

Senate Executive Committee Minutes
September 24, 2015
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference room

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 9/10/15 – Approved. Chair Report. Questions for the President. Provost Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Classroom upgrade group follow up. EPC Report. FSAC Report. CFA Report. Check in for EPC with projects referred by Executive Committee: Online/Hybrid Course Policy; APC-EPC task force on Schedule 25; Academic Certificate policy. Ad Hoc Committee for WASC – not approved. Faculty Retreat Topic discussion. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Carmen Works, Deborah Roberts, Tom Targett, Michaela Grobbel, Andrew Rogerson, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Sam Brannen, Ed Beebout, Ruben Armiñana, Laura Watt, Richard J. Senghas

Absent: Ron Lopez, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Guests: Kate Chavez, Jason Wenrick for L. Furukawa-Schlereth

The Vice Chair presided as the Chair was not able to attend until 4:00.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Minutes of 9/10/15 – Approved.

Chair Report – C. Works for R. Senghas

C. Works reported that S&F recommended Richard Campbell and Scott Severson to the Campus Planning Committee, and Merlin Hanauer for the Copeland Creek committee. One more faculty member for the Copeland Creek was still needed. She briefly discussed the request for an Ad Hoc WASC committee. She said a WASC Steering Committee had been convened and they would start the re-accreditation process. Since APC was on hiatus, there was no faculty governance input into the process currently.

President Report – R. Armiñana

No report. A member asked about the President's statement at the Dreamer's conference regarding the possibility of creating a Dream Center at SSU. The President said he had asked the Vice President of Student Affairs to consider the possibility of a Dream Center in the HUB. A member asked about the Wang Family awards and what the process of nomination would be. The President said to send nominations to Melinda Barnard, if desired. She would coordinate that. There had been a suggested nomination of a faculty member who had already been previously nominated, and noted this was typical in the award process. A member asked about the award. The President said the award was established for a faculty member and

for an administrator. The categories were broad fields such as Science or Social Science. The award is \$10,000. It is a CSU wide award and five awards are given.

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson said he would send out an email about the Academic Affairs reorganization soon. A member asked what the provost had thought about the Faculty Conversation with Chair and Provost regarding faculty input to the new President search. The Provost said it was a good conversation. It was very well attended. He thought some of the comments were very specific such as wanting to hire more faculty, but they did get a general sense of what was wanted. This would feed into the prospectus that the search firm would develop about desired characteristics or qualities of the new President. *(recording stopped for unknown reason)*.

Statewide Senator Report – D. Roberts

D. Roberts said that they would meet again on October 9th.

Vice Chair Report – C. Works

C. Works reported that the position for the Director of Faculty Center had been posted. She hoped someone would be in place by the end of the semester. She noted that the campus had been able to purchase a site license for ShowMe, a white board app. (<http://www.showme.com/>). She said that anyone interested in creating micro lectures on the ipad or tablet might check this out, it was very easy to use in her opinion. It could also integrate with Moodle. She asked members to “spread the word”.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report – M. Lopez-Phillips

M. Lopez-Phillips said his organization was looking for a new Victim’s Advocate and they wanted faculty members on the search committee. C. Works requested that he send an email that she could share with S&F. A member wanted to know what the unique needs of undocumented students would be and what services would be offered in the Dream Center. M. Lopez-Phillips said the Dream Center would assess what were the particular needs of undocumented students and provide a central place for students to access resources and get help with processes. A member asked if all students would have access to this. M. Lopez-Phillips said that the resources would be specific to the needs of undocumented students and not applicable to others. A member suggested providing help for applying to graduate school. A member suggested looking at this holistically and looking at health care, access to food, housing, legal services, etc. A member asked how many undocumented students were at SSU currently. M. Lopez-Phillips said he knew of 68 students, but that was a self reported number. There was discussion about graduate opportunities that included paid positions that presented problems for undocumented students. A member noted that some programs also require background checks.

Classroom upgrade group follow up – D. Roberts

D. Roberts said that the classroom upgrade group had not met since the Senate meeting. They would be visiting Zinfandel Hall to look at the classrooms being built. The Zinfandel classrooms would be available Fall of 2016. C. Works said she had talked to IT about the availability of laptops for faculty use in classrooms. She said laptops were only available for the rooms that had been upgraded with the computer projectors. J. Wenrick said they did not have many laptops to check out, so they were limiting it for now. There was discussion about computer use by faculty and the refresh program.

EPC Report – L. Watt

L. Watt reported that Biology would be bringing a concentration in Zoology forward. They would be talking to the Chair of UPRS at their next meeting. She noted that curricular changes which needed to show in the catalog were due to EPC by December. Chairs would be advised to start the process by early November. A member asked about how UPRS would “close the loop” with programs for WASC. L. Watt said that she did not know that at this time. She said EPC was happy to receive feedback on this topic. The Provost said it was a little strange that this university did not have a meeting with programs for that purpose. He said he does see the program reviews, but thought the “closing the loop” process could be improved.

FSAC Report – E. Beebout

E. Beebout said they would be working with the new revisions to the RTP policy.

CFA Report – C. Works

C. Works said that CFA was planning events prior to the strike vote. They were ramping up for striking later this year. Information had been given to all faculty in their campus mailboxes. A member asked if the financial report that CFA was sponsoring would be available for faculty who could not attend. C. Works said she was talking to R. Senghas about having the report at the Senate. It was also suggested to have the report online.

Check in for EPC with projects referred by Executive Committee – L. Watt

L. Watt said that EPC has eight working groups currently dealing with policy and other issues. She noticed that three of the policy groups were working on policies that had been referred by the Executive Committee. She wanted to check back with the Ex Com to find out if EPC should continue to work on these and if so, what they expected as an outcome.

Online/Hybrid Course Policy

This policy had been brought up at the first Ex Com meeting in 2014 by A. Steckel who had concerns about the implementation of it. (see *Ex Com minutes of 8/21/14*). L. Watt reviewed the concerns: mode of delivery, using accessible design, listing online

courses, workshops for teaching online, office hours for faculty teaching online, and WASC substantive change requirements. She said Ex Com had asked EPC to work with A. Steckel on this policy, but her schedule never allowed EPC to start that conversation. A member asked if the current policy was developed by EPC. L. Watt said that it had been developed by APC. A member who had worked on the policy in APC offered that it took APC two years to work through the policy. She said she could speak to all the concerns. She noted the mode of delivery was on the REF list. She said some things that were written down were, to her, common courtesy. The discussions about the mode of delivery for a course should happen in the departments ahead of time. They couldn't force faculty to attend workshops about how to teach online, so that was a suggestion. She said that faculty could not change the mode of delivery at the last minute, so they clearly defined the modes of delivery and the procedures for changing a class mode. Even if the department wanted to offer another section in a different mode, that still needed to be approved by EPC according to the policy. L. Watt noted that the EPC form for curricular changes does not include mode of delivery currently and perhaps that needed to change. There was more discussion about whether faculty knew of the policy and other implementation issues. There was a suggestion that an email be sent out to all faculty clarifying that the mode of courses require approval at EPC. **Motion that EPC not review the policy further. Second. Approved.**

APC-EPC task force on Schedule 25

L. Watt said this task force had been implemented when Schedule 25 was being rolled out quickly. D. Goss had been tasked with working with APC and EPC regarding implementation. D. Goss had met with EPC's working group and one of his concerns was about computer lab space. He was uncomfortable making the decision about who should get that space, if there was high demand. L. Watt thought many of the concerns brought up originally were not a problem now. Members raised a few concerns still outstanding, such as classrooms being scheduled even before Schedule 25 runs. The Provost noted that some faculty set their class limits high and then reduce them. He would talk to the Dean's about this issue. L. Watt thought there were curricular issues involved in this, but didn't think they needed a task force. **Motion that EPC no longer have a task force for Schedule 25. Second. Approved.**

Academic Certificate policy

L. Watt said that EPC was charged with crafting a policy on academic certificates. Then that was downgraded to just assembling materials that would inform a policy. Since EPC had several discontinuances last year, so they could not get to this. She asked if EPC should still assemble materials. **Motion that EPC create a policy about academic certificates. Second.** A member noted that APC had put forward a policy about SEIE curriculum and included a definition of academic certificates. She thought that could be used as a starting place or perhaps EPC would just like to enhance that policy. L. Watt described the issues that arose in EPC about academic certificates. She said the range of certificates they had seen was very large and they thought that there need to be clearer criteria for academic certificates. It was clarified

that there needed to be a policy for academic certificates that were offered stateside, not through SEIE. **Vote – Approved.**

Ad Hoc Committee for WASC – R. Senghas

R. Senghas said that typically APC would have been brought in to the WASC process at this point in time, but since it was on hiatus he thought that an Ad Hoc committee could take on this role until APC could be convened or an analog found. He passed around a charge and the by-law language for creating Ad Hoc committees was included in the packet. He was concerned that faculty governance have a voice on the WASC process. The Provost noted that there was a WASC Steering Committee and there would be an “action committee.” There was considerable discussion. **Motion to approved the Ad Hoc committee. Second.** There was more discussion about how faculty governance would be part of the WASC process and concerns were raised about creating another committee. **Vote on motion – Failed. Motion to designate faculty members from the WASC Steering and Action committees to act as liaisons, providing two way communication, to the Executive Committee and the Senate. Second.** R. Senghas argued against himself as a liaison. **Motion to amend – liaisons would, at least, report at every other meeting. Second. Vote – Approved.** R. Senghas proposed that the faculty on the WASC committees be appointed by S&F, the normal faculty governance process. **Motion to amend – send the names of the faculty on the WASC committees to S&F and then to Ex Com as nominations. Second.** Final decision: **Designate faculty members from the WASC Steering and Action committees to act as liaisons, providing two way communication, to the Executive Committee and the Senate. They would report at every other meeting, at least. The names of the faculty on both committees be sent to S&F as nominations for serving. Vote – Approved.**

Faculty Retreat Topic – R. Senghas

R. Senghas asked for suggestions about the topic for this years Faculty Retreat. He wanted to know what had worked well and what didn't. He thought it would be good to have a discussion about communicating to the next President about faculty priorities. He thought the theme of pedagogy would be good. Suggestions from members: new and existing tools on campus that faculty could be come aware of that would enhance faculty work; strategies for managing the Presidential transition; do more of what happened last year in terms of format. The Chair asked if members wanted the retreat to continue in more of an in-service mode or retain some of the big picture, strategic thinking work. A member said she would rather see workshops during the time when faculty were being paid. A member suggested doing a longer day and having a more retreat type feeling. By then it would be good to talk about WASC, university learning outcomes, the strategic plan, etc. The Chair asked to members to keep sending in ideas.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Richard J. Senghas

Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items:

Information Items: End of year report for SDS – emailed

BUSINESS

No business.

Approved.

(This Senate meeting was cancelled on Monday, September 28th.)

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes