

Academic Senate Minutes
May 3, 2018
3:00 – 5:02, Ballrooms D and C

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda-Approved. Minutes of 4/19/18-amended and approved. Consent item: from EPC expedited proposal from Hutchins – Approved. Information item: from EPC C- year-long "Golden four" GE courses. President report. From FSAC: Policy for Periodic Evaluation of Athletic Coaching Faculty and Revision to Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty – Approved. Provost Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Associated Students Report. From EPC: Syllabus policy (formally Course Outline Policy) – First Reading. From EPC: Temporary 48-unit GE Pattern – First Reading. APARC Report. Recommendation to endorse ATISS recommendation for new LMS – First Reading. Election of At-Large Members to the Executive Committee. APARC Priority Recommendations – Approved. EPC Report. SAC Report. Good of the Order.

Present: Carmen Works, Laura Watt, Ben Ford, Richard J. Senghas, Jeffrey Reeder, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Melissa Garvin, Sakina Bryant, Carlos Torres, Ed Beebout, Joshua Glasgow, Florence Bouvet, Jennifer Mahdavi, Mattie Mookerjee, Mary Ellen Wilkosz, Michelle Jolly, Michelle Goman, Rick Luttmann, Hope Ortiz, Michael Balasek, Judy Sakaki, Lisa Vollendorf, Joyce Lopes, Wm. Greg Sawyer, Elaine Newman, Jason Gorelick, Isabel Burris Sanyo, Arcelia Sandoval, Michael Visser, Jen Lillig, Stephen Winter, Ron Lopez

Proxies: Elizabeth Stanny for Damien Wilson, Rita Premo for Laura Krier

Guests: Jarod Chasey, Paul Gullixson, Karen Moranski, Justin Lipp, Sandra Ayala

Chair Report – C. Works

The Chair asked the members to save the date of May 15 for Laurel's retirement party. It will be held in the Art Gallery that day from 4:00 to 6:00. She reported that the search for a new Senate Analyst will likely take place over the summer and she asked the committee chairs to anticipate a bit more work at the beginning of the fall.

Approval of Agenda-Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 4/19/18 - amended and Approved.

Consent item: From EPC expedited proposal from Hutchins - **Approved**

Information item: From EPC C- year-long "Golden four" GE courses

President report – J. Sakaki

1. Dr. Sakaki introduced Paul Gullixson, our new Associate Vice President for Strategic Communications. He used to work at the *Press Democrat*.
2. SSU won another prestigious award for the *Star* – we are so proud of our students!
3. Research symposia were amazing over the past few weeks. We are so proud of our students and thankful to our faculty and staff for doing the work required to put on such impressive research symposia.
4. Dr. Sakaki highlighted two graduating students for their accomplishments and thanked the faculty and staff for the incredible work we do with and for our students. Commencement is the most exciting time of the year! Dr. Sakaki thanked everyone for their work in supporting our students toward graduation.

President Sakaki was asked where the \$3M was going to come from for the Tech High “buyout.” She explained that we entered into a negotiation to be able to get more classroom space in preparation for the Stevenson Remodel, and the \$3 million will come out of the \$96 million from the Chancellor’s Office for the remodel. A member then asked Dr. Sakaki about the suspension of the diversity and sustainability directors. Dr. Sakaki emphasized that we care deeply about these areas—and also the other core values that we are articulating in the strategic plan. These are major pillars and we need to do better in expressing these values throughout the implementation process. We are listening to the input and we want to do the best we can.

