

Senate Executive Committee
December 10, 2015
3:00 - 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 11/19/15 – Approved. Chair Report. Revision to Music Concentrations approved for the Senate’s consent calendar. Associated Students Report. Revision to Business Administration minor approved for the Senate’s consent calendar. President Report. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Revision to Early Childhood Studies Major approved for the Senate’s consent calendar. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Feedback on Faculty Retreat. Revised Academic Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee Charge approved as business item for the Senate. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. EPC Report. FSAC Report. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Richard J. Senghas, Carmen Works, Tom Targett, Ed Beebout, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Suzanne Rivoire, Andrew Rogerson, Sam Brannen, Laura Watt, Deborah Roberts, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Absent: Ron Lopez

Guests: Kate Chavez, Brian Wilson, Karen Thompson, Chiara Bacigalupa, Johanna Filp-Hanke, Richard Whitkus

Approval of Agenda – Approved

Approval of Minutes of 11/19/15 – Approved.

Chair Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that a request for proposals for Academic Integration grants would be out next week. The deadline for applications would be February 13th. They hoped to have the grants ready in time for faculty to be able to schedule their work for fall 16. Next week, he would be attending the GMC Board Meeting and the Vice Chair would be chairing the Senate. He reported on the Council of Senate Chairs and said they talked about a number of issues. He had sent a report to the Senate last week. He noted that the packet this time was very thick and that the Senate budget was getting thin. He wanted to shift over to electronic agendas to help out, but did not want to shift copy costs to departments. If members did not have laptops or tablets to bring to the meeting, he asked members to let the Senate office know. A member asked about the conversation at the Council of Senate Chairs about upper division GE transfer and what they had learned. R. Senghas said that was being worked out at a system level, and what the Chairs talked about was the misunderstanding of those outside of the CSU about how upper division GE varies so much between CSUs, and contributes to the distinctiveness of the campuses. They did talk about the variety of organizations of campus governance structures.

Revision to Music Concentrations – L. Watt, B. Wilson

L. Watt introduced the item and noted that it had been approved at all levels. The Music department was revising three of their concentrations. B. Wilson described the changes to jazz studies, applied and music education. The changes had to do with private lessons, change of name of applied to performance, requirement for diction for vocal students, chamber music for instrumentalists, and significant revisions to the music education concentration. A member noted that it seemed that students needed to start this program in their freshman year to graduate in four years. B. Wilson said it is a very vertical major and they work with individual students to help them plan. The member also questioned the change to private lessons providing more money to instructors as .25 for ½ an hour would be .50 for an hour, but it was stated that private hour lessons would be paid at the rate of .33. A member questioned why the time doubled for students but the unit load did not change. L. Watt said it had to do with the CS code used and this revision was making the CS code more accurate. A member asked for the department learning outcomes and assessments. **Approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

Associated Students Report – K. Chavez

K. Chavez reported that the AS would vote on the Dream Center resolution, a Mental Health Services resolution, a response to social media, and a parking resolution next week. When they returned, they would have a task force about advising. They were working on having the library open 24 hours on all three floors. A member said he heard that some students were concerned that the money for the Dream Center would take money away from other student programs and that they would only be given a “closet”. K. Chavez said that people wanted to make sure the Center was adequately funded and did not take anything away from other programs. M. Lopez-Phillips said there was office space for the Center, not a closet. A member asked about the response to social media. K. Chavez said that there were inappropriate postings on social media and they wanted to let students know not to disparage the university. A member asked if there were other such sites for other universities. K. Chavez said she thought so. A member asked about the parking resolution. K. Chavez said they were asking that reserved parking for students overnight be less expensive.

Revision to Business Administration minor – L. Watt, K. Thompson

L. Watt introduced the item and noted that it had been approved at all levels. They were bringing their minor in line with the major in terms of minimum GPA requirements and streamlining advising. There was some discussion. **Approved for the consent calendar.**

President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana reported on the CSU background checks policy and noted that a media source had reported that it was suspended. This was inaccurate. The policy was in place and only looked at crimes of 7 year or more. There was a huge sigh of relief. A member asked about the cost of the background checks to the system. L. Furukawa-Schlereth thought it might run about \$7000 for the whole system. It was noted that it

depended on how many people were hired and how it affected students. The President reported that one person had been denied employment based on not reporting that he had been convicted of sexual misconduct. The Chair noted that EVP Lamb reported that in some cases the policy was used to determine when certain kinds of checks were not needed as well.

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson said he wanted to conduct a search for the AVP of Undergraduate Programs and asked for three faculty to serve on the search committee. The request was referred to Structure and Functions. A member asked if the title of the position was actually Dean. The President said when he came to SSU, there were quite a number of Deans and he thought that diluted the term and it became just used for the Schools, so this position would not carry a dean title.

Statewide Senator Report – D. Roberts

D. Roberts reported on the Statewide Academic Affairs committee meeting and the background check policy had been raised. They would be talking to Chancellor's office staff about the logistics of the policy. They were still trying to get more information about the faculty member at Fullerton who refused to use a designated textbook. They were trying to determine if they should have a response. They were revisiting RSCA funding. She said they would be bringing forward a resolution to include lecturers in orientations. A member asked about the student health insurance issue. D. Roberts said that they were putting together a task force, but she did not have any information yet.

Vice Chair Report – C. Works

C. Works reported that most of S&F's work was about the APAB charge. The Chair said that the Council of Senate Chairs has asked about whether campuses had policies about faculty serving on administrative committees. He wanted S&F to craft a policy to clarify practice at SSU.

Revision to Early Childhood Studies Major – L. Watt, C. Bacigalupa, Johanna Filp-Hanke

L. Watt introduced the item and noted it had been approved at all levels. Two new concentrations were being proposed and some revisions were proposed for the Majors. C. Bacigalupa said that many of the changes were brought about from student input and interest as well as requirements of the accrediting body. There was some discussion. **Approved for the consent calendar.**

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – L. Furukawa-Schlereth

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported on changes to the faculty computer refresh program. He said they were aware of faculty who needed equipment beyond what was offered by the campus. He described the current process and noted that Schools were asked to pick up the difference in equipment costs, if needed. In this conversation, they also found out that many employees were requesting large

screens for disability related concerns and J. Wenrick was talking to DSS about this. J. Wenrick wanted to discuss with FSAC the current recommendations for equipment and see if those needed to be updated. He noted that he had allocated funds for general purpose classrooms for tech upgrades, but they had become aware that there are other teaching spaces that are not general purpose and would also need to be updated. J. Wenrick had asked the Deans to do an inventory of those spaces to understand the technological needs. A member clarified that the campus would give \$1000 credit for equipment and the School or the faculty member could augment that. They would still need the Department Chair and Dean approval. A member noted that faculty may need a desktop and a laptop. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he heard that Fullerton was giving each faculty member an iPad and he would explore that cost. A member asked about theft insurance for iPads. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said they may fall below the deductible, but replacement could come out of the fund for risk management. He would look into it.

Feedback on Faculty Retreat

The Chair asked the members to review three ideas for the organization of the Retreat. M. Lopez-Philips said he could offer his workshop during the School year, if needed. The members preferred the discussions in the morning and the workshops in the afternoon. A member suggested the new President of the Alumni Association could be on the morning panel. The Chair said an alumni had already been identified and that the new President was welcome to attend, if desired. A member said that she was hearing that junior faculty wanted a workshop on skills to handle mental health issues seen in students. M. Lopez-Phillips said his workshop idea would encompass those issues as well as others. The Chair noted that faculty were hearing contradictory messages about whether to walk students over to CAPS and asked that the discussion include when that was appropriate. A member wanted to know if faculty could know if students had been served by CAPS. Privacy issues were a concern about that topic. The Chair asked R. Whitkus if he had any input to the Retreat discussions. R. Whitkus said as long as the graduate students captured information about the discussions, he was glad to see these discussions start at the Retreat. A member offered to talk to a colleague about doing a workshop on assessment. The Chair praised the conviviality of the Retreat.

Revised Academic Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee Charge – R. Senghas

R. Senghas noted that this document reflected the changes suggested by the Ex Com and further revision by S&F. C. Works noted that assessment had been added back into the charge. The committee would offer priorities for budget and planning issues. They did not have a budget. She noted that even though it was a long charge, it seemed important to give specific direction to the new committee. It was suggested to include language about the committee ability to create subcommittees. L. Watt noted that EPC would discuss where the University Program Review subcommittee might live once this committee was constituted. The Chair noted that there was some time issue, so that Schools could elect members in the Spring. A member suggested that the committee be named Academic Planning, Budget and Assessment Committee (APBAC). There was a suggestion to change “Gathers data to inform planning regarding academic programs and seeks to gain an overview of

university programs.” A member suggested “to google” the acronym first and asked if a rep from the School of SEIE could be a member on the committee. A member suggested that all the Standing Committees also include a member of SEIE. The Chair argued that it seemed appropriate for this new committee, but for the others, that could be a separate issue. **It was approved as business item for the Senate agenda.**

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

M. Lopez-Phillips said Student Affairs leaders were grappling with the issues regarding violence on campuses and student demands they were seeing across the US. They wanted to put together more trauma informed training. They talked about travel shots and international travel. They also talked about student health insurance and how that interacts with the Affordable Care Act. A member asked whether there was consensus about student demands. M. Lopez-Phillips said that there were different demands at different campuses and described the issue at Sac State concerning Native Americans. He noted that at Cal Poly when the students demands were made public, they received death threats, so it was a fast moving and complicated issue.

EPC Report – L. Watt

L. Watt reported on the curricular items coming forward at their last meeting. She reported on meeting with the University Program Review Subcommittee, who were having quorum and membership issues. She hoped that when the new Standing committee was convened, it may help UPRS. They were also re-working forms. She also attended the GE subcommittee and they discussed the pathways model of GE. **The Chair asked the Ex Com to refer to EPC to task UPRS with clarifying the program review policy and URPS charge. No objection.**

FSAC Report – E. Beebout

E. Beebout reported that at the last Senate meeting the RTP changes received a lot of good discussion and enough suggestions were made to warrant FSAC discussing those further before bringing the policy to the Senate for a first reading. FSAC heard reports from M. Barnard about clarifying the concept of volunteers working with faculty. She was also looking at revising the graduate application form and process. Many campuses had already moved to electronic forms, as SSU probably would and they were discussing whether faculty needed to sign those forms. A member applauded FSAC for bringing the RTP changes to the Senate before hand. A member argued that faculty needed to sign off on graduate applications. E. Beebout asked if a faculty signature guaranteed all requirements had been met and that FSAC thought it was time for students take responsibility for that. A member noted that the Department Chair also signs the grad forms and argued that the workload issues about that needed to be discussed. E. Beebout noted that 14 campuses only required the student’s signature. It was suggested that the ARR was pretty accurate now and students could tell how they were doing. A member argued that assessment information could also be gleaned by graduate applications. E. Beebout wanted to bring this issue for a discussion at the Senate.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

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

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items: Revision to Music concentrations, Revision to Business

Administration minor, Revision to Major in Early Childhood Studies - emailed

Special Guest: Assembly Member Bill Dodd TC 3:30

BUSINESS

1. Proposal for new Standing Committee – Academic Planning, Budget, and Assessment Committee – First Reading – attached – C. Works

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes