

# Minutes

## of the Academic Senate Meeting May 25, 2016

- PRESENT: Alas, Alex, Duran, El Naga, Eskandari, Farmer, Garcia-Des Lauriers, Ghazanfari, Guthrie, Guyse, Husain, Ibrahim, Kampf, Kopplin, Lloyd, Mao, Mulley, Nelson, Neto, Prichard-Schmitzberger, Salem, Salik, Sancho-Madriz, Shen, Shih, Simjee, Small, Sohn, Speak, Swartz, Tang, Von Glahn, Winer
- PROXIES: Lloyd for Pacleb, Nelson for Husain, Prichard-Schmitzberger for MacNevin, Alex for Neto (until 4 p.m.)
- NOT PRESENT: Mirzaei, Polet
- GUESTS: S. Alva, B. Bahr, K. Colaner, M. Danico, L. Dopson, S. Garver, T. Gomez, D. Gonzalez, N. Hurlbut, J. Myers, T. Passeggi, L. Preiser-Houy, D. Quinn, P. Sosta, S. Srinivas, D. Wills

1. Minutes - May 4, 2016

M/s/p unanimously to approve May 4, 2016 Academic Senate Meeting Minutes as written.

2. Information Items

a. Chair's Report

Chair Eskandari thanked the Academic Programs and General Education Committee for their work on semester conversion. In addition, the General Education Committee will be receiving summer stipends to continue their work on GE Courses over the summer. Chair Eskandari thanked Provost Alva for supporting the summer stipends for members of the GE Committee.

b. President's Report

No report given.

c. Provost's Report

Provost Alva recognizes that administration is behind schedule in discussing faculty lines and faculty recruitment for next year. Provost Alva stated that administration is working to get this resolved. President Coley is currently meeting with the Board of Trustees discussing the fiscal implications of the CFA salary agreement. President Coley needs to understand the impact to the budget before we can move forward on faculty recruitment.

Later this evening, Chair Eskandari, Vice Chair Shen, and a few others have the pleasure of meeting with President Emeritus Jolene Koester from CSU Northridge who has agreed to work on Cal Poly Pomona's Academic Master Planning Process. Tonight's informal meeting will start the discussion on how to organize ourselves and collect data so when the fall quarter starts this process is ready to launch with the full resources needed to start the Academic Master Planning Process. The goal is not to go through what the campus has been through in the past but is to think about the academic program as our currency

and define what the campus wants moving forward and how to achieve it. One senator brought up the Teacher Scholar Program and requested that the Provost briefly discuss the criteria which determine who is awarded the Teacher Scholar award. Specifically, is academic rank or program considered in the award? Provost Alva stated that she did not have the actual numbers with her, but she recognizes that there is a strong commitment in continuing the Teacher Scholar Program. Every college has its own criteria that it uses to determine who is worthy of the Teacher Scholar Awards so there is not a single set of criteria used; the committee review process varies from college to college. Academic Affairs receives the requests ranked within each college and recommendations on how to distribute the funds. Academic Affairs has the goal of distributing the funds across all the colleges looking proportionately how many eligible faculty there are in each of the colleges to ensure that wherever possible there is a broad representation across all the colleges.

A follow up question was asked regarding the amount of funds being awarded as compared to last year. The statement was made that there was a big drop in funding from last year. Provost Alva stated that there was a drop in funding but would not characterize it as big and referred the question to Dr. Srinivas, AVP for Academic Planning, Policy, & Faculty Affairs. Dr. Srinivas stated that in previous years \$1 million dollars was set aside for Teacher Scholars and the requests have been approximately \$600,000 to \$700,000. This year the budget was \$500,000, but the requests were greater than the amount to be awarded, therefore, not all requests were funded. Dr. Srinivas noted that the amount allocated to Teacher Scholars needed to be cut due to budget constraints and that the budget was determined at the beginning of the academic year, prior to any requests being made.

d. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Shen reported.



05.25.16 Report  
Status Summary\_1.p

The Vice Chair Report is also located on the Academic Senate website at [http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/05.25.16%20Report%20Status%20Summary\\_11.pdf](http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/05.25.16%20Report%20Status%20Summary_11.pdf)

**NEW REFERRALS: (8)**

AP-047-156	Nutrition, B.S.
AP-048-156	Nutrition, B.S. – Dietetics Option
AP-049-156	Nutrition, B.S. – Nutrition Science Option
AP-050-156	Communication Studies Minor
AP-051-156	Public Relations Minor
AP-052-156	Chinese Minor
AP-053-156	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Minor
GE-120-156	PHY 1510L – Newtonian Mechanics Laboratory

**SENATE REPORTS FORWARDED TO PRESIDENT: (19)**

AS-2497-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – Technology and Operations Management Option

AS-2498-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – E-Business Option  
 AS-2499-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – Marketing Management Option  
 AS-2500-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – Finance, Real Estate and Law Option  
 AS-2501-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – Accounting Option  
 AS-2502-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – International Business Option  
 AS-2503-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – Computer Information Systems Option  
 AS-2504-156-AP, Business Administration, B.S. – Management and Human Resources Option  
 AS-2505-156-AP, Art History Minor  
 AS-2506-156-AP, Studio Art Minor  
 AS-2507-156-AP, Writing Studies Minor  
 AS-2508-156-AP, MA in English – Literary Studies Option  
 AS-2509-156-AP, Discontinuation of Illumination Engineering Minor  
 AS-2510-156-AP, Discontinuation of Ocean Engineering Minor  
 AS-2511-156-AP, Human Resources Minor  
 AS-2512-156-AP, Management and Leadership Minor  
 AS-2513-156-AP, Computer Information Systems Minor  
 AS-2514-156-AP, Discontinuation of Total Quality Management Minor  
 AS-2515-156-GE, FST 325: Food Safety and Current Issues (GE Synthesis Area B5)

e. CSU Academic Senate

Senator Swartz presented.

Last week was the final plenary at the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach. The following new leadership team was elected at the May 20, 2016 meeting:

**Chair – Christine Miller, CSU Sacramento**

**Vice Chair – Catherine Nelson, Sonoma State University**

**Secretary – Robert Keith Collins, San Francisco State University**

**Member-at-Large – Thomas Krabacher, CSU Sacramento**

**Member-at-Large – Kevin Baaske, CSU Los Angeles**

*Steven Filling (CSU Stanislaus) will serve as **Immediate Past Chair**.*

In addition, Senator Speak was seated to the CSU Academic Senate.

f. Budget Report

No report given.

g. CFA Report

Professor Wills reported.



CFA-Senate  
2016525.pdf

The CFA Report is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/CFA->

[Senate%202016525.pdf](#).

The CSU Board of Trustees voted Tuesday, May 24, 2016, to approve the tentative agreement, which now becomes part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for 2014-2018. The revised articles are on the CFA homepage at <http://www.calfac.org/item/tentative-agreement-documents>.

It is very likely that the raises will not be seen in faculty paychecks until October 1, 2016.

The fiscal impact of the raises is that the campuses have been asked to contribute 1% of the total amount that the CSU is going to have to pay in order for faculty to receive the salary increases. It is understood that this is a hardship for the campuses and the CFA is hopeful this does not negatively impact the faculty in some other areas, such as reduced hiring of tenure line faculty or reduction of instructional support. The intent is to work together to avoid those types of situations.

There will be an “Un-Strike” party to celebrate the end of the academic year. Unfortunately, it is right in the middle of finals week due to the room constraints. The celebration will be June 8<sup>th</sup>, 5:00 to 7:00 p.m., at URSA Minor.

Everyone should have received an election ballot, if you have not, the election is <https://apps.cpp.edu/ballotbox/>. All elected positions do have a candidate, but there are no contested positions. Even though there are no contested positions on the ballot, please submit your votes.

Senator Speak recognized Professor Wills as she is stepping down from her position Pomona Chapter President. Senator Speak stated that Professor Wills has done a very good job at the task of trying to maintain civility during these difficult times (applause).

h. ASI Report

Senator Simjee reported.



Academic Senate  
5-25.pdf

The ASI Report is located on the Academic Senate website at <http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/Academic%20Senate%205-25.pdf>.

ASI has newly elected government for 2016-2017 which can be found on the ASI website.

There are two Semester Conversion Open Forums remaining; CLASS on May 26, 2016 and the College of Business on May 31, 2016.

i. Staff Report

No report given.

j. Semester Conversion Report

No report given.

k. GE Committee Report

Senator Ibrahim reported.



Directly-Converted  
GE Courses\_Senate\_

The GE Committee Report is located on the Academic Senate website at [http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/Directly-Converted%20GE%20Courses\\_Senate\\_Report\\_05.25.16.pdf](http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/Directly-Converted%20GE%20Courses_Senate_Report_05.25.16.pdf)

In total there are 348 GE Courses, 341 have been forwarded to the Academic Senate.

The GE Committee has 235 directly-converted courses, which do not have to come to the Academic Senate for approval, and are covered under the blanket referral GE-001-156.

New and Revisioned courses receive their own referrals and come to the Academic Senate for approval.

The GE Committee has been working on these courses since mid-February and has approved 93 courses; 73 of these courses are directly-converted and are considered catalog ready, the other 20 will need to come to the Academic Senate for approval.

l. Faculty Athletics Representative – David Horner

David Horner, Faculty Athletic Representative, reported.



Athletics  
Representative\_Sen:

The Faculty Athletic Report can be found on the Academic Senate website at [http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/Athletics%20Representative\\_Senate%20May2016.pdf](http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/Athletics%20Representative_Senate%20May2016.pdf).

The main focus is to monitor student athletes in the classroom. The GPAs of student athletes are monitored on a quarterly basis. According to NCAA regulations, student athletes must maintain a GPA of 2.0 or better. As a group, student athletes usually do better than the collective undergraduate population. For example, after the Fall 2015 quarter, the mean Cal Poly Pomona GPA across all student athletes was 3.05. By comparison, this was higher than the average GPA for all students at Cal Poly Pomona during the same quarter (which was 2.93). David Horner showed a presentation that compared the mean GPA per team to the GPA for the entire student body. There are only 3 instances where a team is performing under the mean Cal Poly Pomona GPA of the undergraduate student population.

The NCAA requires student-athletes to achieve both a yearly average of 12 units per quarter and a minimum of 8 units each quarter toward their chosen degree. The vast majority (95% - 100%) of the student athletes achieve these benchmarks each term.

The NCAA bylaw violations for Cal Poly Pomona were presented. A major violation is considered something intentional and is relatively rare. Secondary violations are relatively common and are inadvertent, providing only minimal advantage, with no significant extra benefit to student athletes. Cal Poly Pomona has had no major violations since 2010 and only one secondary violation in the 2015-2016 academic year. There was one major violation in the 2009-2010 academic year and although it was unfortunate, the violation did lead to some necessary changes.

Dr. Horner mentioned that there is always concern regarding classroom absences due to team travel. Students are asked to talk to their professors ahead of time and make up all missed work. Most faculty are supportive of class absences for travel purposes.

The athletic department appreciates priority registration for its student athletes.

### Consent Agenda

Chair Eskandari noted that there are first and second reading reports contained in the Consent Agenda. Adopting the consent agenda means receiving and filing all first reading reports and adopting all second reading reports. Per procedure, any senator can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda.

Senator Small moved to postpone the second reading of AP-015-156, MS in Agriculture, Option in Nutrition and Food Science, to the first Academic Senate meeting of the fall quarter (Fall 2016) due to some inaccuracies in the report.

M/s/p to delay AP-015-156 to the first Academic Senate meeting of the fall 2016 quarter. The motion passed unanimously.

