

Senate Executive Committee Minutes
January 26, 2017
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

Abstract

Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 12/8/16 – Approved. Chair Report. President Report. New Degree Proposal: Geography, Environment and Planning (GEP) – Approved for Senate consent calendar. Resolution for a Center for Faculty and Student Research and Activities – Approved for Senate agenda. Member for the Sustainability Executive Committee. University Faculty Office Hours policy – Approved for Senate agenda as discussion item. Revision to the ITDS minor, BA, BS, MA and MS – Approved for Senate agenda. Possible Resolution in response to silencing of science by present federal administration. Provost Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Senate agenda approved. Good of the Order.

Present: Ben Ford, Carmen Works, Richard J. Senghas, Tom Targett, Michael Visser, Laura Watt, Steven Winter, Ron Lopez, Sam Brannen, Jennifer Mahdavi, Judy Sakaki, Michael Young, Rachel McCloskey

Absent: Catherine Nelson

Guests: Bill Kidder, Deborah Roberts for Jeri Echeverria, Rheyna Laney, Caroline Christian, Melinda Milligan, Richard Whitkus Laura Lupei for Stan Nosek

Approval of Agenda – item added: Possible resolution in response to silencing of science by present federal administration. Faculty role in Commencement removed. – **Approved.**

Approval of Minutes of 12/8/16 – Approved.

Chair Report – B. Ford

B. Ford noted that he had placed his report in Dropbox. He reported that there had been a GMC Board meeting last week. The board had shrunk by about half since the change in leadership announced in the paper in December. The remaining board is very committed to "Aim High, Reach Wide, Educate All" original mission of the center. Quite a few potential board members were on the horizon, and he hoped that things were on their way to a good situation by the summer. The University continues to subsidize the presenting program significantly, and will, over time, have to balance the positives from that support against the many competing needs. Both the President and VPs has expressed interest in having that discussion. The Senate Chairs meeting in December included a meeting with a higher ed specialist at the CA Dept of Finance, who has been fairly active visiting CSU campuses. He's basically the governor's eyes and ears in the CSU. He had pessimistic things to say about the state budget. The governor in January released his starting-point budget for next year, which includes the previous commitment to restoring the CSU base

over time, but nothing more (far short of the BOT request). In particular, he didn't propose funding the \$75 million in ongoing funds for the graduation initiative. And there is language in there that seems to give tacit approval to the tuition increase that we opposed late last semester. There has been lots of progress recently on commencement planning as the cabinet stepped in and made some decisions, and the Provost took on the VP in charge role for commencement. MPP expectations are almost set and Andrea has laid out much of the logistics work. Schools have begun planning their ceremonies. The items intended to be provided in common are: live music (brass quintet: processional, hymn, recessional), grad lineup and security / alcohol check, processional, organizing the diploma walk across stage and it was likely that the President's role would be common across the ceremonies. The issue he removed from the agenda about the role of faculty at graduation sprung from a misunderstanding between the deans and himself. It was important to him to preserve a significant faculty role in all the ceremonies. At ACT on Tuesday, an agreement was reached that a faculty member, probably from the school, would play a significant role in the ceremony and the Deans will emcee. The particulars of that role could be worked out school-by-school, but the Chair said he didn't want faculty to be reduced to observers under his watch. Choosing the faculty representative to do the honors is something he proposed the department chairs in each school discuss. Options included an election on the Spring school ballot, inviting excellence in teaching award winners in schools that have winners that year, or selection based on University service. He said that co-emceeing commencement was pretty much the highlight of the year of the faculty chair position, and it is somewhat difficult to relinquish it. Perhaps the chair of the faculty could be the participating faculty member in their school. The Provost has initiated a series of physical moves to try to make related functions work better together. He thought this was mostly on the first floor of the library. He didn't think they're announced yet, but he had heard discussions happening publicly.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki welcomed everyone back and appreciated the support from B. Ford and the Executive Committee for the changes to the GMC Board. She offered to go in to Executive session to discuss any questions about that. She was very hopeful and noted that a variety of local people were interested to join the Board. She said they had done a good job “aiming high,” and now wanted to “reach wide.” The people on the Board now and those coming soon were very committed to this vision. At a recent concert, she was able to introduce Don Green and thank him publically for his support. She said they may have ambassadors to the Board for people who could not afford to be full Board members, but want to help out. She attended a meeting of COPLAC Presidents in San Francisco. She heard they almost voted SSU off due to lack of attending. They were very welcoming and she was engaged in the conversation. She noted that there were benefits to COPLAC membership that could be more fully explored. She provided an update on the re-accreditation process and thanked everyone for the terrific team effort. She was very pleased with the Provost candidates and noted that there would be open forums and they wanted feedback. On February 6th, they would start the AVP of Faculty Affairs search. She reported on the Legislative Day for campus Presidents. All the Presidents were introduced to the Legislature and they started discussions with representatives about the needs of the

CSU. The next week the Board of Trustees meeting would discuss the tuition change. She offered that if anyone had questions for her to please contact her. She said the Wolfs Den would be open February 3rd and that would be a big night and offered tickets to anyone who wanted to go. She encouraged the members to drop by the new Student Affairs offices on the third floor of the Student Center.

New Degree Proposal: Geography, Environment and Planning (GEP) – L. Watt, R. Laney, C. Christian

L. Watt introduced the item by saying this degree was following the merging of ENSP, Geography and Global Studies. R. Laney said the document was following the template from the Chancellor's office for new degrees. It was noted this was the BA degree in Geography and Environment with five concentrations. Coursework was similar at the lower level and then students could be more specialized in the upper division work. The faculty were trying to find synergies and give students more flexibility. A member asked if there was a transition period for the new degree. R. Laney said yes and that eventually, they would come forward with discontinuances of previous degrees when the new degrees were in place. She said there were no new courses, so all the courses needed would still be available. There was discussion. **It was approved for the Senate consent calendar with a short intro from L. Watt.**

Resolution for a Center for Faculty and Student Research and Activities – S. Winter

S. Winter said the resolution came from the Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs (FSSP). He explained the various functions on campus that support faculty and student research and creative activities. FSSP would like all those functions to be in one place with adequate staff. They also asked for a response by May 2017. The Chair asked if administrators had been part of those discussions. S. Winter said yes and they had not heard any objections. **It was approved for the Senate agenda.**

Member for the Sustainability Executive Committee

R. Senghas said he could not fill this position this semester and asked if anyone else could serve. No one volunteered.

University Faculty Office Hours policy – S. Winter

S. Winter said this was another attempt at a policy for office hours. It provided minimum standards for all faculty. It stated that every "full-time faculty member will schedule three office hours per-week. Office hours will be held over at least two days a week in at least half-hour blocks during normal university business hours. Part-time faculty members will schedule one office hour per-class per-week up to three hours (how to determine appropriate number of office hours based on assigned lecture & laboratory sections and timing of those hours should be discussed and agreed to with the department chair)." The policy designated how students will know faculty office hours and how to notify if faculty can't make office hours. It encouraged faculty to make appointments with students who cannot meet

their office hours and stated that office hours for completely online instruction would be worked out with the department chair. Highlights of the discussion: some thought the policy seemed over detailed, request for principles for the policy and simplification, suggestion to not write it so that departments could not override it, what would happen if a faculty member did not follow the policy, does the department chair really want to know if a faculty member cannot meet office hours, was the policy trying to make a statement or saying what should happen.

Time certain reached.

Revision to the ITDS minor, BA, BS, MA and MS – L. Watt, M. Milligan, R. Whitkus

M. Milligan introduced the item and said these changes have been in the works since 2014. They were working on how to make ITDS work better for students and faculty. She discussed the review process so far. The major change was to shift the focus from student initiated degrees to more of incubator for interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees from faculty. An example was the German Cultural Studies degree. She reviewed the rationale for this change. At the Graduate level, it was still a student driven process and students would now need to do a lot of leg work prior to being approved for pursuing a degree. Highlights of discussion: could faculty members propose a one-off degree, one-offs not seen as efficient, one faculty member could create wonderful programs, faculty could create a degree in response to students, would departments without graduate programs be able to participate in ITDS grad programs, such a department could not initiate a ITDS grad degree, GSS wanted to make sure a student is working through the graduate procedures with a graduate coordinator, question about whether BA or BS degree would be in a “special major” or another degree name, “ITDS” degrees or “special” majors have a hard time in the work world. There was discussion about whether the item should be on the consent calendar or a business item. **It was approved as a business item for the Senate.**

Return to Office Hours discussion

A member was questioning whether the language in the policy was actually policy. A member appreciated the policy and also thought policy should be separated from procedure. A member noted that the policy would be enforced through student grievances or grade appeals. He also argued for a simpler policy that delineated principles and had less procedure. A member suggested that the policy be simple and the procedures could be suggested guidelines for implementation. S. Winter said the campus already has a policy that all faculty should hold three office hours per week. He said the committee had based this policy on the format of the course outline policy and was encouraging departments to create their own policies based on department needs. A member asked what would happen if there was a rogue department that didn't want to do office hours, then if there was a grievance there would be nothing to point to without a policy. B. Kidder asked for shared understanding of whether a particularly obstinate faculty member would fall under faculty discipline. A member observed that the policy seemed to be about working with students in courses and it needed to be clear whether the three hours were for “advising” or meeting with students from courses. The CFA rep noted that the

faculty are instructed by the contract to provide advising and that language was not specific. She noted that a policy could not be used in a disciplinary process. A member noted that the policy did not specify that that office hours needed to be held on campus. A member said he understood that students want faculty to be present in their offices at designated times and to be able to get back at them if they don't.

Pause in discussion.

Possible Resolution in response to silencing of science by present federal administration – R. Senghas

R. Senghas asked if there were any volunteers to help write this type of resolution due to the silencing of the EPA and others issues. A member voiced concern about undocumented students. SAC was asked to draft such a resolution. The Chair said he would send the idea to AFS and ask them to draft a resolution on the silencing of science topic.

Return to Office Hours discussion

A member suggested sending the policy back to FSAC for simplification. The FSAC Chair said they had brought three versions now and he really didn't have anywhere to go. A member suggested bringing the versions to the Senate and let the Senate discuss it. A member asked if this was a solution in search of problem. D. Roberts said faculty usually did not get reports about faculty that are not doing what they are supposed to be doing. A member asked for numbers and D. Roberts said she did not keep score, but said it was few dozen. FASC did think they were addressing a problem and giving new faculty a clear understanding of what was expected seemed desirable. A member stressed the value of this for department chairs. **It was decided to provide to the Senate the three versions of the policy and the overviews of the policies in the CSU for a 15 minute discussion clearly explaining that there is a real problem that needs to be addressed. No objection.**

Provost Report – D. Roberts for Jeri Echeverria

D. Roberts reported Academic Affairs was working very diligently on the WASC process. Candidate visits for the Provost search would happen the week of February 16th. There would be many opportunities for the Ex Com to meet the candidates. Plans for the Investiture were going forward and she asked for proposals for the mini conference. She said more information about the Graduation Initiative for 2025 would be coming out soon. They planned to get the Quantitative Reasoning Report

out on time. 🙄 Regalia had been purchased for commencement. The search for a permanent AVP of Faculty Affairs would commence on February 6th. The Provost met with ERFA and found they have a very active chapter and would give them a home in Faculty Affairs. A member asked why ERFA needed a home. D. Roberts said this was to help them engage more fully with the campus in many ways. A member asked how the campus could keep working on the graduation initiative, if the resources were not provided.

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

L. Lupei said the Governor did exactly what he said he would do which was to give \$157 million to the CSU, not the requested \$340 million. She noted there was no budget shortfall, just a reduction in the projected revenue. She said the Chancellor was working hard with the Legislature to be on a priority list for a portion the actual amount of projected revenue. The Board of Trustees would discuss a tuition increase this month and vote on it in March. If the increase was enacted, it would bring \$77 million to the CSU. Campus visits of candidates for the VP of Advancement would be publicized soon.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report – M. Young

M. Young said the transfer of programs back to Student Affairs was mostly complete. He discussed the leadership team. They had physically moved to the Student Center. They had hired a conduct officer which was greatly needed. They had had an all division meeting where they shared values and started the work of changing the culture of the division. He said the Veterans issue had not been addressed yet, but he hoped to do that in the larger effort to create a culture of caring. A member suggested that the new organization chart be shared with the Senate. She also asked if Athletics had moved to Student Affairs. M. Young said, no not yet. There was some talk that might make sense in the future. A member asked if there would be a Dean of Undergraduate in Student Affairs. M. Young said that when the Residential Life admin retires, they would put that and other duties into a Dean of Students to provide more overall coordination of student services. A member asked if there would be a presentation to the Senate about the reorg in Student Affairs. The Chair said he would schedule that.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Ben Ford

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items: New Degree Proposal: Geography, Environment and Planning (GEP) – emailed

Business:

1. By-laws change: Creation of subcommittees – Second Reading – C. Works – attached
2. Revision to Existing Program: ITDS (Minor, BA, BS, MA, MS) – First Reading – L. Watt, M. Milligan, R. Whitkus, L. McCabe - attached – TC 3:30

3. Resolution to create a Center for Faculty and Student Research & Creative Activities – First Reading - S. Winter – attached
4. University Faculty Office Hours Policy – Discussion – S. Winter - attached

Approved.

Good of the Order

The CFA rep said students would be holding a rally about the tuition increase on February 1 at 11:00am, Stevenson Quad, which would coincide with the Board of Trustees meeting. She encouraged faculty to send students. M. Visser said he had put his report in the Dropbox and noted the program review policy was coming through and they wanted substantial consultation. The north bay community engagement fair was happening Sunday at the Fair grounds. L. Watt said one of the first things coming to EPC was the internship policy revision. B. Kidder said on Sunday there would be an event in the GMC supporting our undocumented students - Jose Antonio Vargas in conversation with one of our faculty members.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes