**For**

First Reading of 1/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Policy on Amplified Sound Use on Campus (Replaces 1/AS/97/SAAC The Use of Amplified Sound on Campus). Will return as a second reading item.

First Reading of 2/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy (Replaces the Posting Guidelines that were approved by the Academic Senate on 3/11/2003 and the President on 5/1/2003). Will return as a second reading item.

Second Reading of 17/AS/14/UEPC GE Goals and Objectives. Resolution passed.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

February 24, 2015

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

Minutes submitted by:

Koni Stone, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 1, 2013

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

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

Academic Senate

February 10, 2015

**Present:** Bettencourt, Broadwater, Brodie, Burroughs, Carroll, Crayton, Edwards, Foreman, Gerson, Ghuman, Guichard, Hoover, Huang, Pengtao Li, Littlewood, Manrique, Miller-Antonio, Morris, Mulder, Nagel, Olivant, Park, Peterson, Petrosky, Powell, Price, Provost Strong, Roe, Silverman, Strong, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Tzu-Man-Huang, and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Espinoza and Filling.

**Proxies:** William Foreman for Andrew Dorsey, Elmano Costa for Noelle Won, Nancy Burroughs for Lynn Johnson, and Koni Stone for Chad Stessman.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, Erin Littlepage, Susan Marshall, Marge Jaasma, John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, Stan Travena, John Tillman, Ron Rodriguez and Brian Duggan.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:02pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of January 27, 2015** (distributed electronically)

Provost Strong Last year registration information was given at the last minute, this year we have similar situation. We have more demand then we have room in our target. We will try to continue to improve communication with students. Five emails were sent to students regarding registration. Three or four emails were sent to faculty and staff. Decisions were made based on discussions in enrollment management committee. The final minutes were approved.

1. **Introductions**

Speaker Carroll welcomed the following guests: John Sarraille, Erin Littlepage, Susan Marshall, Marge Jaasma, John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, Stan Trevena, John Tillman, Ron Rodriguez and Brian Duggan.

1. **Announcements**

Speaker Carroll welcomed Koni Stone with huge thanks for agreeing to be Clerk for the remainder of the spring term. Applause. Also a big thanks to David Colnic and Ann Strahm who are both sharing the Statewide Senate responsibilities this spring.

Speaker Carroll: Earlier announcements have been made about the community college BA programs. At this point the Chancellor’s office is only interested in duplication of programs. So please send Speaker Carroll a note by February 12th, if there are duplicate programs. We may send a letter outlining many other substantive concerns. You may contact Speaker Carroll or Steven Filling if you have questions.

Stan Trevena shared that on Monday February 9th the campus experienced a catastrophic failure of the Blackboard system. The failure was the result of an obscure known bug in the version of Blackboard run on campus. During the upload of an extra import file, the specific triggers for this bug were activated and system started to randomly drop both faculty and staff from the system. The Help Desk responded by adding the dropped users back into the system as soon as they were identified.

An email was sent notifying campus that the Blackboard system would be taken offline at 5:45pm. The email stated that the system would be back online by 4:00am the next morning, and another email would be sent if it was back up earlier. A new restore feature of our backup software was used to fully restore the database to a backup taken earlier in the day at 3:30am. The restore was completed by 9:30pm, and the system was placed back online and an email sent out to campus by 10:00pm.

Provost Strong asked that if Blackboard was hosted by the Blackboard Company would this still have occurred? Trevena noted that it probably would not have happened. If our Blackboard was hosted by Blackboard it would not have had this bug.

Thompson attested to the hard work of the OIT staff, he witnessed it. Silverman asked what would be the performance if it was hosted by Blackboard. Trevena assured that users would not know the difference; that the campus recently upgraded our Internet to dual 10gig fiber connections to the CENIC network.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

None.

1. **First Reading Items**
   1. **1/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Policy on Amplified Sound Use on Campus (Replaces 1/AS/97/SAAC The Use of Amplified Sound on Campus)**

Speaker Carroll moved the resolution, seconded by Strahm.