- a. AP-014-156, MPA in Public Administration – **FIRST READING**
- b. AP-018-156, MA in Education – Education Multimedia Design Option – **FIRST READING**
- c. AP-020-156, Asian/Pacific Islander Studies Minor – **FIRST READING**
- d. AP-027-156, B.S. in Apparel Merchandising and Management – Textiles Option – **FIRST READING**
- e. AP-028-156, BA in English – Applied Language Studies Option – **FIRST READING**
- f. AP-031-156, Physics, B.S. – General Option – **FIRST READING**
- g. AP-032-156, Physics, B.S. – Biophysics Option – **FIRST READING**
- h. AP-033-156, Physics, B.S. – Integrated Science Option – **FIRST READING**
- i. AP-034-156, Physics, B.S. – Anthropology, B.S. – Archaeology Option – **FIRST READING**
- j. AP-035-156, Anthropology, B.S. – Applied Anthropology Option – **FIRST READING**
- k. AP-036-156, Bachelor of Music – **FIRST READING**
- l. AP-037-156, Landscape Architecture Minor – **FIRST READING**
- m. AP-038-156, BA in Criminology – **FIRST READING**
- n. AP-039-156, Supply Chain/Logistics Minor – **FIRST READING**
- o. AP-040-156, Urban and Regional Planning Minor – **FIRST READING**
- p. GE-006-156, Encountering Difference: Culture and Power (GE C1) – **FIRST READING**
- q. GE-007-156, PLS 1011 – Introduction to Political Science (GE Area E) – **FIRST READING**
- r. GE-012-156, UPR 1040 – The City in Context – History, Politics, Environment (GE D3) – **FIRST READING**
- s. GE-044-156, IGE 1200 – Authority and Faith: Late Ancient and Medieval Worlds (GE

- Areas A2/C3) – **FIRST READING**
- t. GE-046-156, SPN 1120 – Intro to the Spanish-Speaking World (GE Area C3) – **FIRST READING**
  - u. GE-047-156, URP 1040L – The City in Context – History, Politics, Environment Lab (GE Area D3) – **FIRST READING**
  - v. GE-063-156, HST 2201 – United States History to 1877 (GE Area D1) – **FIRST READING**
  - w. GE-064-156, EWS 1020 – Engaged Education: Integrating Knowledge, Learning and Success (GE Area E) – **FIRST READING**
  - x. GE-069-156, AST 1010 – Stars, Galaxies, and the Universe (GE Area B1) – **FIRST READING**
  - y. GE-077-156, GSC 1510L – Earth, Time and Life Laboratory (Ge Area B3) – **FIRST READING**
  - z. GE-078-156, VCD 1330A – Foundations in Ceramics (Ge Area C1) – **FIRST READING**
  - aa. GE-080-156, FRL 1001 – Personal Money Management (GE Area E) – **FIRST READING**
  - bb. GE-082-156, LS 1020 – Integrating Knowledge, Learning, and Engagement for Success (GE Area E) – **FIRST READING**
  - cc. GE-090-156, AG 2480 – Focus on the Future: Leadership Skills for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (GE Area E) – **FIRST READING**
  - dd. GE-110-156, GEO 1010 – Physical Geography (GE Area B1) – **FIRST READING**
  
  - ee. AP-010-156, Minor in Non-Profit Management – **SECOND READING**
  - ff. AP-024-156, Minor in Nutrition – **SECOND READING**
  - gg. AP-025-156, Apparel Merchandising & Management – Apparel Production Management Option – **SECOND READING**
  - hh. AP-026-156, Apparel Merchandising & Management – Fashion Retailing Option – **SECOND READING**
  - ii. AP-029-156, BA in English – English Education Option – **SECOND READING**
  - jj. AP-030-156, BA in English – Literary Studies Option – **SECOND READING**

M/s/p to adopt the consent agenda – the vote was unanimous.

3. Academic Senate Committee Reports – Time Certain 3:45 p.m.

- a. AA-005-156, Attendance in Classes by Non-Enrolled Students – FIRST READING

Senator Nelson presented the report.



