Senate Meeting Minutes Nov. 15, 2016

Tyrrell calls the meeting to order at 4:32pm

1. Approval of Senate minutes for October 18, 2016. No corrections of objections.

2. Disability, Accessibility and Reasonable Accommodations Policy (Second Reading): policy 2nd reading:
   a. Procedure is being worked on. Word change to "reasonable" from "meaningful" since legal term is "reasonable." Or just strike "meaningful" without replacement. Arleen call for vote, seconded. Passes unanimously.

3. IDEA Survey:
   a. Guest presentation Doug Harvey and Judy Vogel. 2012 survey on satisfaction of IDEA with recommendation survey held again in 5 yrs. So, now undertaking the next survey with changes to instrument from IDEA. Repeated questions with some added about planned IDEA changes particularly online administration (done through phone or laptop) and short forms. 38% response rate. Concern: 65% rate to guarantee statistic validity of online results but online not getting the same response rate. Increased bias in online response; need more data on this issue. Will present data to Provost Council, might send out to all faculty or posting it online. Going to pilot taking survey on mobile devices and kiosks to mimic new IDEA administration plan. Pilot can help Stockton develop tactics to address concerns such as response rate. Senators request samples sent out instead of presenting them in Senate meeting. Incentives for taking IDEA suggested. Can shorter version have customized questions especially for online? Interest in it but must talk to IDEA about if can and how to. Decision is between Union and Administration whether or not Stockton stays with IDEA. Alternative systems do have reliability issues; caveat only going to be a perception of students, not actually a measure of teaching effectiveness. New IDEA has results/breakdown online instead of paper. The cost benefit of IDEA (or alternative) as opposed to Stockton creating own assessment system, no clear answer.

4. Discussion on Shared Governance Task Force:
   a. Boakes suggestion break into groups and talk. Spend 20-25 minutes in groups; one member designated as spokesperson.
      i. Group1: Better communicating value of shared governance and doing service in it. Expectations of service/shared govern from school to school. Question: language used to describe senate that is not flattering? Partially about lag in process and about how value of something such as Gender & Sexuality Center not made clear in terms of outcome.
      ii. Group 2: Debated about value of transparent shared governance; qualified for things such as budget, building acquisitions? Different mechanisms for shared governance but not real assurance that separate entities come together in common venue to deliberate and decision making. Silos of

decision making. Spirit is egalitarian model but Stockton has deviated from this; Quaker model for truly shared governance but not feasible. Odd juxtaposition of IDEA neoliberal with discussion of shared governance.

iii.   Group 3: Perhaps need a clear line and role/voice of staff in shared governance. Importance of clear line between voting and non-voting members for standing committees of senate. Increasing faculty presence strains faculty – seeing same faces. How to make valued input from participants such as students; how does student senate feed into this. Chart of all the entities going on, give sense of where fit best for those who do want to serve. Similar to diagram needed for accreditation report in EDUC (Boakes). How to increase participation in meetings such as virtual meeting places & recording available afterwards for who could not directly participate; important if moving to AC as satellite to integrate faculty across. Digital suggestion box for all such as on website without threats to non-tenure and the like. Questions: meetings for other campuses like ACCC cluster uses IT/virtual meetings.

iv.   Group 4: History of Stockton not had moment of systematic thought on these questions and issues. Report lays out interim recommendation and mission statement, if senate can give feedback to the taskforce on those. Greater understanding of what actually exists in terms of the working committees and who is on them. Look for things missing in report that can be passed on to the task force. Question if a single venue a good thing since it centers power. Model of whether or not to be a university should be used for shared governance, constant re-evaluation.

Jackson moves to adjourn meeting adjourned. Approved by unanimous consent. Meeting adjourned at 5:55pm.