report and how the work groups will function. You can make your way over to the table to sign up for these work groups. It will be fun, so don’t let the rain keep you away – bring your umbrella on Thursday. There will be lots of food.  We want as many folks involved as possible. Stuart Sims will be presenting via a film clip, as he cannot be on campus that day.

Sims noted that Young looks good in the swag sunglasses. Thursday at the Event Center at Noon-1:30pm. The first half or so are remarks and information from a variety of people, keeping it quick with one voice to the next. Then there will be food and table activities. Come and go as your schedule allows, even if only for 5 minutes. Visually it will be awesome. From the archives, they will have photos that tell the story of the evolution of our university, blown up to poster size. This event is intended for history walk around the room to see history of the institution and grab some food. Programs and flyers are everywhere. They currently have 90 RSVPs plus the 30 working the event. Hoping for 150 or more to attend.

WASC Senior College and University Commission

2018-19 Accreditation Reaffirmation

Launch Event

Thursday, February 16, 2017, 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m., Event Center

12:00 – 12:10 Reception & Accreditation History Walk-through around the Room

12:10 – 12:25 Opening Remarks – *WASC Steering Committee Co-chairs*

*Harold Stanislaw & Shawna Young*

 Description of the Reaffirmation Process

 Commendations and Recommendations from the March 2015 Commission Action Letter

 Importance of Full Campus Participation

 Introduction to the Steering Committee & Consultant

12:25 – 12:40 Importance of WASC Accreditation: Value of the Reaffirmation Process, Importance of Full Campus Participation, and Connection to Strategic Planning

 *President Ellen Junn*

 *Provost Kimberly Greer*

 *Speaker Stuart Sims*

12:40 – 12:50 Introduction to the Core Competencies Faculty Learning

Communities (FLCs) – *FLC Lead Mark Thompson*

 The Big 5 – Core Competencies

 Introduction to FLC Leads

 Call for Participation

12:50 – 1:00 WASC Institutional Report – *Principal Writer Christopher Claus*

 Structure of the Report

 Introduction to Workgroup Facilitators

 Call for Participation

1:00 – 1:30 Table Activities with FLCs and Institutional Report Workgroups

Interactive ♦ Informational ♦ Sign-up Sheets ♦ Swag!

Shared Stories, Continued Success…

1. Active Learning Classrooms – Update

Sims noted that we are looking at converting a set number of classrooms – 10 or so – to active learning spaces. The process is underway and there is no new workgroup or committee being set up to do this. The UEPC assigned this project to the Technology and Learning Subcommittee in consultation with Darrell Haydon, Stan Trevena, Corey Cardoza and Melody Maffei from Facilities and they will move forward on what this will entail, how to identify classrooms for conversions, and what kind of conversions should take place. Trevena said that the start of the general classroom technology upgrades presented previously to senate are underway. With regard to active learning classrooms, the Keck lab will be a demo room, as it is already most of the way there. OIT will add the technology that will take up to the finished product. This will give us another possible space to view active learning technologies and furnishings. Once it is ready to go, faculty can check it out. It is a good space that is already being used in that type of active learning environment.

Wood asked for clarity on who is on the committee. VP Haydon will be involved, working on coordinating solutions with faculty. They will be using the same core tech for classroom upgrades as conversions.

**Members of the Technology & Learning Subcommittee are as follows:**

**Peggy Hauselt, CAHSS Chair**

Scott Russell, COS

Tim Held, Library

Anysia Mayer, COEKSW

Jeong Youn Kim, CBA

Andrew Wagner, At Large

ASI to Appoint, ASI Student Representative

Stan Trevena, ex-officio non-voting

Glenn Pillsbury, ex-officio non-voting

The visual anthropology lab is the Keck lab that is the demonstration lab. Thompson said there is a hunger for this among faculty, and it sounds like plan is underway, but it’s unclear how to try to have input into getting certain classrooms done. Sims noted that in the last two weeks, this project was referred to a committee, and they’ve connected folks, and now they need to get together to figure out how to make this less murky, get informed themselves, and add input from others.