AA-005-156\_Report  
\_First\_Reading\_05.2!

Report AA-005-156, Attendance in Classes by Non-Enrolled Students, is located on the Academic Senate website at

[http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/AA-005-156\\_Report\\_First\\_Reading\\_05.25.16.pdf](http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/AA-005-156_Report_First_Reading_05.25.16.pdf)

M/s to receive and file AA-005-156, Attendance in Classes by Non-Enrolled Students.

This referral is intended to address the conditions in which non-enrolled persons may

attend classes. The committee decided that there should be restrictions to prevent disruptions in the classroom but there are a number of legitimate reasons that people may want to visit classes. The policy explicitly states a number of categories of individuals that the policy shall not apply to, e.g., classroom aides providing aid to students utilizing the services of Disability Resource Center (DRC), junior faculty, etc.

Senator Kopplin had a concern regarding non-student, non-staff individuals who may need to attend classes. In performing arts, it is sometimes necessary, even advisable, to have people in our ensembles who volunteer more than two times during the term. In the past we have had a liability waiver for this type of situation and this should be included in the policy. Senator Nelson requested that Senator Kopplin forward the proposed language and the Academic Programs Committee will consider the language.

b. FA-003-156, Revision and Updating of the Current Policy for Granting Emeritus Status – SECOND READING

Senator Sancho-Madriz presented the report.



FA-003-156\_Report\_  
Second\_Reading\_wi

Report FA-003-156, Revision and Updating of the Current Policy for Granting Emeritus Status is located on the Academic Senate website at:

[http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/FA-003-156\\_Report\\_Second\\_Reading\\_with\\_Policy.pdf](http://www.cpp.edu/~senate/documents/packets/2015-16/05.25.16/Documents/FA-003-156_Report_Second_Reading_with_Policy.pdf).

After the first reading, the committee received some additional input to the report which has been included in the second reading.

M/s to adopt FA-003-156, Revision and Updating of the Current Policy for Granting Emeritus Status.

Previously, the language in the policy was not consistent regarding coaches and librarians, so now the policy is inclusive of all unit 3 personnel; instructional faculty, librarian faculty, counselors, and coaches. There is a separate paragraph for coaches since they are in a different organization and there is no department chair for coaches.

Additional language was included to clarify that “the resolution is sent by the Department Chair or designee, acknowledging the department/unit vote” for recommendation to the President to confer the corresponding emeritus title. This language was added to make it clear who has the responsibility of forwarding the resolution for recommendation for emeritus status.

Chair Eskandari had a concern regarding the proposed language for abstentions and provided the following comment to the Faculty Affairs Committee: “As a rule of thumb, it is better to stay within the normal guidelines established and accepted by Robert’s Rules. According to Robert’s Rules, abstentions are not counted. When blank ballots are submitted, they are treated as equivalent to abstentions (i.e., they are not counted). Robert’s refers to a vote as an action of a “deliberative assembly” and, therefore, the recommendation to count abstentions as “yes” votes is at odds with this notion. At best, abstentions express deliberate neutrality toward a position, and at worst, they express



a lack of interest in the issue.” This was discussed after Senator Sancho-Madriz went over the policy (See Discussion).

In order for a coach to receive emeritus status, a resolution shall be forwarded from the Athletics Director or designee.

The committee added a minimum requirement of at least 5 years (the usual requirement proposed by the report is 10 years of service), which may be considered in instances of exceptional contribution to the University. In this case written justification for exceptional contribution must accompany the resolution.

Currently the policy does not have an appeal process therefore this policy has added an appeals process. The wording has been changed from the first reading to state that “the appeal shall consist of a written request, including a draft of a proposed emeritus resolution.” In that case, the Faculty Affairs Committee will meet with the eligible retiree and representatives of the department. If the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends awarding emeritus status, it will forward the resolution to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. If the committee does not recommend awarding emeritus status, the retiree may appeal the decision, in writing, to the University President who makes the final decision.

