

APARC Minutes

September 10, 2019

Attendees: Elias Lopez, Sean Place, Elita Vermini, Merith Weisman, Rheyna Laney, Emily Acosta-Lewis, Karen Moranksi, Emily Twisselmann, Puspa Amri, Christina Baker

Minutes: Puspa Amri

1. Introductions

2. Agenda approved (minor change to schedule: budget update from Laura Lupei and UPRS update from Laura Krier is postponed for the next APARC meeting); minutes approved.

REPORTS

3. Chair's report:

- President Sakaki will be reviewed this year and review committee members will be contacted.
- Excom:
 - The lecturer representative provided a report regarding conversion of lecturers to TT and the financial benefits that can come along with that process. The report will be presented at senate in the coming weeks.
 - A conversation was made about clarifying policy on FERP faculty members serving on RTP committees. Current rules state that RTP committee members must be full time.

4. AVP Moranski- Academic Affairs Update

- Six campuses of the CSU (including SSU) have received a grant from the Teagle foundation on curricular reform for faculty and student. The grant should help with curricular revisions for existing degree programs to increase student success. Examples include diversity training, service learning initiatives, streamlining a degree program, add/replacing concentration, related to assessment results of program review, and related to GE (conversion of units). There will be a call for proposal in the fall, for work to be conducted in spring 2020.
- A Teagle Fellow will be appointed to work with AVP Moranski to help run this program. Primarily focused on undergrad program, but will see how to make it more open to graduate programs.
- SSU is gearing up for another WASC accreditation. APARC is relevant here for program review. At some point we could do a report on where we are with program reviews. It is noted that the quality of program reviews have gone up.

5. Stevenson Task Force Update: Rheyna Laney informed us that the task force has not met yet.

6. ATISS report: none yet. No communication yet on a representative from ATISS .

7. UPRS report: postponed until next week.

BUSINESS

8. Classroom survey results

- Sean Place asked the committee for reactions and ideas on how to process the information and data. Potentially, groups that could be looking at this to make recommendations include

APARC/ATISS, classroom upgrade working group, and IT staff themselves. Where is the appropriate place for the results to sit?

- Rheyna Layney commented that it would be more fruitful to first hear from Facilities (and also IT) about what their constraints are, how they operate, what sort of protocol is used to go about with maintenance, before thinking about how to make recommendations. Knowing how IT and Facilities operate would be a useful preliminary to start making analysis of the data from the classroom survey. Emily Acosta-Lewis and Elita Virmani second this. Rheyna is curious about questions such as: how often are classrooms cleaned in the regular rotation? Does it differ between buildings? How often is a classroom deep-cleaned? What do they think ought to be done better? The same questions applied to common spaces like bathrooms.
- Sean Place stated that it is still useful to have a process to distill the Classroom Survey data, before beginning a conversation with IT and facilities. A similar note was made by Karen Moranski, since narrowing down the information from the survey into a list of priorities would be helpful to make a set of recommendations. For example, what are the systemic problems affecting faculty?
- An idea raised by many members would be to classify the results into “global comments” (e.g., cleanliness, which many know is an issue), and specific classroom comments.
- Elias Lopez confirms that IT has a database on the equipment and a protocol about what equipment gets looked at and how often the procedure is applied. What seems to still be needed is ATISS classroom status, such as: should we have a laptop in every classroom? What type of projector should we have? What is the ideal position of the projector? ATISS has been commissioned to create these standards. What is needed is a whole coordinating body looking at bigger funding to do all the renovations. With regards to the \$3 million funding for classroom renovations, this is for non-STEV and non-high-tech. APARC as the owner of the classroom survey can make recommendations to help allocate these funds effectively, according to the needs of faculty and students. Karen Moranksi pointed that we should have a list of our priorities and cross it with IT’s and facilities’ lists, if the priorities match.
- Elias also updated that the AVP for facilities has submitted a proposal. Questions are being asked on whether the current model should be revised. It is worthwhile to discuss issues such as: whether separate staff should be assigned to focus on classrooms and others on offices.
- Emily Twisselmann suggested it may be worthwhile to extend the survey to students. Elias Lopez and Sean Place will coordinate with Emily and Associated Students, to get their involvement to run the survey. Although we have plenty of information that can be processed already at this stage, students may see things that professors don’t see (sitting on uncomfortable chairs, for example) and may be willing to provide a lot of details. Emily feels that many will respond if context of the survey is given.
- Puspa Amri suggested that it might be worthwhile for APARC members to split up into smaller groups (2-3 people) to look at the big trends. Even a finding that this survey, meant to understand about classroom-specific needs, revealed more systematic problems such as cleanliness, furniture, and cleanliness of common areas is interesting information.
- Elita Virmani suggested to think of coding the qualitative comments. While we can generally tell that there are global/systematic problems, such as cleanliness, it is worthwhile to have some more data to support these general trends. Coding is important. can be done by Elias’s students. Possibly, smaller groups of faculty could come up with 10 key words on each of the 3 groups (cleanliness, IT/equipment, furniture/physical condition of classrooms).
- Christina Baker suggested to start with just a word analysis and Elias Lopez offered to start this with SPSS software. Sean Place then volunteered to take a first look at this word analysis to get

the conversation rolling. If such a survey will be administered in the future, it may be useful to ask respondents to pick 3 classrooms that you they have been in and then rate the conditions. We should have a drop-down menu for prioritizing 3 classrooms. Elita Virmani also suggested to enable a cross-tab of the data by classroom and by quality.

- The group converged on asking Elias Lopez and team to get the ball rolling with doing a word-analysis on the qualitative comments using SPSS. Then, Sean Place will start take a first crack of the data. After that we can discuss contacting AVP facilities to give presentation at APARC.

9. Course scheduling modules proposal:

Elias Lopez and Karen Moranski presented and distributed a draft. APARC members are asked to take a look at the draft and please be prepared to discuss this at the next meeting. One of the issues discussed was whether to keep the noon-hour free or to have certain days dedicated as no-class noon-hours. Input on p. 13, "will be paired" instead of "must be paired."