Trevena said that in addition to the demo lab that was set up last fall, Aronsack’s Keck lab will be slightly upgraded to have more of the active learning technologies as another set up to check out. This is a place to come to get exposure to one flavor of the ALC. It can be set up lots of different ways. This is an easy way to give a real world example.

Thompson’s other concern was openness to diversity in design. Active learning classrooms could be different. Trevena said he is not forcing a design on people. It’s like we’re given a bucket of Legos, and can decide how to put them together. Some of the new furniture includes rolling chairs to be grouped into clusters and broken apart. There are so many pieces, not just one model. We’re getting some of that technology on campus so you can see an example to fire your imagination.

This was Sims’ worry all along. There are a lot of choices within this heading. We’re trying to make sure it’s as open and consultative as possible to put possibilities and wishes on the table. We have folks who share a room, so we need a consensus on what rooms and how. Faculty need to be educated on what is possible, what Lego blocks are they using. We don’t know yet what is possible. Then we’ll start conversations. In the Senate there will be regular updates on this. No decisions will be made that will surprise anyone. These are our teaching spaces. If there is not consensus, then we are open to compromise. Not sure how we’ll do it, but it will be transparent.

Trevena noted that the demo lab is not yet set in the Keck lab. There is new lighting to be added, for example. Converting Arounsack’s room will help us see new possibilities. They are starting to order pieces for the lab, and it will be later this spring when it is operational.

Guichard asked where the funding to switch the Arounsack lab came from. Trevena said that it came from an upgrade fund that was set up and was not grant funding. How many rooms will there be money for? Trevena says there is no specific money for ALCs, but there is money for upgraded classrooms. They used that money to get us to the next step. They’re using this to get the effort moving. Since President Junn arrived, we have been looking at spaces and trying to figure out where to put a large ALC. Without something to look at, it is hard to figure out. Arounsack’s lab makes sense because it close to this already.

Guichard asked if this is a room Anthropology allocated to Arounsack? Trevena said yes, it’s his lab and he is opening it up to others. If starting an ALC from scratch, the cost of the example would be much higher.

It was asked if before any room is converted, will there be discussions with the departments that use it? Trevena said yes, all through it. Sims said that we will not impose changes on anybody that will remove the ability to do things that they are currently doing now. No rooms will be changed without faculty consensus or compromise to change it in some ways. Some faculty know a lot about active learning classrooms, some disciplines are more aware than others. Some have discovery and learning to go on about what is possible before deciding what to do. Nothing will be done by fiat.

Trevena noted technology that is in the classroom upgrades touch the boundary. So if we move a room in the ALC direction, half of it is already there.

Thompson asked for an update on classrooms. Trevena noted that through the PAC, there was consultation among the deans, who listed which to upgrade first. They prioritized 13 that were identified, and equipment was ordered and spaced out. They’re working with Facilities, as they need to do some electrical work in some rooms before installing equipment. They’re trying to time when to do it so it is not disruptive to instruction. They’re building in the demo room and will notify those using the room and roll it out over a couple of days and then offer training sessions so faculty will have OIT staff there to help people know how to use the technology. Trevena said they’re using the same process as last year. There was a survey, results were shared here, and they demonstrated the gear. It’ll be consultative and they are relying on input to guide the process.

C. Davis wants to know how many faculty are teaching in the same room for more than one semester at a time. She is in a different room every class every time. Some faculty have control, but some will need to figure out how to schedule to have a room with a particular configuration. We need to be able to request an ALC. If Davis is assigned a room that doesn’t work for her pedagogically, she emails those in a preferred room, and tries to work out a switch that will work for all. There is no way to request a room of a certain configuration in terms of furniture. That needs to be fixed and needs to be part of the plan.

Wood asked if ALCs will lose capacity. Will the 40 cap drop to 30? CJ has many large classes, and they are sometimes struggling to find classrooms. Will we lose capacity? Trevena said in the beginning we will identify space where an ALC can be built and request the room, and technology can move into others. There are a couple CSUs that have them, showpiece the ALCs, and request to schedule in the room. Junn said one is larger and one is moderate. Will we lose capacity because of configuration for group activity? Yes, there will be some loss. We need input from AS and faculty because if we build one larger, we will still accommodate the typical class sizes. This needs to be discussed with more feedback. When we have new configurations, students who take the courses are likely to have higher pass rates, and need fewer sections because they pass the first time around.