Another recommendation from Chair Eskandari is to add the wording “upon receipt of retirement status notification from Human Resources” to the beginning of the second paragraph. In addition, the following sentence should be added to the end of the paragraph to accommodate posthumous resolutions: “Emeritus status may be requested posthumously by the department of the deceased faculty.” Senator Sancho-Madriz consulted with the other members of the committee present at the Academic Senate meeting and they agreed these changes should be incorporated.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The outstanding recommendation to the policy is to not have abstentions counted as “yes” votes. The proposed policy currently reads – “Abstentions will be counted as “yes” votes.” The committee felt that when someone is about to retire, there should be clear opposition from the department in order to deny the emeritus award. There is another policy, Vote of No Confidence in a Dean, in the university that states that abstentions are counted as yes votes, but there is no consistency across policies. Robert’s Rules of Order states that “to ‘abstain’ means not to vote at all...” According to Senator Sancho-Madriz, the Academic Senate does not always follow Robert’s Rules of Order and that the committee’s concern was that opposition to an emeritus recommendation should be a clear “no” vote.

Chair Eskandari stated that Robert’s Rules are very clear on abstentions as a “deliberate expression of one’s neutrality” towards an issue and counting an abstention or a blank ballot as a “yes” vote is clearly altering the expression of that individual.

The following amendment was proposed: “Those with a minimum of ten years of University service at the time of retirement shall be awarded emeritus status when a resolution approved by a majority vote, by secret ballot, of the tenured and probationary faculty...”

By including the words “by secret ballot” anybody who is motivated enough to deny emeritus status should be able to make it to the meeting and vote appropriately. A secret ballot would be that abstentions are not counted.

M/s to change the policy wording to “Those with a minimum of ten years of University service at the time of retirement shall be awarded emeritus status when a resolution approved by a majority vote, by secret ballot, of the tenured and probationary faculty....”

It was brought up that if the amendment is not made that it would have to be made very clear that an abstention is a “yes” vote when the vote occurs. Senator Sancho-Madriz reiterated the committee’s intention was to make sure that there was clear opposition to the awarding of emeritus privileges via a “no” vote and that is why they recommended abstentions be counted as a “yes” vote.

Senator Guyse stated that the reason that abstentions are considered “yes” in the policy for the Vote of No Confidence in a Dean was to accommodate for faculty members who were not present at the vote. If people were not present at the meeting where the vote occurred the simple rule of majority could be biased by the people who were present. The count was very specific and the abstentions as “yes” votes accommodated for faculty who were not available to vote due to sabbatical or other reasons.

Senator Kopplin stated that abstentions should not be counted as “yes” or “no” votes and that as the policy is written now it is not consistent with Robert’s Rules of Order.

Senator Swartz spoke in favor of the proposed amendment. The reason secret ballots are used is to discourage abstention and peer pressure to vote in a certain way. Senator Swartz believes that in a secret ballot very few people would actually abstain.

M/s/p the proposed amendment with one “no” vote.

M/s/p to approve FA-003-156, Revision and Updating of the Current Policy for Granting Emeritus Status as amended. The vote was unanimous.

4. New Business

5. Old Business

6. Discussion

a. DRC – Paula Sosta and Tracee Passeggi

Paula Sosta, Disability Program Specialist, and Tracee Passeggi, Director, Disability Resource Center, presented. Kevin Colaner, Associate Vice President for Student Services was present.



Academic Senate  
Presentation May16

Anytime you talk about disability services, at the core you are talking about access. The Disability Resource Center’s (DRC) role in the process is to verify a student’s eligibility for

services. The DRC meets with a student to determine what accommodations are necessary to remove any barriers of access that may exist based on the documentation that they are required to provide that details the functional limitations of their disability. Some of the typical accommodations are extended testing time, the use of sign language interpreter, any adjustment or modification that would remove that barrier to access.

One thing that is a big trend across the nation in all of disability services is the increasing numbers which translates into an increase in required services. A snapshot at Cal Poly Pomona shows that there are 791 students registered with the DRC; that is a 125% increase since 2008. The most common accommodation in the DRC is testing; on average the DRC works with 590 unique faculty to provide testing and accommodations for students during the academic year.

The most growth has been in autism; eight (8) years ago the autism number was 1% and now it is up to 8%. Based on the applications that the DRC has today, it is safe to say that this number will go up, especially since CPP is a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) institution. One of the challenges in working in disability services is that the population of hearing disabilities is only 3% but on average will use 35-55% of the budget, which makes it challenging to provide services for the other 97% of the student population.

There is a shared responsibility to ensure that qualified students are provided access to the educational opportunities that the campus offers. This responsibility extends into the classroom. There is a lot of misinformation out there and faculty are not always confident or certain of what their rights and responsibilities are in this process or providing accommodations. The faculty role is to provide the learning environment that is accessible to all qualified students which means the following:

- The way in which information is communicated, both in and out of the classroom
- The way you measure or test the student's mastery of the material
- The physical environment must be accessible

When there are barriers, that is when accommodations come into play. As soon as notification is received from the DRC that a student is approved for use of accommodations, the faculty has the responsibility to provide accommodations and maintain the student's disability status as confidential because that is protected under FERPA.

Just because a student has a disability does not mean that you forego your rights as a faculty member. You need to hold students to the same academic standards that you have deemed essential to the course. Use of an accommodation should never compromise the integrity of a course. If at any time a faculty member thinks that an accommodation would compromise course integrity, they should contact the DRC to start the dialog on what alternatives exist.

The DRC goal is to foster a good working relationship with the faculty. The DRC has identified some items that would improve access and the relationship with the faculty.

- Evening testing hours – currently DRC testing hours are 8:30 am to 4:30 pm. If there is a final at 6:00 pm, a student would have to take the test earlier or on another day which causes an undue burden on the faculty. Currently exploring offering evening testing hours which will help faculty but also supports the legal

rights of the student. Every student has the fundamental right to take the test at the same time as the class. Working forward to offering evening testing hours next academic year.

- Student behavioral issues in the classroom – with the increase in autism diagnoses, the DRC needs to work better at providing support to faculty who are dealing with behavioral issues in the classroom. When students come in with autism the DRC will implement a different questionnaire to start the interactive process with the student and the faculty members sooner so that these students are not being sent to Student Conduct and Integrity but instead that we are working from the beginning to help these students succeed.

The DRC is making improvements in the office to help the success rate of students with disabilities. The DRC has implemented the following improvements:

- Converted a conference room into a testing center so now during finals week all testing is done in the DRC
- Installed security cameras in the smaller testing spaces and the testing center so students are monitored during exams
- Realigned job descriptions to better serve the students
- Looking into possibility of hiring additional staff

One concern was brought up regarding the appropriate steps a faculty members should take if the student's family contacts them directly requesting more resources be provided. Tracee Passeggi stated that the faculty member should refer the family member to the DRC.

Senator Sohn inquired about the type of testing that is performed to determine if a student is eligible for accommodations. Paula Sosta replied that it is dependent upon the disability. There are a series of tests that can be administered. No testing is performed in the DRC. The DRC will provide a "referred out" list and financial aid for testing is available if they qualify. Students bring their documentation to the DRC for eligibility.

There was an inquiry about if there are any commonly accepted warning signs to suggest that a student should consult with the DRC. Tracee Passeggi suggested that faculty should be very general when discussing disabilities with a student. The faculty member can just make the comment that the DRC and its resources are available. Certainly do not make any specific diagnoses or suggestions.

b. Senator Nelson – Student Work Retention Discussion



AA-004-156-discussion.pdf

The Academic Affairs Committee received AA-004-156, Student Work Retention Policy and in considering the problems associated with retention of student work, it was recognized that there are competing issues that Senator Nelson would like to discuss with the entire Senate body for feedback.

The proposed text is as follows: "Student work refers to examinations and other materials, including materials in electronic form, which contribute to the student's final grade in a course and/or to the fulfillment of the requirements for a degree, program, or certification

offered by the University.

Students have the right to examine their work even if instructors choose to retain it rather than return it. It is the student's responsibility to request to examine their work within one academic term after a grade is assigned for the related courses(s). For the purposes of this policy, summer is not considered an academic term. If a faculty member is not teaching, the academic term in question is the term in which the faculty member returns. If a student does not request to examine their work within that time, the faculty has no further obligation to produce said work for student review.

Student work pertaining to a grade appeal or other request for inspection or review that is not completed within one academic term as defined above must be retained until the appeal process is completed.”

The issue is the student has the right to review any work that the instructor does not return to them and the intent of this policy is to allow that. In keeping with the policy that a grade appeal must be completed within the next quarter, this policy is written that faculty must retain the student work for one academic term after a grade is assigned. The original referral recommended one calendar year, however, with some discussion it is clear that this would put an extreme burden on faculty and the department due to storage constraints so the committee compromised with the current proposed text of one academic term.

Senator Prichard-Schmitzberger stated that the College of Environmental Design is impacted by retention of work due to large models that would need to be stored. There is no mention of resources in this policy so the assumption is that the department would have to supplement this policy with their own policy. There is also concern regarding retention of student work electronically; how is the backup of this electronic work addressed? Senator Nelson stated that this policy mainly addresses paper and physical projects but electronic backup should be addressed by the university.

The current proposed text is extremely open about what we retain but it does not address the “how”. The College of Environmental Design has large models that would need to be retained and there is just not the space to do that. Senator Prichard-Schmitzberger requested that the committee consult with university resources to deal with the “how” when it comes to retaining student work.

Provost Alva stated that it is a wise idea to look at the policy statements in regards to retention of work. One worry is that the Provost has often seen instructors put a box of students work outside their office for review. Students have a right to confidentiality and that should be included in this policy.

Senator Shih stated that the College of Engineering has a problem that some of the projects have hazardous materials (metal, electronics, etc.) that require technicians to disassemble.

Senator Alex responded that when students in Chemistry do a project that they are responsible for clearing all hazardous waste and wondered why they don't use the same methodology in Engineering.

Terri Gomez, Interim AVP of Student Success, proposed with grade appeals language on the second paragraph where it talks about “if a faculty member is not teaching...” to include “that if the instructor is on leave, or sabbatical, or is not currently on the faculty, including FERP, at the time of the appeal, the university shall attempt to contact the

instructor on behalf of the student.” This would align with the grade appeal language.

Senator Speak noted that the policy may need a statement about the university providing for an adequate means of safe, confidential, and sustainable disposal of material. There is a need for a statement that the university has to provide and publicize the mechanism for the safe, confidential, and sustainable disposal of work retained.

Senator El Naga made the clarifying statement that this policy is for student material that an instructor elects to retain. The instructor could also elect to return the materials back to the student then these problems do not exist.

Dan Lewis, Interim AVP for Academic Quality and Assessment, added that the committee was hoping not create restrictive language that would potentially create problems in one college as we tried to address problems in another college. That is why this is a fairly open policy. He reminded the body that the issue being addressed by the policy is student work and the access to that work. Confidentiality does belong in this policy but archiving methods should be addressed in another policy. The committee was mainly trying to address the length of time for retention.

Senator Small stated that he understands all the concerns but looking at this policy from a different angle, this policy seems to carve out a “safe harbor” for retention of work. If after one quarter the work has not been requested, the instructor is free to dispose of the work in the appropriate manner.

Senator Shih voiced the concern that many projects are team projects and that it is not a good idea for one team member to take the project home. Need to reserve the right of one team member to challenge the grade and this cannot be done if one team member took the project. Somehow the project needs to be retained and preserved in its original form.

Senator Salem suggested that the language be revised to state that the “basis of the grade” will be retained. If this type of language is used maybe the original work does not need to be retained.

Senator Nelson thanked the body for their input.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.