FROM FSAC: Policy for Periodic Evaluation of Athletic Coaching Faculty: Criteria, Procedures, and Forms – Second Reading and Revision to Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty – Second Reading – S. Winter

The Chair noted that at the first reading of these policies it was suggested to combine them into one vote since they were related. **She asked if there was any objection to considering the two policies at the same time. No objection.**

S. Winter said at the first reading, it was suggested to remove the forms from the policy and discussed slight changes FSAC had made at its meeting prior to the Senate to the Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty policy. After these changes, the policy revision will just address removing language about coaches. He said FSAC will take a look at the entire Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty policy next year. S. Winter formally requested that the Senate remove the forms from the policy. The Chair asked if there was any objection. A member asked if the Senate would subsequently be able to review the forms at a later time. S. Winter said that it was his understanding the FSAC would review the forms and would welcome any feedback. **There was no objection removing the forms from the Coaches Evaluation policy.**

Motion by FSAC Chair regarding the Periodic Review of Temporary Faculty 1. C – remove the sentence previously added: ~~Departments lacking chairs and/or Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committees will develop procedures for forming a~~

~~review committee and to return the striked out section in 2. F to the original version. Second. No objection.~~

**Motion to add sentence to Coaches Evaluation Policy in 2. A. 1 and 2. B. 1
“Questions on the survey will be subject to FSAC review and approval.” Second.
Approved.**

Vote on both policies – Approved.

Provost Report – L. Vollendorf

1. A&H Dean finalists are on campus this week. Thanks to all who are participating in the many opportunities provided to meet the candidates. Please do not forget to provide feedback on the website.
2. CIO search is on track to bring in finalists later this month.
3. The Provost thanked everyone who participated in the strategic planning process. The feedback throughout—including in the final phases of input—has been incredibly helpful to helping us move to a plan that we can work with over the next few years. Strategic plan kick-off party is scheduled for 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 9 on Seawolf Plaza. Please encourage students and colleagues to attend.
4. Wine Spectator Learning Center is celebrating its grand opening on May 29 at 6 p.m. An all campus invitation will go out in the next few days.

A member asked about Senate endorsement of the plan. Chair Works suggested that there were a lot of opportunities for input throughout the year. She suggested that the plan could come to Senate next time or first thing in the fall. There was discussion whether it was appropriate to bring it to the Senate for endorsement at this point.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – J. Lopes

1. We are nearing decision time for the AVP for Facilities Management. Please provide feedback as soon as possible.
2. Candidates are coming for the Chief of Police next week (week of May 7). Please participate and provide feedback.
3. We continue to work on opportunities for workforce housing for staff and faculty. We had focus groups recently. Three focus groups (35 people each) were held. We had waitlists so we will do more focus groups and we will also put out a survey to students, faculty, and staff to learn more about everyone’s needs. We are looking at ways to provide housing as quickly as possible.

In response to a question about the VP of Advancement search, Joyce Lopes said HR confirmed that we are on schedule to bring finalists in the last week in May.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report – Wm. Greg Sawyer

1. Dr. Sawyer continues his listening tour. He praised Jason Gorelick specifically and other student leaders generally for a job well done.

2. Student Affairs is having a leadership retreat after graduation to talk about a student-centered, intentional needs-based model for his division. They will examine needs of students and how to best meet those needs within his division. The goal is to strengthen support for students and strengthen the Division of Student Affairs.

Associated Students Report – J. Gorelick

J. Gorelick reported that the Associated Students passed their budget. They did have a discussion about the Director of Diversity and the Director of Sustainability positions, and after that conversation they came away with the recommendation to have more consultation with students and faculty regarding these sorts of decisions. He noted that Monday was their transition meeting and this was his and Isabel's last day at the Senate. He thanked everyone for their passion and dedication as educators. He said he would always look back on this as the defining experience of his college career. Applause.

From EPC: Syllabus policy (formally Course Outline Policy) – First Reading – J. Lillig

J. Lillig said this revision started with the need to change the name of the policy, since no one was searching for course outline policy when they wanted to find this policy. The structure of the policy was changed to provide more clarity. Below is taken from the cover memo for this item.

III. C The policy was updated to include information related to syllabus accessibility in order to provide consistency between the template and the policy.

IV. A.5 The policy now requires syllabi to include measurable student learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are already required by EPC for program changes and addition to course syllabi and are in line with the EPC MCCCCF which requires a description of how a course fits in with overall curriculum. Addition of the course learning outcomes will also facilitate course assessment and program review from the department level to WASC. A definition of learning outcomes was also included (II.B) and it will be linked to additional example content in the SSU Curriculum Guide.

IV.A.6 SSU GE information is now required (as opposed to strongly encouraged), which is in line with information already included in the GE Course Approval process. This will facilitate future GE program assessment ventures.

IV.B. Additional considerations were included to direct faculty to information that may be helpful during syllabus preparation including online/hybrid instruction, the Faculty Center guide for evaluating a syllabus, and the SSU Intellectual Property Policy.

She noted that this was approved unanimously by EPC after two readings.

Questions and comments:

A member pointed out that the sections needed to be re-numbered. The member asked if syllabi are checked that they meet the requirements of this policy. J. Lillig said no, and discussed when the syllabus is required beyond the classroom. A member questioned the need for the following sentences in the policy: "If the student adds the course after the first full week of class, it is the student's responsibility to obtain information about the course" and "Faculty shall inform students that it is the student's responsibility to read the syllabus and to request any clarification of course policies." K. Moranski said learning outcomes from syllabi will be collected from now on to meet recommendations from WASC. A member raised concern about items that were previously "strongly recommended" and were now under "must include." A member suggested that the drop deadline was more important than the add deadline. A member asked if syllabi are on the LMS, how can they be stored in the departments. She also asked who will determine if the learning outcomes are measurable and to change the phrase "due dates" to "expected due dates." It was pointed out that the terms syllabus and course outline were still interspersed in the policy. There was a request to define more clearly the concept of "in a timely manner" for giving student feedback. It was noted that the Dispute Resolution Board required hardcopies of syllabi. A member noted that the reminder to students of policies that students should be aware of, which included the grade appeal policy and the cheating and plagiarism policy, were not included in the new version and should be, since without those there could be an increase in cases for the DRB. A member asked if all courses needed to include GE learning objectives. A member requested more of a rationale for why items previously "strongly recommended" were moved to "must be included." A member voiced concern about learning outcomes that were not measurable and/or were seen over time and not just in one class. He was concerned that the policy was creating a situation of just checking off boxes. A member voiced concern about the sentence: If the student adds the course after the first full week of class, it is the student's responsibility to obtain information about the course, asking how students would know this unless they read the policy.

First Reading Completed.

From EPC: Temporary 48-unit GE Pattern – First Reading – J. Lillig

The Chair noted that because the campus received an extension on EO1100, we are required to implement a 48-unit GE pattern in the fall. J. Lillig said this pattern was only for 18-19 and it was not unanimous at EPC. She said the main changes were the addition of A1 and that one of the statutory requirements does not count for GE. She noted that all the freshman learning communities were good with this 48-unit pattern. She referenced the information item.

Question and comments:

A member asked about students who overlap different GE pattern years. There were questions about the list of learning communities and courses that were not listed. K. Musick said that all learning communities met the new standard. The ones listed were the ones with a different configuration. A member argued that this strategy was 'cheating,' as it was still asking students to take the same number of units, even

if not in GE which seemed to go against the reason for EO1100. J. Lillig said EPC did not unanimously approve this because of this issue with Area D, the need for more careful advising and the concern about students in the same class with one getting GE credit and other not. She said EPC thought GE needed to be separate from budget issues so decisions are not made based on fear. They did recognize the issue of high unit majors and restricting access to electives and will discuss this next year. A member asked how double majors would be impacted by this change. A member asked how this would be shown in the catalog and did EPC consider making Area D 12 units. A member noted that other campuses do not include the statutory requirements in their GE. He suggested having one requirement in GE and the other as statutory and not let students choose.

First Reading Completed.

APARC Report – M. Visser

M. Visser described the three handouts in the Senate packet – Executive Summary of LMS report, rubric used by ATISS and a cost comparison of the two platforms. He introduced J. Lipp and S. Ayala, who then made a brief presentation to the Senate.

LMS Project

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY 2017-2018



Project Team

- **Dr. Justin W. Lipp**, Director of the Faculty Center & Educational Technology (interim) - Project Director
- **Dr. Sandra M. Ayala**, Associate Professor Educational Leadership and Special Education; Chair ATISS
- **Joel Gould, M.A.**, Candidate (Education), LMS Research Consultant
- **Noelia Franzen, M.A.**, Academic Technology Manager
- **Dr. Kristin Denver**, Online & Blended Instructional Designer
- **Robert Bach**, LMS Support Consultant
- **Dr. Matthew Callahan**, Associate Professor of Psychology & Faculty Center Instructional Consultant
- **Brent Boyers, M.A.**, Disability Student Services
- **Dr. Jack Nguyen**, Disability Student Services
- **Barbara Moore, Eric Eisenhart**, Information Technology
- **Sean Johnson, M.A.**, Office of Reporting & Analytics

S. Ayala introduced the presentation. She reviewed the reason for the LMS review and the membership of committees that worked on the project. J. Lipp discussed the Executive Summary of the LMS report and some details of the full report. The full report is available at: <http://lms.sonoma.edu/about/research-and-resources>.

ATISS Committee Members

Dr. Sandra M. Ayala, Chair, Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Special Education

Dr. Daniel Soto, Assistant Professor, Geography,
Environment and Planning

Dr. Martha Byrne, Assistant Professor,
Mathematics

Dr. Chong-Uk Kim, Associate Professor,
Economics

Hillary Smith, MA Librarian Research Services

Dr. Robert Train, Professor, Spanish

Dr. Justin W. Lipp, Director of the Faculty Center &
Educational Technology (interim) - Project Director

Brent Boyers, Director Disabilities Services for
Students

Carol Ingerman, Director of Campus Planning

Dennis Goss, Academic Affairs Scheduler


Natalie Asemi, Student Representative

Executive Summary

Introduction & Overview

- ATISS Recommendation to the Academic Senate
- ATISS LMS Selection Rubric

Report on 2017-2018 Learning Management System Project

- LMS Project Background & Pilot Selection Overview
 - LMS Market Review
 - LMS Technical Evaluation (Moodle & Canvas)
 - SSU Spring 2018 Canvas LMS Pilot
 - Planning for a Vendor-Based LMS
- 

The Process

•Provost requests investigation

- Moodle LMS evaluated as part of request

•Consideration of top five LMSs

•Canvas and Moodle – finalists

- Investigation: Company Specs, Services, Cost, Features, Transition plans

•Both Companies – Phone meeting review initial investigative data

- On Campus Presentations – Two visits, Two presentations per visit, Product features

•More data collected, analyzed, presentation feedback



S. Ayala reviewed the process of evaluation.

The Process

- Faculty Survey on Current Moodle LMS
- **Sandboxes provided for faculty to experiment**
- Pilot established for 16 faculty, 400 students
- **Two Surveys sent out to pilot faculty and students**
 - Data collected and analyzed
- **IT analytics on backend, Financial cost – discussed for both programs**
- ATISS went through this process for the entire year
- **A recommendation was made to adopt Canvas as the LMS**

They did not set up a pilot for Moodle since that was already in use.

ATISS Recommendation

“The Academic Technology and Instructional Spaces Subcommittee (ATISS) recommends by a vote of 4-2 that SSU adopt Instructure’s Canvas beginning in Fall 2018 with a transition period of one academic year during which Moodle will also be available for instruction (through Spring 2019).”

- Fall 2019: Canvas would be the only supported LMS.
- Strong recommendation for additional resources to support transition.
 - Purchase 24/7 Canvas support for students and faculty.
 - Purchase premium implementation for 5000 course bulk-migration.
 - Allocate resources for training of faculty and a faculty-lead mentorship program to assist with migration & Canvas instructional design best practices.
 - Ensure accessibility of instructional materials.