Sims said this is not zero-sum. If a room has a few depts. sharing it but there is a desire to change the room, that can be a problem if it gets in the way of high enrollment. If we lower the cap, will we be funded for more sections? We need to consider these effects as we go along. It’s murky and interconnected, and we don’t want to move past concerns. Current practice is imperfect but serves some needs.

Garcia added that we need to be careful with language. Active learning is not new, we have been doing it a long time and working with the rooms we have. We are not doing it because it is a new approach, the room we’ve made modifications to, how to get out of the way or into the classroom to do what we want to do.

Sarraille wanted to know if there are scholarly articles to do with active learning classrooms making a difference in pass rates of students in Computer Science. He would be interested in knowing about them.

Garone wants to go back to C. Davis’ point. As we’re playing musical classrooms and we do not know when classes will be placed, or in some cases classes are being bumped from the selected time, and we need to pick a new time and place. If requesting one of the renovated classrooms, would that affect priority of being bumped or not? If bumped from the one you wanted, how would that work to accommodate faculty to get a classroom?

Sims said that is a question about assignment of facilities that this is an additional component of. We will mark it and keep it on the docket for now.

Trevena said some active learning environments wouldn’t have special technology, just furniture. Don’t confuse active learning only with technology as that doesn’t apply across the board. Sometimes just a change of furniture or white board will suffice.

Contact Peggy Hauselt, Chair of the Technology & Learning Subcommittee of UEPC or Speaker Sims if you have questions.

1. OTM Courses Policy Review – Update

Sims noted that this was from November, and he wanted to let everyone know that we referred this item to the FAC, UEPC and the Technology and Learning Subcommittee of UEPC. This will be discussed in those places.

1. Introduction of Dr. Kimberly Greer, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Greer wishes she had some cool sunglasses, like those just modeled by S. Young to announce the WASC Launch. She is glad to be here. It’s been a fast three weeks, but she already feels like she’s a member of the Stanislaus State team and community. She’s happy to entertain questions.

She mentioned that she was thinking back to her open session in this same room.  It was at the conclusion of that dialogue with faculty and staff that she realized she really wanted to come here. It was a very warm and welcoming place, and she received good and hard questions late in the day. “That’s where I was hooked.”  That sense of community that was reflected among faculty and staff in the open session was affirmed over and over again in her first few weeks on campus. People have been great to introduce themselves and are sharing information about their programs with her.

1. Introduction of Dr. Gitanjali Kaul, Vice President for Strategic Planning, Enrollment Management and Innovation (VP SPEMI)

Kaul will be taking over the enrollment management function from Espinoza’s area. She will be working closely with Admissions, Financial Aid, Outreach, Institutional Research, and Strategic Planning to help implement the plans once they are developed. Innovation is part of her title and designates her as someone who champions innovation throughout the campus. Junn wanted a central person on the cabinet to keep this topic on the cabinet’s agenda. Innovative thinking involves being flexible, doing more with less, and using resources in a way that give us the best bang for the buck. None of this can be done alone. After listening and hearing campus viewpoints, she will put ideas together and push for them. She has been introduced in several settings and her professional background is already known in many circles.  She spent most of her time in Academic Affairs, she was Associate and then Vice Provost. She is happy working with assessment, program review, and accreditation. She’s been an NCA liaison, and SACs and WASC liaison as well. She’s a researcher at heart, and has written many grants including multi-year grants. Her favorite one was about developing learning communities with GE courses. She had lots of fun with that. She has brought community college students into the learning communities. She grew up in India, in the state of Kashmir near the Himalayas and likes remote places. She worked for the University of Alaska Fairbanks and University of Alaska Anchorage where she spent five years each. She is happy to be here now.

1. Introduction of Mr. Darrell Haydon, Interim Vice President for Business & Finance/CFO

VP Haydon noted that it is a pleasure to be here. He has one observation; he was at East Bay for eight years and something he sees here that is remarkable compared to other CSUs, is that the President willingly comes to these meetings. The level of engagement is motivational. He likes to be out and about on the campus and feel part of the community. At East Bay he was the AVP of Financial Services, and he is a first generation CSU graduate. At East Bay he also taught Government Accounting. He is currently working his Ed.D. and his dissertation is on financial literacy for college students, what information they need to persist. Finance is an issue to not persist or extend time in school. He wants to understand that. At East Bay it was the same as here, first year non-traditional students and impacted by financial issues. He tries to take what he learned in the classroom and apply it to his job. In the classroom is where the dots get connected. Daily wins in classroom make it all worthwhile. To work with faculty and support what the campus is trying to do is something he’s excited about.

Sims thinks Haydon’s research is really interesting. Thinks it is great to have someone involved in the research that is tied to us. Fascinating synergy.

1. **Second Reading Item** 
   1. 13/AS/16/SEC Joint Statement on Shared Governance Resolution

Sims noted that we had a question from Nagel about clarity on a line in the 3rd paragraph related to FBAC. This was discussed in SEC. Davis noted we decided not to change it. They looked at the constitution and pointed out that FBAC is described in the constitution as one of the primary vehicles by which faculty give input on budget, so we see the line here as reminding ourselves as to where there is input on the budget. We discussed other options, but this works well enough.

Sims noted that this strengthens linkage between FBAC and UBAC, with hopes to make that more robust. SEC thought we’d let it stand.

Eudey strongly supports this statement and hopes we can obtain unanimous support for it. If there are concerns she hopes they’re raised now so they can be addressed.

Thompson asked if this was a sense of the senate resolution, or if it was a standard resolution. Junn responded that when she arrived at Stanislaus she asked Sims if there was interest in developing a shared governance statement, as she sees it as very important institutionally. If we adopt it will be accepted as is and will be formalized as a campus policy and it will be made clear that is our desire. So it will be a formal resolution for signature. Not a sense of the senate resolution.

Thompson stated that we had a statement on shared governance for a long time that was never endorsed by a president. He thinks it’s really important to be able to say there is a joint statement and the administration fully endorses it. Sims concurs.

Garcia concurs as it is important to have a statement. He reminded all that the policy will not dictate our behavior. It will be the work of the people doing this that will determine if this statement has any merit.

Results of the vote, Yes 34, No 0, Abstention 2. Ovation!

Junn thanks the group. It is important not just symbolically but this is affirming the relationship between administration and faculty. To her knowledge, Sacramento State and Chico recently signed these; and it’s a trend she hopes continues. Not every president will agree with these concepts. She wonders what will happen in the future, but hopes this spirit will continue.

Sims notes we’re excited too. We will share with sister campuses, and see if they’ve talked about this, and can bring it to their campus to start a conversation. This is an affirmation of how we work and is a great place to be in. Things can change, and this could become an important document if things are maybe not as agreeable with different players. This is a concrete statement about our ideals.

Thompson notes the level of agreement of vote is that of those voting, there was unanimity. Those who abstained didn’t participate in the vote. It’s technically recorded as unanimous, and suggests that. Sims will check on definitions. Sims agrees and we should indicate the tremendous support this received.

1. **Discussion Item**
   1. Strategic Planning discussion and feedback

Sims noted that we got good feedback from the forum. The website [www.csustan.edu/strategic-plan](http://www.csustan.edu/strategic-plan) gives information about the process so far.

Sims noted that they are at a stage of iterative feedback, and just like WASC groups, we are asking questions about surveys that have been done already. Headline items are some of the biggest issues coming back to the Strategic Planning Council from various faculty consultations and fora. Using the clickers, Sims is engaging the senators in a brief survey. We are asking you these question as a faculty member who happens to sit on the Academic Senate today and you are not answering for your departments.

Sims distributed the following questionnaire and asked the Senators to vote with their iclickers.

distributed the following questionnaire:

**CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate – Strategic Planning Discussion, 2/14/17**

**TEACHING & LEARNING**

I. Please weight the following, in terms of potential for future improvement and/or university distinction (A=most potential; E=least potential):

1. Faculty development (tenure density, expanded faculty development funding and resources, active and collaborative RSCA, etc.)

2. Instructional innovation (interdisciplinary teaching, development and implementation of high impact practices, hybrid instructional models, expanded service learning and field work, etc.)

3. Learning Environment (classroom technology, lab and studio spaces, library, collaborative work spaces, student lounges/affinity spaces, etc.)

II. Within each of these categories, which possible item do you think is most important, and second-most important?

4. Faculty development (first choice):

A. tenure density

B. faculty development funding and resources

C. expanded, collaborative RSCA

D. other

5. Faculty development (second choice):

A. tenure density

B. faculty development funding and resources

C. expanded, collaborative RSCA

D. other

6. Instructional innovation (first choice):

A. interdisciplinary teaching

B. high impact practices

C. hybrid instructional models

D. expanded service learning and field work

E. other

7. Instructional innovation (second choice):

A. interdisciplinary teaching

B. high impact practices

C. hybrid instructional models

D. expanded service learning and field work

E. other

8. Learning environment (first choice):

A. classroom technology

B. lab and studio spaces

C. library

D. collaborative work spaces/lounges/affinity spaces

E. other

9. Learning environment (second choice):

A. classroom technology

B. lab and studio spaces

C. library

D. collaborative work spaces/lounges/affinity spaces

E. other

**DISCUSSION & FEEDBACK**

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS (if time):**

Please weight the following, according to your sense of their importance or urgency of need (A=most important or urgent; E=least important or urgent):

10. Administrative processes and procedures (forms, contracts, requisitions, signatures, timelines, etc.)

11. Staff resources (positions, compensation, training, etc.)

12. Student mental health resources and services

13. Stockton Center

14. University awareness and reputation (locally, regionally, statewide)

15. Local culture, events, spaces, etc.

**Results:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D | E |
| 1. Faculty Development | 19 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 2. Instructional Innovation | 9 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 1 |
| 3. Learning Environment | 8 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 2 |
| 4. Faculty Development 1st most important | 11 | 15 | 5 | 1 |  |
| 5. Faculty Development 2nd most important | 8 | 13 | 7 | 2 |  |
| 6. Instructional Innovation 1st most important | 4 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 7 Instructional Innovation 2nd most important | 4 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 4 |
| 8 Learning Environment 1st most important | 12 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 1 |
| 9 Learning Environment 2nd most important | 13 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 1 |

The themes selected are those that have come back through several fora and processes. Any thoughts on these topics or anything else we should consider as we look at important themes with regard to the strategic plan?

Carroll noted in terms of Faculty Development, anything to reduce teaching load is worth our attention. Sims did some research prompted by C. Davis and sent an email chain to the statewide campus Senate Chairs and assessed the workload, and we are in the norm of the system, we are not an outlier. Most faculty are assigned 24 WTUs, 18 WTUs is not the norm, 24 is. We thought ours was higher than typical, but that is not the case, but it doesn’t mean it’s not a concern. This was not a formal study; it was an email thread among campus Senate Chairs.

Sarraille said this is an important issue, so if we’re going to walk away with conclusions, we should be clear on them. Sims noted that this is not conclusive. Sarraille said even if this is the average, we could still have too high a workload. Sims noted that was his pessimistic response as well. Sims will work on getting better data.

Garone added another tweak, campuses can say a 24 WTU expectation, but a number of those end up with a 3-3 load. From personal experience, he knows colleagues at CSUs who were 4-4 but throughout their entire rank taught 2-2 because they got lots of course releases for development. Sims said the conversation was about assigned time, most lost their assigned time since 2008-10, this practice was not sustained and not restored. But this is still anecdotal from the Senate Chairs, and he will try to get with real data.

Strangfeld asked how we differ in advising load. With mandatory advising, we spend a lot of time as needed with our students given who our students are, and she’s curious as to how that differs across campuses as that adds significantly to our workload.

Guichard noted that in consultation with colleagues, and this doesn’t mean to negate feelings about workload, but most aren’t complaining about their teaching load. But our load is high considering mission creep in other areas. There are higher expectations in research and service areas when reviewed for RPT. At the UC they had to do lots of research and productivity, but they got released from 1-2 classes per term for time for this. It’s expressed as a frustration to her that teaching isn’t the problem, it’s high expectations in other domains. We want to do research and service but it’s too much. Sims said confirmed that it’s not the teaching per se, but the overall workload. Do you have a sense if it’s too much extra workload, not accounted for properly?

Guichard noted that for Psychology and Child Development, they are also advising master’s students, on top of office hours, which takes tons of time. She is chairing 8 thesis committees and a member of 17 others. At the very least, this requires attending the proposal and defense, and reading documents, and depending on the writing it can take hours. If a graduate student is working on their thesis for 4 semesters, the faculty member only gets credit for 3 semesters, and no more for however long it takes after 3 semesters. This is not a complaint, all of us have realities and expectations that make the workload high. It isn’t so simple to have 4-4. But if you have 4-4 and with conferences presentations, but not a publication, then you are up the creek in RPT processes.

Strahm notes that our contract doesn’t require that we all teach 24 units; it doesn’t say 24 anywhere. Piggybacking on Guichard on creep, if we show that we are adept or interested in something, our colleagues and administrators come to us and want us to do that, but she’s finding for herself and for her colleagues, that putting together a panel for folks here and community members, writing something up that requires literary review and research but is in a newsletter, doesn’t count for anything. Basically there is a lot of creep in that it’s not accounted for, not given consideration in any of these decisions when the time for us to maybe get a bump in pay. She would love one and would love to catch up with others in her cohort, but she’s not as productive in publications because she does all these little things. And we are not alone.

Nagel emphasized that the CBA article is vague. It is not specific about 24 WTUs nor 30 for FT lecturers. Faculty who believe their workload is excessive, have the ability to grieve. Contact CFA to ask questions about whether or not you have a legitimate workload grievance. A stack of these might be an effective tool to get the institution to address this. This is a tool to think about using.

Wellman echoes Guichard’s and Strahm’s comments. We are not addressing unique needs of graduate programs, thesis, comprehensive exam service that does not count toward WTUs or RPT, as well as external accreditation.

Davis said four courses a semester is excessive. Last spring, she had 4, one with 75 students, and she did nothing but teach. She finished her sabbatical because she had no time for breathing. Think of what is excessive, maybe across CSU it has 24 units, but 4 is excessive, as you can’t do all you want to do with your students.

Garcia said that as discipline experts we control elaborations. Make sure we get credit for the work we’re doing. This doesn’t change workload, but consider what we get credit for while under review.

Wooley didn’t see graduate issues named in the survey. In terms of faculty development, prestige, productivity, student learning, all can be under graduate studies.

Eudey wants to echo what Garcia just said that we do have control over elaborations. It is still surprising the number of departmental elaborations that don’t mention advising or assessment, and have no information about how curriculum development and service are valued in programs. Some don’t mention the different kinds of RSCA work that are valued within a discipline. As we saw at convocation, elaborations and RPT activities is something that Faculty Affairs will be addressing over the next few years, and we’ve done some work on this as we’ve enacted aspects of the RPT Task Force report, but there is still work to do to finish this out. We control some of these issues. We need to use elaborations wisely to identify and advocate for the kinds of work that is important to our disciplines.  Following upon Davis’ comments, she agrees that 4 courses per term is excessive but notes that some of our lecturers are teaching 5 or more per term.  Some are also teaching at other campuses because they are paid low salaries here and can’t afford to work only at one campus. Lecturers shouldn’t be teaching 30 WTUs and they too should get some time for non-instructional work as part of their workload. And in addition to heavy teaching load, many don’t have computers, offices etc. This is something that needs to be discussed.

* 1. Possible Resolutions Re: Executive Orders; immigration policy, etc.

Sarraille asked if we going to do more on the DACA student? Sims asked the Senators to look at the resolutions other campuses have passed, and think about what might we want to do. There are a couple of more that we’ll post on the webpage. That will be discussed at the next meeting. Continues as a discussion item next time.

1. **Open Forum**
2. **Adjournment**

4:06