**1/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Policy on Amplified Sound Use on Campus (Replaces 1/AS/97/SAAC The Use of Amplified Sound on Campus)**

**BE IT RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached policy regarding the use of amplified sound on campus; and be it further

**RESOLVED**: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook; and be it further

**RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate recommend that this policy become effective upon approval by the President.

**RATIONALE**: 1/AS/97/SAAC, endorsed by the Academic Senate on May 20, 1997, established guidelines regarding the use of amplified sound. These are now, in revised and more fully developed form, being translated into formal policy in order to avoid misunderstandings that emerged under the old guidelines, to ensure consistency and fairness in regulating the use of amplified sound on campus, and to give the administration the appropriate authority to administer and enforce it.

Reviewed and recommended by SEC on 2/3/15

Nagel stated that in section 3, “may act” is unclear. Regalado noted that the scope of the policy does not include the amplified sound that is inside the classroom. He recommends expanding the scope to include amplified sound inside the classroom. Speaker Carroll agrees that sound in the classroom can be disruptive. However, the noise issues inside classrooms are between faculty members. FAC might want to address this intra-faculty issue.

Wisniewski noted that inside the classroom, noise has been a problem. This policy should address this. Strahm stated that the geometry of the room contributes to the noise disruption in adjacent classrooms. The faculty need to work this out. Perhaps more speakers in the back of the classroom could solve the problem. Regalado noted that it is not a matter of what classroom wins, all students lose. Students who have to take midterms will be distracted by amplified sound in another classroom. They will lose points and it will affect their graduation. Midterms in March are imperative to their graduation.

Duggan asked a practical question: does the university have a decibel meter and who will do the measuring? Strahm assured that AVP Shimek has a decibel meter and will use it. Price stated that the office of student activities also has one. Peterson pointed out that in Bizzini, rooms share ceilings, so sound in adjacent rooms travels. Faculty should work together as another policy is needed for inside sound.

Wisniewski has only received dirty looks from people in the rooms that has loud noise and this is more than an inconvenience. Regalado emphasized that the opportunity is now. Make the change now. Students want to graduate now. He has played in rock bands all his life and knows how loud sound should be. OIT has the technology to address this.

Duggan replied that there are things we can do, but we are limited. We can limit speaker volume in the classrooms. Ceiling mounted speakers would focus sound down. There is no remote switch to control volume. Provost Strong stated that this policy covers all noise on campus. Strahm clarified: no, AVP Shimek was clear that this policy is for sound outside the buildings. Foreman echoed Peterson’s idea to keep policies separate.

Salameh spoke to the Dean of Students for clarification and reported that this policy is to avoid outside noise interfering with classroom activity. Colnic suggested some word smithing: 1st paragraph on amplified sound. Strike “found to be disruptive” or get rid of “70 decibels”. Price noted that bass sounds may be disruptive below 70 decibels. Colnic reaffirmed: it should be either 70 decibels or disruptive, not both.

Strahm clarified with information from AVP Shimek: We needed a limit to determine what level is disruptive, according to research, 70 decibels was usually considered disruptive. Regalado agreed with Wisniewski and disagreed with Foreman. Not just the students are affected, staff are also disrupted.

O’Brien pointed out that Foreman is the chair of FBAC, not FAC. Wisniewski actually agreed with Dr. Colnic, what will happen if noise is above 70 decibels but it is not disruptive. Salameh was concerned about how this will this be regulated and when will it be in place? For example, what are the consequences?

Speaker Carroll clarified that the resolution would become effective when the President signs it. It is not clear what the consequences will be. Nagel said that noise is often defined as noxious sound, meaning that it is always subjective, and this seems to be the target of the policy.

Tuedio was here when the original policy was approved. The issue was the balance between being able to have student activities and faculty being able to teach. Petrosky brought up the issue of equal enforcement between buildings as a problem. He could bring in the Trojan Marching band and it will not disturb the next class in DBH. Wisniewski suggested adding punctuation to clarify “70 decibels etc.”

Duggan asserted that we can only measure decibels when the amp is producing sound. Paul Park asked what is the pre-approval procedure for having amplified sound? Price indicated that most complaints come from first floor of Bizzini. Strahm cautioned that this policy could prevent spontaneous events. We don’t want to avoid spontaneous events. Peterson suggested that the noise between classrooms varies a lot based on the building; perhaps Bizzini needs more insulation. We might save money and it would be better for the planet and less sound would travel.

This item will return as a second reading item to the Senate.

* 1. **2/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy (Replaces the Posting Guidelines that were approved by the Academic Senate on 3/11/2003 and the President on 5/1/2003)**

Speaker Carroll moved the resolution, seconded by Strahm.

**2/AS/15/SEC -- CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy (Replaces the Posting Guidelines that were approved by the Academic Senate on 3/11/2003 and the President on 5/1/2003)**

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus recommends that the attached revised CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy replace the Posting Guidelines that were approved by the Senate and the President on 5/1/2003. The Academic Senate requests that the newly revised 2/AS/15/SEC- CSU Stanislaus Posting Policy be approved; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That this revised policy replace the existing policy in the Faculty Handbook; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recommend that this revised policy become effective upon approval by the President.

**RATIONALE:** The original policy was created in order to avoid misunderstandings about posting parameters, to ensure consistency and fairness in posting practices on campus, and to give the administration appropriate enforcement authority. This policy is being revised in order to avoid misunderstandings that emerged under the prior policy and to ensure that faculty maintain authority over posting in their offices, on their office doors, and on bulletin boards associated with their offices.

Reviewed and recommended by SEC on 2/3/15

Bettencourt noted that A frames cause problems for students in wheelchairs. He suggested the addition of “or access to buildings” to IV.b.iii, on third page: add “obstructing ADA door opening buttons”. Nagel took exception to the language “orderly appearance”. It is too vague. Could the campus be appropriately disorderly? On the top of page 2: “or discourage” can’t post “we’re doomed”. Not sure what that means. On the last page: faculty doors, the “office door” means both sides of the office door.

Speaker Carroll stated that when referring to the “door” it means the entire door. Wisniewski indicated that students have an issue with IV,d, viii. The process should not be restrictive for postings in languages other than English. This is discriminatory.

Silverman had eight questions and asked five of them: Is there a name of a department or person associated with this document that created and will manage this policy? Is the only purpose to produce orderly look as opposed to fire rules or something? What constitutes an orderly look?

Silverman said: I just need some clarifications because we did have problems with information being posted in our department and somebody quoted the old Posting policy and somebody removed my notice from Computer Science Lab doors. Do I understand correctly that on my door, I can post for example an announcement for my next semester courses, announcement there are free flu shots in student health center, pictures of my cats? I read there is restriction of 3 weeks posting material. Do I understand that I can post for more than three weeks? In one of the bullets it said we can't use adhesive tape.

The Speaker and others explained that yes, faculty can post anything they want subject to decency and other constraints on their office door, for as long as they want.

Foreman reasserted that faculty office doors are exempt from the policy. Regalado stated: under free speech, objectionable language is not allowed. He suggested including use of allegations driven by religious extremists. We should discourage that as well. Provost Strong noted that the guidelines were authored by Business and Finance.

Petrosky was concerned that some messages require quick approval, so who is the approver? Is there an alternate approver? Burroughs inquired about the definition of interior and exterior of faculty office doors, notices cannot be posted on the hallway doors. Is this due to the Fire Marshall? Foreman reiterated that faculty office doors are outside of this policy.

Wisniewski addressed what Regalado was talking about: Offensive statements. Faculty can post whatever they want but students cannot. There are no rules for faculty. If a faculty member is a Safe Zone that might be offensive for students to be in a LBTQ safe zone. Strahm stated that this policy is about the posting, not the content. What we post has to follow guidelines. Wisniewski responded that under the policy, students are restricted, faculty are not with respect to content. That is the point that she was speaking on.

Thompson suggested striking the entire paragraph under IV. Policy, a , ii. that follows:

*While state and federal free speech protections permit speech that some individual may find objectionable or offensive, the University strongly discourages the use of slurs, epithets, or other statements that offend or discourage.*

Edwards stated that faculty office doors are not part of the policy but the university is “discouraging”. Do we need a policy on civility? Hoover stated that just because faculty doors are excluded from this policy it doesn’t mean there are no rules for faculty. Ghuman informed the Senate that a community college was sued for $80,000 because a student could not post the constitution?

Silverman asked, could the University etc. discourage? Regalado suggested that we strike # 2 on page 2. He would like to see his suggestion moved over to #1 under a. and include “religious extremist language, terrorist threats” etc. All of these things open Pandora’s Box. Post-modernist malarkey is a slur. This is the place to debate this. Wisniewski extemporized that the constitution does not prevent any extremist comments, that wording (above) does not belong in this policy.

Dean Tuedio suggested that we need a standard for extremist comments. This was confirmed by Price. Brodie inquired about electronic posting? Salameh confirmed that there are procedures, but she did not know if there is a policy. Bettencourt supported Thompson’s recommendation to remove IV, a, ii. For IV, a, i, we need to consult with Title IX experts on campus. Guichard indicated that her questions about electronic posting and Facebook were answered. Hoover suggested to exchange “or” for “and/or” at the bottom of first page in IV, a, i.

1. **Second Reading Item**
   1. 17/AS/14/UEPC GE Goals and Outcomes

Speaker Carroll gave a brief introduction. This iteration is due to a need to meet WASC requirements. We need to consider assessment as we consider the goals. Moved by Carroll and seconded by Strahm.

Strahm thanked all who commented in Senate and all who contacted her outside of Senate. She then summarized the following changes: the resolution has been changed to review GE courses 7 years (not every 5). This was done to fit the APR cycle. UEPC has decided not to include foreign language as it is not a general education requirement. “Tools” has been converted to resources. Goal 2, under c, suggestions were made to alter the language, but UEPC chose not to include the suggestions. “Structures” includes “language and institutions”. Faculty are instructed to “Address 2 to 4 of the most essential learning outcomes for your GE course.”

*California State University, Stanislaus*

*General Education Program*

**Goals and Outcomes**

Goal 1: Develop the intellectual skills and competencies necessary to participate effectively in society and the world.

Students attaining the first learning goal will be able to:

1. Demonstrate effective oral communication.
2. Demonstrate effective written communication.
3. Demonstrate the ability to think critically and creatively.
4. Apply quantitative reasoning concepts and skills to solve problems.
5. Find, understand, examine critically, and use information from various sources.
6. Comprehend and use appropriate technological resources effectively.

Goal 2: Develop broad knowledge of biological and physical sciences, humanities and creative arts, and social sciences.

Students attaining the second learning goal will be able to:

1. Explain and apply basic scientific methods.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the living and non-living physical world.
3. Recognize the structures and institutions that frame human interactions.
4. Express appreciation of cultural, intellectual, and artistic ideas and works.
5. Demonstrate effective creative expression and understanding through artistic means.
6. Identify life-skills and behaviors needed to flourish as a mature person.

Goal 3: Develop abilities to integrate knowledge, make informed ethical decisions, and accept civic responsibility.

Students attaining the third learning goal will be able to:

1. Integrate and combine knowledge and abilities developed in several fields to analyze and critically evaluate specific problems, issues, or topics.
2. Illustrate the ability to self-reflect and assess relevant ethical values.
3. Identify and analyze problems within local, regional, national, and/or global contexts.
4. Demonstrate enhanced awareness of multicultural, community, and/or technological perspectives.

GE courses will address two to four of the most essential learning outcomes.

As of 1/29/15 UEPC

The following is the slight change to the resolution:

**California State University Stanislaus**

**17/AS/14/UEPC – Resolution to Adopt General Education Goals and Outcomes**

**Be it Resolved**: That CSU Stanislaus adopt the attached General Education Goals and Outcomes.

**Rationale**: Executive Order 1065 requires that the CSU Stanislaus General Education Goals and Outcomes align with the essential learning outcomes developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities as part of their Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative. The accompanying goals are the result of a thoughtful, multi-year, collaborative effort between the GE Ad Hoc Committee, General Education Subcommittee of the University Educational Policy Committee (UEPC), the Faculty Coordinator of General Education, the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Coordinator of the Assessment of Student Learning, and UEPC. The resultant goals represent the skills and competencies, knowledge, and abilities that CSU Stanislaus commits to developing in its students.

We recognize that the Goals and Outcomes of any educational program are continuously being evaluated and revised. The determination of Goals and Outcomes for General Education is one part of an iterative process designed to assure that students are acquiring the knowledge, skills, and abilities we believe to be critical to a broad liberal education. As individual courses are mapped to the GE goals and outcomes, assessment strategies are developed, and evidence of student learning analyzed, we may desire to modify our Goals and Outcomes to better reflect our academic programs. Every seven years the GE Subcommittee will also revisit these Goals and Outcomes as we respond to changes in our world and society.

As of 1/29/15 UEPC

Peterson stated that it is much better and it will be easier for many to adapt their courses to these criteria. She suggested “and/or” is needed in goal 1. 2. Students need to understand the living “and/or” nonliving. Dean Tuedio cautioned against changing to “and/or”. We need to have both critical thinking and creative thinking, not one or the other. Peterson rebutted, she was worried about her class not being creative. For Littlewood, the last line ruins the goals. This line makes these goals focused on the individual courses, not the program.

Colnic agreed with Dean Tuedio and Peterson. The goals create a package. This policy will be used to recertify GE courses. Thompson made one important point: this is a second reading, the committee made a good faith effort to accommodate the input of the Senate. This has been going on forever, and it will never be perfect. Speakers should speak in favor or in opposition to the resolution. Those who are not sure whether to be in favor of the resolution should not be hung up on “address”, and it does not mean exhaustively explained. UEPC chair is on record of how these goals should be used to recertify. Marshall was in favor, she clarified that the new goals are in response to a CSU mandate, not a WASC request. Foreman was in favor. Perhaps we could develop a companion document to clarify what these words mean. This companion document could define “Structures”, etc. Provost Strong was in favor.

Hauselt indicated that her department colleagues are in favor; however her department is concerned about how these goals will be implemented. Petrosky called the question. Foreman seconded. Senators voted 34 yes, 4 no, 1 abstention, the resolution passed.

1. **Open Forum**

Wisniewski revisited the posting policy and recommended the removal of the line about non English posting. Strahm whole heartedly agreed with Wisniewski. Foreman announced a seminar that will be presented by tenure track candidate: “Textual Harassment”. Nagel conveyed that a lecturer contacted him, and that since then many faculty (tenure-track and non-tenure track) have discussed their problems with bookstore orders with him. Ron Rodriguez announced that a survey was sent to faculty that will be used by the Library of the Future Steering Committee, a group comprised of students, faculty, staff, administrators, and a community member. This survey, which will help us shape the Library services and the entire Library building, is short and should not take more than 5 minutes to complete. Please take some time between now and February 20, 2015 to complete this important survey and make your voice count.

Gerson announced that the Pappageorge winner Dr. Choong-Min Kang from the Department of Biological Sciences will be presenting the “Microbes and My Life” seminar on Wednesday, February 18th, from 3-4pm, in FDC 114. Dr. Arnold Schmidt from the Department of English will be sharing his sabbatical work in a seminar entitled "Sabbatical Research in Rome & London: Pizza & Pasties, Poetry & Pirates" on Monday, February 23rd, in FDC 114.

The FDC is cosponsoring with Faculty Affairs an evening in honor of Black History Month on February 18th. This will be a nice event with faculty across campus.

Provost Strong announced that our enrollment target is 4.4% over our target. Faculty should implement the IW when appropriate. The Chancellor’s Office requires that we are not more than 3.4% over.

O’Brien announced the start of UBAC meetings; they are Tuesdays at noon, either in Lakeside Conference or South Dining.

1. **Adjournment**

3:58pm