Key Canvas Benefits

Annual Moodle Migration: Gone
All courses saved and available always

Course Organization

Calendar

Gradebook

To-Do List

Mobile Apps

Syllabus, Rubric

UDL – Multimedia

Accessibility (508)

Canvas Commons

App Market

Portfolio

Millions of CA Higher-Ed students using
across various institutions (CCC, UC, &
increasing CSU)

Migration Plan

Timeline:

- Fall 2018: Transition semester Next-Generation LMS (legacy course available as faculty self-service from Moodle Archive)
- Spring 2019: Last term self-hosted Moodle is available for instruction (legacy course data available by special request after May 2019)
- Summer/Fall 2019: Next-Generation LMS is sole option available for instruction

24/7 support for Faculty & Students

Faculty Training (Ongoing Workshops, 1-1 Consultation, Dept/School Outreach)

Faculty Peer Expert Supports (Details TBD)

M. Visser thanked the presenters for their enormous amount work. He said APARC received ATISS's recommendation and, after discussion, decided to endorse ATISS's recommendation. He asked the Senate to consider endorsing the recommendation.

Recommendation to endorse ATISS recommendation for new LMS – First Reading

Questions and Comments: A member noted that the cost of moving to Canvas would cover having snacks at the Senate. He wondered if the student surveys asked

students to compare their experience with both Moodle and Canvas. J. Lipp said they did look at that and overwhelming students preferred Canvas. A member brought up concerns about Instructure noting that they claim “to make people smarter” and do not provide any evidence. Their marketing methods appear to use adoption rates rather than features of Canvas to promote their product. She noted that even on their investor site, they do not show honestly who is using their materials. She questioned whether SSU wanted to do business with this company. She also questioned the survey sample for using class sizes that did not reflect the variety of class sizes. A member asked how long faculty would have their Moodle data available, especially for courses that are not taught every year. J. Lipp said faculty will have access to that data and they have three years’ worth of data already. A member asked if there was an ergonomic analysis of the two LMSs. She said she had heard that Canvas was not as ergonomically friendly. She wanted to know why the two faculty on ATISS voted no on the recommendation. She wanted information about how Canvas will work for a fully online class, such as Nursing provides. A member noted that some pages from Moodle do not migrate well into Canvas and wondered who would do those fixes and would there be help to migrate classes at any point. The CFA rep brought up issues of workload and compensation for the switch to Canvas and asked the administration to talk about how faculty will be compensated to do the work of migrating their courses. J. Lipp said they could disaggregate face to face course and fully online course if need, but the sample size would be too small. He discussed a tool that could migrate a large number of courses and clean up would have to be on a case by case basis. He said there were cases where features between Moodle and Canvas would not be analogous and they were looking at feature use by faculty to anticipate any issues. He noted that the LMS Strategic planning group did speak with Instructure and heard that the marketing costs were typical for start-ups in this area. They were investing heavily in their product at this time. The Chancellor’s office was also involved in the vetting of Canvas. A Nursing professor noted she was part of the pilot for Canvas and did keep track of the time it took to migrate even though that question was not asked in the survey. She noted the difficulties of having a person besides herself migrate the course.

M. Visser said they will take all these questions and create an FAQ from those.

Motion to extend by five minutes. Second. Approved.

A member voiced concern about issues that could be found at the end of the pilot and wanted those to be understood before a big transition takes place. A member asked if any promises were made by Instructure to entice the CSU or SSU to use their product. J. Lipp said no, he was not aware of any promises. There was discussion about the cost of migrating and how that would be paid for. A member noted that tools for migration were not included in the costs. J. Lipp said the cost of those was nominal. A member noted that she will lose 10 years of work in this transition. She also brought up privacy issues with Instructure and asked that the group address data gathering by third parties in this process. A member wanted to know if the Moodle instance would still available for faculty after they migrate, so they can re-create structures that might not migrate seamlessly.

