

Senate Executive Committee Minutes

April 28, 2017

9:00am – 11:00am, Darwin 101

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes 3/30 and 4/13 – Approved. Chair Report. President Report. Revision to the Single Subject Credential Program – approved for Senate consent calendar. Revision to the Global Studies major and minor – approved for Senate consent calendar. Statewide Senator Report. Off site location for Business degree completion at College Marin referred to all Standing Committees. Revision to the Student Grievance policy approved for the Senate agenda. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Ben Ford, Carmen Works, Richard J. Senghas, Catherine Nelson, Michael Visser, Laura Watt, Jennifer Mahdavi, Judy Sakaki, Stan Nosek, Michael Young, Bill Kidder

Absent: Tom Targett, Steven Winter, Ron Lopez, Sam Brannen, Jeri Echeverria, Elaine Newman

Guests: Rob Eyler, Karen Thompson, Gregory Milton, Jason Lau, Karen Moranski, Kelly Estrada, Rheyne Laney

Approval of Agenda – Approved

Approval of Minutes 3/30 and 4/13 – Approved

Chair Report – B. Ford

B. Ford said he had nothing new to report since yesterday. He did want to talk about interest in doing something like the investiture mini conference on a yearly basis. He thought it could be a big conference that would be an entire day to highlight the work of faculty and students. A member said he liked the showcase nature of the mini conference and would like a future event to be more open. B. Kidder suggested having the Excellence in Teaching Award in the evening. B. Ford said if more awards were established, they could all be folded in. S. Nosek suggested having elected officials attend to bring more of the community in and they could become advocates for SSU in the future. A member noted that the campus does not really have a place to showcase books written by faculty. When the call for the mini conference came out, she was unsure if talking about her own work, such as a book, was appropriate. A member voiced support for more emphasis on the Excellence in Teaching Award. There was a suggestion to hold such an event in late April or early May. The President noted that all elected officials were invited to participate in the platform party for the investiture. B. Ford asked if using an instructional day was appropriate for this event. A member said if it was known ahead of time, she could work with losing a day of instruction. There was more discussion about the specifics of this idea. The President voiced her support for the idea. B. Ford asked for help working on a task force to develop such a conference. B. Kidder offered to be an administrative consultant. Carol Ammann was suggested.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki thanked the Executive Committee for the special gift given to her at the investiture. The gift was a special brew of an IPA. She noted that during the searches one thing they would talk about was did they like the person enough to share a beer. The gift was extra meaningful to her. She expressed her dismay at having to do so much work for the GMC and how difficult it has been. She was confident the new GMC Executive Director would help and there was still quite a bit to do. S. Nosek agreed with the President about the challenging nature of the GMC at this time. A member suggested a quick presentation or update be given to the Senate about all the changes at the GMC. The President said that she would be talking to the Board about the new agreement with MasterCard. She thought this new agreement worked for the campus. Quite a few people who had distanced themselves from the university were stepping forward. She wanted to diversify the Board to have different voices and different ages there. They were convening a nominating committee, so all new Board members did not have to go to the entire Board. They lowered the annual commitment to \$20,000 and hoped to eventually have 25 members of the Board. She has said to the existing Board and new Board members, that they are not just needed for the money, but also their involvement in the entire center. A member said she was very happy to see that the new GMC Executive Director came from academia. A member said that faculty she was talking to weren't sure if the President understood academics, academic freedom or shared governance. This didn't mean that she didn't understand that, but faculty were not hearing enough from her. The President thanked the member for her comment. She noted that she would be meeting with Ben and Carmen to talk about the new cabinet members coming on board. She noted that in her "walk and talks" most of the people she has walked with have been faculty. She talked about the Black Student Summit and noted it was well attended. During the summit, there was a panel of students, staff and faculty. Hearing their stories broke her heart. She thought it was a good open discussion and a good place to start. M. Young said what was a surprise was the depth of the concerns. He said he thought the campus had just checked the boxes for diversity and hadn't dealt with the real needs of communities. He was hopeful that the campus was small enough and that people had the capacity to turn this around.

Time certain reached.

Revision to the Single Subject Credential Program – L. Watt, K. Estrada

L. Watt praised EPC for meeting on the day of the investiture. This revision was approved unanimously. K. Estrada said the revision was in response to changed standards in the state of California. She described the revision in detail. L. Watt noted that there needed to be more clarity across campus about when we can make curricular changes ahead of the catalog. These changes are being implemented in Fall 2017 and would typically not be implemented until Fall 2018, but it has to be implemented due to the California standards. A member suggested to put the summary of changes at the beginning of all curricular changes instead of the signature page. There was no objection to this idea. **Approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

Revision to the Global Studies major and minor – L. Watt, R. Laney

L. Watt said this revision also passed unanimously at EPC. R. Laney said there were three

significant changes – the discontinuance of the global environmental policy concentration, changes to the area studies concentrations to clearly identify that these require study abroad, and changes to the minor that link the minor to area studies. **Approved for Senate consent calendar.**

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson reported on electronic meetings with statewide committees. At the Executive Committee, they discussed process issues regarding the intellectual property policy. A series of FAQs had been posted on the Graduation Initiative 2025 website concerning academic preparation. They also talked about the GE memo that went out earlier which showed programmatic change, but had not gone through shared governance. The Statewide Senate will have a resolution about the intellectual property policy soon. She was not sure exactly what would be in it. She noted that SJSU approved a resolution that was very clear about the issues. It was agreed to send that out to all faculty. A member raised an issue about a faculty member refusing to submit a syllabus to the department using intellectual property as an argument. Subsequent searching did not reveal a policy which states faculty are required to give a copy of their syllabi to the department. **This issue was referred to FSAC to consider adding such language to the Course Outline Policy.**

Off-site location for Business degree completion at College Marin – R. Eyler, G. Milton, J. Lau, K. Thompson, K. Moranski

B. Ford said this item came forward to the Ex Com to discuss the process for faculty governance to review proposals for off-site locations. The proposal had gone to EPC before the location had been identified. EPC did not approve it and the vote was close. Since no curricular changes were proposed, EPC was not sure they should have seen it. R. Eyler said they were seeking a process by which to talk about selecting a site to run a degree completion program off campus. A degree completion program in Liberal Studies already exists at Napa Valley College and Solano College. K. Moranski said there is a CSU process and a WASC process for taking a program off campus. She noted that the campus now has an MOU with the College of Marin. A member asked how the Business department would handle the ensure the rigor of the program. K. Thompson said they would have a coordinator for the program and it would have to meet all the accreditation standards for the Business program. The off-site program review would be part of the Business program review and it would differentiate between cohorts of students. A member noted that the Ex Com was talking about this particular program and establishing a process for future proposals. He thought they would want to be assured that the faculty hired for an off-site program were hired through the department's usual process for adjunct pools, and that any curricular changes would be dealt with in EPC as usual. APARC might want to review the program if there were resource implications to ensure that the program was not impacting other departments or programs. B. Ford said there was more to this than just an off-site request, it was a proposal to have a degree program off campus. He also agreed that FSAC should weigh in on the faculty role in lecturer pools for off-site programs. The EPC Chair asked who makes the decision about supplanting. This program was the first time an off-site program was also being taught on campus. She noted that in the Ukiah program, they didn't receive course reviews, peer observations of faculty or SETEs. She thought because this program was accredited, it has all

that built in. She was concerned about creating mirror degrees elsewhere in circumstances where accreditation was not present. R. Eyler spoke to the supplanting question by referencing EO 1099. The Chancellor makes the decision about supplanting and asks Extended Ed every year to assess their offerings according to EO 1099. Because the programs at Napa and Solano Community College mirror a stateside program, it does not supplant. He said it really boils down to fees. It is possible to get around 1099, if the fees of an offsite program is the same as stateside or less. Because the Business program exists on stateside it does not supplant. Students do not have to take it to gain their degree. If it was a requirement for their degree, then it would supplant. The Chair noted that this does not limit enrollment at an off-site location. A member argued that this Business proposal was not a good case due to the Business accreditation, however a list could be generated from this proposal about what is needed. A member noted that when the Ukiah program was asked for their program review, it was not clear whose responsibility it was to do the review. R. Eyler said Extended Ed was working on having a tenure-track person in charge of all their programs to help with that problem. K. Moranski said the Provost's office had made a clear decision that tenure track faculty must be in charge for Extended Ed programs and if that needed to be in policy, that was fine. She thought Business was a good model to show how it should be done correctly. It was suggested to refer the item to APARC and FSAC to help develop a protocol or procedure for these kinds of proposals. The EPC chair was concerned with "drift" and did not want programs to start and then become unsustainable. She still had the question about when a department and Extended Ed want to do a program, who makes the final decision. K. Moranski said such proposals have to go to the Chancellor's office and to WASC for final vetting. On the campus, there were different types of decisions to be made and she wanted to find a process in governance for these proposals. A member argued that it should still go to EPC as a curricular item. The Chair said after reading EO 1099, he was not sure that the supplanting definition given previously was clear for *programs*. The CSU process doesn't take place until after our campus process. The Chair thought APARC should look at the resources issues and the supplanting concerns, FSAC should look at faculty hiring/management agreements, and EPC should look at the curriculum and curricular oversight. R. Eyler suggested limiting the number of seats for off-site programs. A member suggested that the resource agreements could drive the limit. A member raised the issue of students in these programs having the same access to services as stateside students, including a grievance process. R. Eyler said the MOU with the College of Marin would provide for many of the same services except for academic issues. Students at College of Marin in this program would have to come to the SSU campus for academic issues. **It was decided to have all the Standing Committees discuss this from their perspective keeping in mind developing a campus process.** It was suggested that EPC and APARC discuss which committee would bring it all together for the Senate. The Chair asked EPC to review the prerequisites of both the campus Business program and the off-site degree program. Summary of referrals: APARC for resources issues and "supplanting"; SAC for student conduct and Title IV issues, EPC for curricular oversight mechanism and FSAC for faculty hiring.

Revision to Student Grievance Policy

B. Ford noted that the Ex Com had referred this back to SAC to determine where students would go who were not in a degree program in SEIE. SAC proposed that such students would go to SEIE and use their procedures. A member was concerned that the rationale stated

the SEIE procedures were in process and questioned having that language in the policy before the procedures were finished. A member asked why all students could not be eligible under the existing Student Grievance policy, and if they couldn't be, does faculty governance have oversight of a grievance process in SEIE. A member brought up the lack of clarity between SEIE and the rest of campus on a variety of issues. M. Young asked if the campus wanted to be part of their student conduct issues when the resources were scarce for the campus. There was more discussion about readiness. **Approved for the Senate Agenda.**

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Ben Ford

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Consent Items: From EPC: Revision to the Single Subject Credential and Program Revision to the Global Studies Major and Minor - emailed

Business:

1. From SAC: Revision to the Student Grievance Policy – First Reading - R. Lopez - attached
2. From FSAC: Revision to the Range Elevation for Lecturers policy – Second Reading – S. Winter (*4/27 agenda*)
3. From APARC: Revision to the University Program Review policy – Second Reading - M. Visser (*4/27 agenda*)
4. From SAC: Revision to the Cheating and Plagiarism policy – Second Reading - R. Lopez (*4/27 agenda*)
5. From S&F: Resolution - Faculty Representation on President's Diversity Council - Second Reading – C. Works (*4/27 agenda*)
6. Request to endorse APARC Priorities document – M. Visser - attached
7. Election of At-Large members to Ex Com

B. Ford noted that FSAC was not going to have time to address the RTP feedback in time for this Senate meeting. It was approved to postpone the second reading of the RTP revision to May 18th.

Approved.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes