

## **Minutes: Faculty Senate meeting 1/25/19**

### **Meeting called to order at 12:49.**

Minutes from December meeting accepted.

### **Revised Strategic Planning Timeline**

Provost has agreed to suggested timeline. The meetings that are reflected as school meeting will now be open meetings for all faculty to attend as open forums.

Q: I noticed the Provost's email did not explicitly mention an end point for the timeline.

A: What we ultimately said is that we would discuss it at Fall Faculty Conference, and then left open the end point for them to decide.

Q: Is there a specific focus to these open forums?

A: They are intended to collect more feedback from faculty and they will be more open – meeting at roundtables to discuss questions about the plan. They will also be co-facilitated by faculty members.

### **Senate Resolution: Shared Governance Notification Form**

The Senate Executive Committee has proposed use of a form for the Provost to fill out when the Senate or a task force puts forth a recommendation that is not followed by administration. (See wording of resolution at Senate website.)

C: I think this is fantastic and I thank the Executive Committee for this. But I recommend including a deadline for administration to provide feedback.

- The wording says that they need to give us feedback prior to implementation rather than giving a deadline of a certain number of days.

C: Why can't we include language that would say how many days in advance of implementation?

Motion to amend to include language to modify by adding language about how many days prior to implementation.

Discussion:

- Including a specific timeline might not be wise because different changes might require more time, which is why I was in favor of leaving it open.
- This seems like a good-faith thing and maybe we should use that language.
- I understand these concerns about why we wouldn't want a set time, but I think it would be good to have a longer period like a month.
- Perhaps we can say "sufficient time during the contract year" so that they don't spring something on us in August.
- We could also leave it open and we can request a deadline that is appropriate for each proposed change for each recommendation we make. For example, a taskforce recommendation would include this.
- The Provost will be acting on the Senate's recommendation, so the Senate would be adding a timeline not a taskforce.
- More debate and discussion on the pros and cons of adding a specific timeline.

Vote on changes to the wording of the resolution (see wording change on Senate website): changes approved unanimously.

C: Given that the President's note on shared governance about student involvement, should we add something about students?

- This is more about the Faculty Senate and not an appropriate place to include this.
- We don't speak for the students. They have their own Senate.

Vote on resolution: passes unanimously.

### **Blackboard Ally – Document Accessibility**

The presentation on this was at the December meeting and we now want to determine whether we endorse the purchase of this product.

Comment: I want to know, for an average course, how much time it would take for use to listen and read every document to check for accuracy. It seems to me that this would take a great deal of time for each course. Would this be optional or would we have to do it for every course?

Questions and comments:

- If we don't use this, then what other options are there for us to do this for students who need this?
- My question is about whether we as faculty should have to do this or is this something that Learning Access can do?
- I have these same concerns. It seems like this is all being put on the faculty to do this and it seems unreasonable. It was my understanding that this was the job of the Learning Access Office.
- I use this program at another school and we hired someone to help faculty with this. The law suit required that all classes make this accommodation, not just doing it after we learn that there are students that need it. But I agree that we need someone, perhaps in IT, who can help faculty with this.
- I feel like both sides have strong arguments, what troubles me is that we would be committing to this technology. I would like to include a phrase saying that this is experimental and we are not using this as an experiment.
- I'm concerned about this being used to evaluate faculty.
- I want to point out that the school is being proactive because the student who sued another school is a student at Stockton.
- Maybe we would be better off being sued because then we would be more likely to get the support we need to make the change rather than putting it on us to do this now as faculty.
- I'm very supportive of accommodating students who need it. However, acting based on fear of a law suit does not seem wise especially since we know little about the suit and the suit is still open.
- Why would this be required for all students as a preventative measure? We know that students learn more from reading than from listening so why would we want to encourage students to listen to all texts we assign?
- When using this program, it shows how much of your Blackboard page is accessible.

I suggest we table this until we can answer some of these questions.

Tabled

### **Graduation Update**

Efforts are being made to streamline graduation commencement and provide greater opportunity for faculty-student interaction. The proposed change is that we not sit on the stage but would sit on the first couple rows of the stands near the stage so we can get up and congratulate students as they walk back to their seats. They are working on other ways to shave time including not singing the anthem (applause and laughs).

Q: Since staff are not here, I would like to bring up an issue that staff brought up, which is that it was too hot in the hallways.

Smith: I was aware of this and we are taking care of that. (John describes changes in seating in detail.)

### **Shared Governance Task Force Report & Recommendations**

We will get to this later because we are running out of time.

The February meeting will be a Faculty Assembly meeting with the President, and members can ask questions about shared governance then. The meeting will be more of a discussion than a speech by the President. We will also come back to this issue in the March meeting.

Q: Is there any validity to the original document that the President refers to in his letter related to shared governance?

- See Bob Halsabeck's document on shared governance at Stockton where he runs through the whole history of shared governance and describes the period of President Bork as a period of extreme authoritarianism. As far as I can tell from researching related documents, the first document that takes serious the idea of shared governance was from a BOT meeting in 2009 that acknowledges the Faculty Senate.

Motion to adjourned. Adjourned.