First Reading Completed.

Election of At-Large Members to the Executive Committee

The following Senate members were nominated to serve on the Executive Committee in 18-19: Sakina Bryant, Laura Krier and Carlos Torres.

Laura Krier and Carlos Torres were elected by ballot.

APARC Priority Recommendations – First Reading – M. Visser

M. Visser said that this year's priority recommendations did not look much different from last year. Some items had more specificity as progress had been made and the new recommendations were about the WASC recommendations for changes. A member asked why these recommendations from the faculty were important. M. Visser said he knew it was referenced at PBAC and thought it would be used in the strategic budgeting process and could be used for curriculum development.

Motion to waive the first reading. Second. Approved.

Motion to endorse APARC Priority Recommendations for 2018-2019. Second. Approved.

APARC Priority Recommendations for 2018-2019

These are initiatives that faculty request that the administration make progress on in AY 18/19.

- Strategic planning is under way. We encourage the administration to remain focused on several key issues in this process as they pertain to our identity as an institution.
 - How large do we want to be?
 - What should our student population mix be?
 - How do we plan for receiving and supporting transfer students?
 - Strategic enrollment management and admissions.
 - What should our tenure density be?
- A strategic budget framework is being developed in tandem with strategic planning. We encourage the administration to continue to involve faculty governance in this process, and also to share with the campus community the details of the new budget processes. This will help to make clear how a new strategic budgeting process will tie resources to priorities. It should be transparent how long-term FTES projections and tenure-track hiring plans are included in a long-term budget plan. A two-year course schedule would also help to make more concrete budget plans, and also facilitate some discussions around curricular change. The Spring Budget Forum was well-received, and we encourage a continuation of this event.

- It remains a priority that a plan be established and implemented to address campus salary inequities (including gender and racial disparities), compression, and inversion. We are aware that the administration is engaged in careful study on this topic and we hope that a plan will be announced soon. Many people are encouraged by the announcement of Phase 1 of the plan. Faculty look forward to participating in the development of additional phases.
- Support for sustainable program review and assessment at all levels remains a top priority, particularly as relates to the WASC accreditation. Several suggestions have been made by WASC, and we should take this input seriously.
- Be responsive to the WASC report recommendations. In particular, address the concerns around the following recommendations:
 - Measurable learning outcomes for all programs.
 - Adherence to the program review policy.
 - Full implementation of a new strategic plan, including campus and student identity.
 - Implementation and use of data tools to guide decisions toward student success.
 - Strategic plan for Information/Academic Technology.
 - Develop a diversity plan.

EPC Report – J. Lillig

J. Lillig said the Internship Policy was starting over and she said more feedback was welcome. She responded to a couple of questions about the 48-unit GE pattern. The pattern would be in catalog. She said on the campuses that don't have the statutory requirements in GE, they are listed in the 4-year plans as part of the 120 units. On our campus, the current 4-year plans do not show that and will roll forward and the extra class requirement will show in GE. She said that there was a motion at EPC to have Area D at 12 units, but that motion failed.

SAC Report – R. Lopez

R. Lopez reported that they were visited by Wm. Greg Sawyer and enjoyed learning about him. They further discussed the rights and obligations for faculty concerning potential visits by immigration officials.

CFA Report – E. Newman

E. Newman reported that CFA had a successful Lobby Day. They met with legislators and she believed there was momentum for increased funding for the CSU. CFA has endorsed candidates for Governor and Superintendent for Public Instruction. She said they would be doing phone banking for their candidates. The end of the semester social will be held on Wed, May 16th 4 – 7 at Lobos.

Good of the Order

Phi Beta Delta was having their research awards immediately following the Senate. Academic Regalia would be available for faculty at Commencement and there was no need for a reservation. The SYRCE symposium will be held in Weill Hall starting at 11:00am.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes