

Senate Executive Committee
October 30, 2014
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 10/16 – Approved. Chair Report. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Question for Vice President of Administration and Finance. EPC Report. FSAC Report. University Studies Curriculum Committee proposal discussed. Revision to the Lecturers in Departmental Governance policy – approved for Senate agenda. CFA Report. Associated Students Report. Honorary Degree Committee membership. Graduation Initiative presentation at the Senate approved for Senate agenda. 2015 Faculty Retreat discussion. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Richard J. Senghas, Maria Hess, Catherine Nelson, Melinda Milligan, Richard Whitkus, Laura Watt, Sam Brannen, Ruben Armiñana, Andrew Rogerson, Elaine Newman

Absent: Terry Lease, Margaret Purser, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Matthew Lopez-Phillips

Guest: Christian George

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 10/16 – Approved.

Chair Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that the Senate Chairs listserve had been very active around the use of clickers for voting and the use of secret ballots. Clearly, there was some interesting tensions around voting processes at sister campuses. He was asked if our Senate wanted to use clickers, but he thought unless anyone initiated that, our Senate was doing fine. He reported that the Honorary Degree Committee met and that's why that was a business item. In the Senate Budget Subcommittee, they followed up with the meeting they had with L. Furukawa-Schlereth and others from A&F. In that conversation, they heard reasons why Monterey Bay was not necessarily a comparable institution to SSU and the role particular categories might play in whether another campus compared or not. He found it a useful and open conversation. He had just come from the Non-Profit Conference and reported that it was very full. He had a sense that it was successful, but it was not over yet. He thanked the President for helping faculty and students to attend.

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson said he also supported faculty that wanted to go to the Non-Profit conference. The Chair thanked him as well and noted the help of the Provost's assistant. A member asked whether Faculty Affairs was considering subscribing to

websites that specialize in academic job postings targeted at gaining a more diverse faculty. She noted there was a question about who should pay for it and she was hearing that the Schools would have to pay for it. The Provost asked how much money was needed. The member said it was \$4000 for one year for one site that would allow any department on campus to post a job. The Provost said perhaps one could be subscribed to that could be shared across campus. He would look into it. The Chair noted that ACT would be taking all the feedback for the Strategic Plan and coming up with the final draft of the plan.

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson reported on the work of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Statewide Senate. They were working on two resolutions. One was about the Academic Sustainability Plan and the specific performance indicators in that plan. They were going to ask for a system wide task force to work with the Legislature about the indicators to make them more about academic quality than degree production. The second resolution regarded the criteria for bachelor's degrees in the Community Colleges to be evaluated similar to the CSU. There were questions about whether a community college in another part of the state could offer a degree similar to one in San Diego that is not offered in any other CSU. They had been tasked with coming up with this criteria and she welcomed any input.

Vice Chair Report – given by R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that S&F was discussing how much S&F wanted to be involved in calls for faculty to serve on university and search committees. This fed into the discussions of the Recruitment and the Representation on Search Committees Policy. They were working on putting all replacement language in one area in the by-laws. They also discussed the membership of the Honorary Degree Committee.

Question for Vice President of Administration and Finance

A member reported that the women's bathrooms on the second and third stories of Stevenson were leaking water.

EPC Report – M. Milligan

M. Milligan said the EPC would be reviewing curricular proposals from ENSP and SOC. They had six more in the pipeline. They would continue the second reading of ES 210 as a permanent GE course in A3. Controversy had arisen about this course being in A3 and she provided background on this issue. She noted that since it was a single course, it stopped at EPC, so if it failed, they could start over or it had been suggested they could bring it to the Ex Com for the Senate agenda. This last suggestion seemed unlikely. The larger issue had to do with needing to reduce the number of units in the major which was coming from the system and then potentially being told by their campus they can't do it the way they want. It was clarified that the GE Subcommittee had approved it. M. Milligan said that the letters from the Curriculum Committees of S&T and A&H were supportive, but the letter from A&H had serious reservations. When it came before EPC as a consent item, it was pulled off to be a business item. C. Nelson noted that the same thing was

coming up on campus after campus; whether Engineering courses could be included in critical thinking. M. Milligan noted that at SSU there were many other classes in A3 that were not Philosophy. She noted that GE decided to have a moratorium on any new A3 classes for now, so they could look into this issue. A member noted that a math course had just been approved in A3 and they had met with Philosophy and observed their classes before they started teaching theirs. Had Engineering done that? M. Milligan said Engineering had responded to questions raised by A&H and have offered to have the course team taught as well, but there was so much engineering content in the course, that EPC members were finding that aspect difficult. A member, who also sat on EPC, stated that her issue was that in terms of the learning objectives of GE area A - what if a course meets the objectives of a sub-area of A, but not the larger objectives of area A. A member suggested that from a process perspective, this course was following the process and wondered if it was appropriate to stall it based on larger questions the campus was unsure of. M. Milligan said that another perspective in EPC was that the GE committee had not sufficiently assessed that course. There was a discussion about how the feedback process had gone between EPC and Engineering. There was some discussion about curricular forms and routing in SEIE.

FSAC Report – R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus reported that FSAC started working on the RTP timeline and realized all the questions that were coming up around this. They would be bringing larger questions to the broader campus. They also discussed the feedback from URTF about sabbatical applications.

University Studies Curriculum Committee proposal – M. Milligan

M. Milligan passed out copies of the proposal. M. Milligan said this was a proposal from EPC to create a University Studies Curriculum Committee. She provided history of this item. She said the main motivation was that the University Studies courses had not been getting the appropriate oversight, particularly at the beginning stages of curricular development. She noted that having University Studies overseen by an administrator now, pointed out that there was no faculty oversight of University Studies curriculum. She said that the campus did not have a curriculum committee policy currently. EPC may take that up in the Spring, but this proposal was coming forward now. A member noted that the language did not include that the committee would review new curriculum. There was discussion about specific issues related to University Studies and curriculum committees in general and their membership. The Chair voiced concern about creating another committee in general. M. Milligan discussed how often the committee would meet. She said this proposal had come from many years of discussion and they really thought this was really needed. She said she would take the issues raised back to EPC. She asked if the Senate would eventually approve this. There was discussion about this idea and procedurally how would this work. There was interest in how curriculum committees were originally formed.

Revision to the Lecturers in Departmental Governance policy – R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus noted that this was brought to Ex Com and had been sent back to FSAC with major concerns. He brought those to FSAC for discussion. The three main concerns he heard from the Ex Com were: how do departments determine a voting formula, when they did, would that be over seen or vetted by FSAC, and how could they not open the door to grievances in the future. He said FSAC thought departments should be able to determine what processes they wanted to do in their departments. He reminded the Ex Com that departments did not have to do voting, there were other forms of decision making. So, if there were no formal process for decision making, then it would preclude oversight of FSAC. They also did not want more workload on FSAC or any other committee. In terms of grievances, they thought grievances were actually good and could point out problems that needed to be fixed. As long as departments did not exclude lecturers, they would not be the subjects of a grievance since it was a university policy.. There was some discussion. **Approved for the Senate agenda.**

CFA Report – E. Newman

E. Newman reported that there was a tentative agreement and CFA was recommending a yes vote on the tentative agreement for the first year. She noted that the bargaining team's goal was to put money in people's pockets. She described what would happen if the tentative agreement was not approved or delayed. She said the agreement really addressed the lowest paid faculty in year one. She thought more money could be available in years 2 and 3. She encourage everyone to vote starting November 1. Voting was online. She noted that there was some new language in the workload article that had a small amount of money for faculty who do exceptional service. She passed out that portion of the tentative agreement. It asked faculty governance to create a structure on each campus to determine how that money would be given out to faculty who were suffering from excessive service requirements. She thought it was a bit early since the agreement was not ratified, but it would need to be thought about. The Chair thought that since it seemed reasonably likely that the agreement would be ratified and if they didn't start talking about it now, there wouldn't be help in the Spring. He thought it should be referred to FSAC. There was some discussion. **It was approved to refer to FSAC.**

Associated Students Report – C. George

C. George reported that the AS passed a resolution urging the Rohnert Park City Council to resist the expansion of the Wal-Mart Super Center. It was presented to the City Council two days ago. They had a large number of applications for alternative Spring Break. Nate Johnson came to their meeting and talked about the Non-Motorized Vehicle reform as he did at the Academic Senate. He said there was a lot of hesitation about the implementation of the policy from the Associated Students Senate. He noted there would be a vigil on Friday at the speaking circle, for one of our student's father who was a police officer, and killed by a drunk driver. He said Phi Delta Theta organized this.

Honorary Degree Committee membership – R. Senghas

R. Senghas described the reason for the honorary degree committee and had looked into the membership. It is required by the CSU that the President consult with the Executive Committee for the membership of this committee. He noted that some of the titles had changed in the original constitution of this committee in the past. He thought that another official document needed to be put forward with the new changes for the record. There was some discussion. **No objection.**

Graduation Initiative presentation at the Senate – R. Senghas

R. Senghas asked if the Ex Com thought some of this information should be brought before the Senate. He noted that the Provost had sent out information about the new dashboard too. He thought perhaps the Senate might need to have a reminder about what the Graduation Initiative was and be introduced to the dashboard and then hear about what the faculty needed to do in this regard. He asked if that should be two presentations or one to the Senate. There was some discussion. The Chair offered to invite the Co-Chairs of the campus Graduation Initiative to come to the Senate and present.

2015 Faculty Retreat

The Chair requested more ideas on what faculty wanted at the Retreat. He wondered if the larger GE questions could be discussed at the Retreat. A member suggested that topic would need to be very well directed. A member suggested that the Retreat “give” to the faculty or have more give than take. A member suggested something inspiring. A member fondly remembered a Retreat when faculty shared their research.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

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

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – 10/23 emailed

Special Visit: Mayor John Dell Osso of Cotati TC 3:15

Special Report: Graduation Initiative update

BUSINESS

1. Lecturer’s role in Departmental Governance –First Reading – R. Whitkus – attached

Approved.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes