

Senate Executive Committee
March 9, 2017
3:00 – 5:00pm, Academic Affairs Conference room

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 2/23/17 – Approved. Chair Report. President Report in Executive Session. Seawolf Commitment presentation. Revision to Faculty Consultation in Decision Making policy and proposal to rescind Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matter policy approved for Senate Agenda. Faculty Office Hours and Availability policy revision for second reading – approved for Senate agenda. Recommendations from the Academic Advising Subcommittee – referred to EPC. Green Music Center Tickets for Senate. Senate agenda approved. APARC Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Associated Students Report. Good of the Order.

Present: Ben Ford, Carmen Works, Richard J. Senghas, Tom Targett, Sam Brannen, Catherine Nelson, Jennifer Mahdavi, Laura Watt, Steven Winter, Ron Lopez, Michael Visser, Bill Kidder for Judy Sakaki, Michael Young, Laura Lupei for Stan Nosek, Karen Moranski for Jeri Echeverria, Elaine Newman

Guests: Rachel McCloskey, Tramaine Austin-Dillon

Chair Report – B. Ford

B. Ford noted that interim Provost asked him to let the members know that she is keeping track of the agendas and minutes and will make sure any thoughts or issues she has is communicated. With the appointment of the new Provost, J. Echeverria was looking at how to use her limited days left to best effect.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 2/23/17 – Approved.

Chair Report continued – B. Ford

B. Ford said the ASCSU received a response about the campuses responses to the Quantitative Reasoning task force report. The CSU response to the ASCSU closely mirrors campus responses. Concern was expressed about equity issues and the fourth year math requirement. A revision to EO1100 was promised which would affect the GE requirement for quantitative reasoning. B. Ford was curious to hear from members how the discussions about faculty involvement in Commencement were progressing. **He asked if anyone had objections to him writing a welcome letter to Lisa Vollendorf, the newly appointed Provost, and ask if she wants to be on any distribution lists. No objection.** It was noted that fireworks were set up for three days after her start date. B. Ford noted that the Fee Advisory Committee has been restructured. Now the Chair of the Faculty or designee would be on the committee instead of the Chair of the Faculty and Chair of SAC. They decided to create a subcommittee to review IRA funding requests. Fee Advisory Committee has

broader responsibilities than just IRA funds. The subcommittee would have three faculty and four students. S&F is talking about how to appoint faculty to the IRA committee. A member asked why the SAC Chair was taken off the committee. B. Kidder said that they did consult with the Associated Students for this change. He would look into the reason. The member said that had been a large job for the Chair of SAC. The Chair asked M. Young to communicate to the IRA subcommittee the importance of the Chair of SAC being involved.

President Report – B. Kidder for J. Sakaki

B. Kidder requested an executive session.

There was no objection to entering executive session.

Executive session ended. Time Certain reached.

Seawolf Commitment – T. Austin-Dillon

B. Ford introduced T. Austin-Dillon from Residential Life. T. Austin-Dillon said he has been at SSU for five years. He worked in Sauvignon Village and also taught in University Studies. He was an advocate for the Seawolf Commitment. He passed around cards with the commitment. He noted the four main words in the commitment – Integrity, Respect, Excellence and Responsibility. The words came from students in 2014 after a bias incident on campus and subsequent meeting regarding the incident where many stories were told about bias incidents, micro-aggressions and hate speech due to people looking different or believing differently. The students really wanted to understand what it means to be a Seawolf and they spent many months working on the commitment. He said he and Mo Phillips were speaking to many groups and committees to help them be aware of the commitment. He was not asking the Executive Committee to do anything. He just wanted them to be aware of it and see how they might incorporate it into daily life. In Student Affairs, they are starting to use it as part of their mission and values. He said he had just come from a meeting about putting on a Black summit to discuss Black issues on campus and this was the first time something like this was happening. He was impressed that such an action could derive from the commitment. B. Ford noted that the Associated Student Senate had endorsed it and that the President was using it in her communications. He wanted the Ex Com to discuss how faculty governance could help the commitment be more a part of the campus culture. A member offered how she would use it in her teaching. A member asked if the commitment was an “honor code.” M. Young noted that at a previous institution they had a similar code and after a few years it really started to sink in. They had it everywhere on that campus. A member suggested that the Senate formally endorse the commitment. A member suggested that the commitment be part of the university catalog and be placed immediately after the President’s introduction to show this is what we stand for as well as on the main SSU webpage. He agreed to ask the Senate to endorse it and perhaps add it to the Course Outline policy instead of the link to the cheating and plagiarism policy to let students know this is what we expect from you. A member suggested it be brought up at Convocation, perhaps a large PPT slide behind the speakers. Additionally, it should be part of the Academic Strategic plan. A member asked about the Seawolf Commitment Recognition Committee. T.

Austin-Dillon said they were accepting nominations for students who exemplify an aspect of the commitment. Students will be recognized with their name on LoboVision and a seawolf water bottle. K. Moranski suggested taking one of the commitment themes each year and focus student units on it, promote what it means and in calculated it into campus programs. **It was agreed that C. Nelson would write the resolution for the Senate to endorse the commitment.** B. Ford summarized that the commitment should be seen as holding ourselves to a higher standard. T. Austin-Dillon said the response was more than he hoped for and he was very appreciative. He offered to help in any way and looked forward to continuing collaboration.

Questions for B. Kidder

B. Ford asked about the status of administrative searches. B. Kidder said he did not have an update on the Advancement search. The Executive Director of the GMC search was down to the finalists. They had made efforts to set the salary to be market driven rather than exceeding the market as in the past. A member voiced concern about the campus DREAM center being a target in the current national climate. B. Kidder said he thought Homeland Security coming to campus and targeting the DREAM center was very unlikely and agreed that if that did happen it would be catastrophic.

Revision to Faculty Consultation in Decision Making policy – M. Visser

M. Visser noted changes to the revision based comments at the Ex Com last time. This item was linked to the request to rescind the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy. **Both items were approved for the Senate meeting on March 23rd.**

Faculty Office Hours and Availability policy revision for second reading – B. Ford

B. Ford noted that document included suggestions given at the first reading at the Senate. The revision for the second reading attempts to address those suggestions. The title was changed to instructional faculty. A minimum cap was created of three hours. It excludes individual instruction from the WTU calculation. There was discussion.

Motion to remove academic from the first sentence: In order to provide students with access to faculty for additional academic help, . . . Second.

Proposer amended motion - In order to provide students with access to faculty, for additional academic help, faculty members with teaching assignments shall . . . Second. No objection.

Motion to remove sentence: WTUs for individual instruction with students—e.g., independent study—shall not be included in the calculation of the minimum requirement. Second. Approved.

Motion to add to sentence: alternative mode for such availability, when appropriate to meet student and *curricular* needs. . . (the Chair asked for approval of changes, but this motion was not formally approved.)

Approved for Senate agenda.

Recommendations from the Academic Advising Subcommittee

B. Ford noted this memo went to various people and it was brought to the Ex Com to talk about which committees might consider the recommendations. K. Moranski said the GIG group endorsed the recommendations and gave considerable feedback on implementation. M. Visser said he would take some of the recommendations and feedback to APARC for their priorities discussions. M. Young said he met with AAS and was left with a question about item 7:

7. The following policies should be clearly outlined, posted and distributed:

- (a) EO1100 / ASA-2016-08. Include an local interpretation for A1 and year-long courses. For example: Which GE areas have grade minimums? In what term are those grade minimums in effect? Can this information be included in the ARR?
- (b) The policy on the remedial portion of current and future year-long Math courses and ENGL 100A/B. For example: How is the remedial piece met? What is the grade minimum? How is the GE piece met? What is the grade minimum? Can this information be included in the ARR?
- (c) The repeat policy for year-long courses. For example: Can MUS 160A/B be repeated with one course or two? If one, is it the A3 or the C3? How does the policy change when a student fails MUS 160A? What if they pass MUS 160A, but fail 160B, or don't earn the minimum grade (see .7 above)? Is the policy different for NAMS 160A/B because of Ethnic Studies? What about SCI 120A/B because of three areas and the lab requirement?

Who would these recommendation go to? M. Visser said this was why it was brought to the Ex Com to understand where particularly 7b and c would be discussed. The GE subcommittee and EPC were suggested. M. Young asked for guidance about how to deal with this kind of issue going forward and suggested a first stop when there is a question about an academic regulation. A member suggested that curricular questions would go to EPC first. There was discussion about specifics of the #7 recommendation. B. Ford said **item 7 was referred to EPC**. The other items seemed to belong in the Academic Advising subcommittee.

Green Music Center Tickets for Senate

B. Ford noted the document in the Dropbox about Weill Hall Performances. He said the GMC was agreeable to offer some tickets to shows and B. Ford thought there could be a Senate night at the GMC with a potluck beforehand. A member noted that she wanted to see more emphasis on other campus speakers and events at the Senate rather than so much on the GMC. A member discussed the programming at the GMC and its lack of relevance to students. A member suggested May 5 for the event proposed. B. Ford said if members were interested he would pursue the idea

with S. Nosek. He also thought it was good idea to have more communication about other events on campus as well. It was clarified that members could email Alicia Hodenfield for individual tickets to GMC events. B. Ford was glad to see the Rush program back.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Ben Ford

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items:

Business:

1. From APARC: Faculty Consultation in Decision Making revision – First Reading – M. Visser
2. From APARC: Recommendation to rescind Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters – First Reading – M. Visser
3. Faculty Office Hours and Availability policy – Second Reading – B. Ford

APARC Report – M. Visser

M. Visser said APARC was still soliciting feedback on the revision to the Program Review policy. He wanted all feedback before March 21. He said he was working with CFA President Newman on developing a proposal for confronting salary inversion, compression, and equity. He would play a background role and would bring the framework through governance to make sure people were comfortable with it. He said it was a formula that confronts shortages relative to a 50th percentile benchmark and includes a factor for addressing compression. The principle was that everyone would have an equal claim against whatever money was allocated in an equity program. The details could be worked out in advance, so that when any money becomes available it would be known how to allocate it. This had been successful at other universities and keeps a positive relationship with the administration.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report – M. Young

M. Young said the incident that was discussed at the last Senate meeting was investigated by the Student Conduct officer and nothing was found to indicate that it was hate speech.

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson reported that at the CSU Board of Trustees meeting in March there would be an item to require a C- for the “golden four” for all transfers students. She would delve into that more at the next Statewide Senate meeting. Also, regarding the revision to EO 1100, there was some movement for the Senate GE Task Force and Chancellor’s General Education Committee to get in sync with each other on how to implement the revision. A member asked about the grade requirement for B4 since that had been going back and forth between C and C-. She said she would find out about that next week.

Vice Chair Report – C. Works

C. Works said S&F found some inconsistencies between the Constitution and By-Laws regarding At-Large members to the Senate.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – L. Lupei for S. Nosek

L. Lupei said S. Nosek had not been able to attend due to the demands of search committees he was chairing. A member thanked L. Lupei for the quick action on bringing a guest speaker to campus and helping with travel costs. He wondered how well known this was. L. Lupei said it was a policy in place. She would follow up with Contracts and Procurement to communicate the policy better.

Associated Students Report – R. McCloskey

R. McCloskey said the AS had passed a resolution for more support for the HUB and heard that a ½ position would be added to the Hub. The AS was also looking at new programs such as a farmer’s market, a school supply swap shop, a safety ambassadors, legal services, multi service turf field, and a student mobile app. Next week they would discuss two resolutions - one on the Biology research requirement and one on food and housing insecurity. A member asked about the student mobile app. R. McCloskey said they were asking students what their needs are and one of the biggest things they have heard is that the SSU website is not mobile friendly. She said they know a new website is being created, but in the meantime this app would be a place for students to get information quickly. A member asked about the resolution for the biology course. R. McCloskey provided the background of trying to bring a pilot course back.

Good of the Order

A member asked if the DRUPAL migration was delayed. K. Moranski said she thought the main SSU page was supposed to be migrated during Spring break. There had been some test failures they needed to work out.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes