

**Senate Executive Committee Minutes**  
March 14, 2013  
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

**Abstract**

Agenda approved. Minutes delayed. Correspondence received. FSAC SETE Task Force Recommendations. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Discussion of recent hate graffiti incidents. Associated Students Report. FSAC Report. SAC Report. APC Report. Vice Chair Report. Chair Report. Senate agenda approved.

**Present:** Margaret Purser, Richard Senghas, Maria Hess, Terry Lease, Deborah Roberts, Sam Brannen, Ben Ford, Karen Thompson, Viki Montera, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

**Guests:** Anthony Gallino, Mary Ellen Wilkosz, Mark Fabionar

**Approval of Agenda – Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes of 2/28/13 – approval delayed.**

**Correspondence** – The Chair said that now four campuses had submitted petitions to extend the timeline to bring degrees to the 120 unit cap.

The Chair deferred her report to later in the meeting.

**FSAC SETE Task Force Recommendations – V. Montera, M. E. Wilkosz**

V. Montera introduced the item. FSAC had created a smaller task force to look at the issue of SETEs. In the Fall of 2011, the President's Diversity Council had asked FSAC to include questions about diversity in SETEs and that had prompted a look at all the SETE questions. The Task Force had looked at the literature on SETEs, samples from other CSUs and a joint CSU/CFA report from 2008 about Student Evaluation of Teaching that had interesting suggestions in it. The Task Force decided to use the 2008 report as a starting place since it seemed most CSUs had not follow up on the report. The document presented to the Ex Com summarized their recommendations and they were asking the Ex Com for guidance on two possible ways to proceed – to take on a massive re-do of the SETEs or do minor revisions and increase the membership of the task force while also doing education about the value of the SETEs and the use of the data. V. Montera asked the Ex Com for feedback and introduced Mary Ellen Wilkosz, who was on the task force. A member noted that he had previously asked FSAC for aggregated data on the SETEs and was denied this request and wondered if FSAC would be changing their mind. V. Montera said that they were talking about who owns the data, who would have access to the data and were not at the point to make a recommendation about that, but knew the question was pertinent. A member thought it was reasonable to look at the SETEs due to moving SETEs to be done electronically. He questioned why FSAC was not recommending a complete re-do of the SETEs. V. Montera said the major reason they were not wanting to undertake a massive re-do had to do with time and

resources. It was noted that the 2008 report thought the SETEs needed to be less general and more specific and questioned the value of the SETEs. A member suggested appropriating a SETE design that had already been tested for reliability and validity from another CSU. M. E. Wilkosz said they had already discussed that, as there were questions included in the 2008 report. A member voiced concern that the 2008 report stated that SETEs were mainly measuring student satisfaction. There was discussion about whether it was better to re-do the SETEs to measure teaching effectiveness or rather to know what was being measured and not give so much weight to them in the RTP process. There was a question about whether the current SETEs were valid and reliable. That question could not be answered and to see if they were valid and reliable would take resources. A member voiced support for the second recommendation and said he had very little confidence that an instrument could be developed that was valid and reliable and measured what the faculty wanted. A member asked if the company providing the online SETE platform could be used to gain valid and reliable questions, what the cost would be and whether the faculty would agree to that. There was a suggestion that the task force might enlarge its membership with reps from other Standing Committees. A member suggested that the SETEs be renamed to indicate that they measure student satisfaction or re-do the SETEs to measure teacher effectiveness. The Student Rep argued that the SETEs could measure student satisfaction and teacher effectiveness. V. Montera said they would take in all this information and have more discussion. The Chair took a straw poll on the two recommendations – Prefer Recommendation 1 = 4; Prefer Recommendation 2 = 3. V. Montera said they could do recommendation 2 and look for instruments that had been found to be reliable and valid.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported on a recent meeting at Long Beach where he sensed that the Department of Finance was very interested to associate the current budget as proposed by the Governor with “outcomes assessment” for part of the new \$125 million to be given to the CSU. The Chair said that there was a talk of an assembly bill in the legislature that would include that, but there was not actual language yet. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he thought everyone should be very aware of it, as it had not been proposed previously. He also thought that it would be good to pay close attention to the Board of Trustees meeting and how they might allocate that \$125 million. A member asked about the Transportation Committee and skateboard issues. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said now the Transportation Committee would take up the issues raised by the faculty about skateboard and other kinds of transportation safety. A member asked about a report requested at the Senate for the cost of parking as related to the new parking fees. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he was asking the task force of CRC that came up with that recommendation to articulate the rationale for their decision. A member asked if there were any searches or appointments in the A&F area. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the active search now was for a Director of Development for the GMC. A member voiced concern that on Saturday, the parking permit machines were broken which resulted in quite a mess. She thought that if the campus was going to charge for parking on Saturday, the permit machines should work. A member asked for an update on the RFP for the bookstore. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he was not updated on that and would report back after spring break.

## **Discussion of recent hate graffiti incidents – M. Purser, M. Fabionar**

M. Purser said she put this on the agenda because of the recent events and wanted faculty governance to think about its role as the university moves forward to address these issues. She asked M. Fabionar to show the committee a video (<http://vimeo.com/61573997>) that was made about the event in response to the first hate graffiti incident. The Chair wanted the committee to see the video to help the conversation going forward and noted that what came through from the students was the need for community. She discussed the tradition of teach-ins on the campus. She said she had heard that perhaps a resolution might come forward about this event, and suggested that faculty governance might take a role in not only participating in responding to events like this, but also helping structure what the responses might look like. She asked for input on these ideas. A member noted that often acts of vandalism were attempts at feeling powerful and reactions of this nature may make the perpetrators feel powerful instead of questioning their actions. A member noted her dismay that often the campus had a dichotomy between what the campus said it wanted to do about diversity and what actions it took. She noted that a student in the video said that since the administration would not do anything, that the students had to do it. She reported that she heard at the GIG meeting that EOP would be cut by 1/3 because the EOP Director was retiring and reiterated that the campus actions should follow its statements on honoring diversity. The Chair of FSAC noted that FSAC had put forward a resolution on civility (<http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/resolutions/endorseFSACcivility.html>) and they were thinking of revisiting that and broadening it. She argued that the student event was more about responding as a community and not so much about those who perpetrated the hate graffiti. The Student Rep noted that the Associated Students Senate was working on a resolution about the EOP program, the Director of EOP and the Director of Diversity. He said his conversations with students in multicultural clubs found they did not feel a lack of support. He asked how could a body be created that was not just reactive, but proactive. A member suggested that a joint resolution be created between the faculty Senate and student Senate and include the cut to EOP, etc. in the resolution because the allocation of resources demonstrated priorities. A member noted that SDS asked for a resolution about the cut to EOP and the Director to be drafted and argued for on-going proactive actions. A member asked M. Fabionar to talk about what he thought would be a good faculty response. M. Fabionar said he thought that the students were able to vent a little at the event, and then were asked what kind of community did they want this to be and what would they do to create that? It gave them some responsibility. He also thought there needed to be more dialogue about creating community. He thought there was a lack of cohesion within the university from an organizational standpoint. He said after the event, they partnered with Project Waking Up, which provided amazing social justice training from a global perspective and 50-60 students attended that training. He was talking to students about the inaccuracy of the narrative that the administration of the campus wasn't doing anything and was working with University Affairs to focus on what had been done on the campus and what we wanted to see. He thought faculty could focus on what we can build in terms of community and programs and encouraging students who are self-selecting in these programs to make good decisions. The Chair asked, regarding targeted

students, what could the faculty do, or what would the students targeted want faculty to do, to show support. She was concerned about students who already felt vulnerable to only be noticed when something bad happens. The student rep thought that the students being targeted should be asked how they want to be supported and how they might find a sense of belonging to the university community. He noted a lack of the feeling of belonging among most students. A member suggested “rolling teach-ins;” where faculty could bring up these issues in the classroom.

### **Associated Students Report – A. Gallino**

A. Gallino reported on the results of the Associated Students election. He noted that both the Diversity Senator and the Community Relations Senator were not filled. He said the turnout was 25%. He said the transition date for new officers was May 3<sup>rd</sup>. He said that this year for the first time in many years, all the top level officers were white, heterosexual males. They were having discussions about what that meant to the AS.

### **FSAC Report – V. Montera**

V. Montera reported that FSAC would look at the Course Materials Adoption Policy before the next Senate and may come with revisions. She passed out a handout that was going to Deans and Department Chairs about the implementation of electronic SETEs. She said FSAC would be looking at guidelines for aggregating data and noted that response rates for students’ completing the online SETEs was part of the discussion. She asked if the committee thought M. Barnard should visit the Senate with this information and hear from Senators. The committee agreed. A member thought the “SETE policy” would need to be revisited, if they are online. V. Montera noted that faculty could control how the students do the SETEs online. She also noted FSAC would be recommending to the President about whether all classes would be evaluated or some would be evaluated as per the new CBA. A member suggested that the handout state that FSAC will recommend guidelines to the Senate, as FSAC did not have authority to that by itself.

### **SAC Report – K. Thompson**

K. Thompson reported that SAC heard the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement and wondered what would be done with that data. The Chair asked for that to be agendized for the next Ex Com meeting. K. Thompson also reported that SAC would be working with FSAC on a concern about the proctoring policy written by Athletics.

### **APC Report – D. Roberts**

D. Roberts said she was on the task force about Information Technology. She said that she told that task force that faculty needed more support for academic technology and that the smart classrooms needed to be brought up to speed. She also reiterated that she would be APC Chair again next year and wanted a serious discussion about APC’s charge. A member suggested that at some point a committee

of the whole discussion at the Senate might be useful to talk about planning on the current environment. The Chair noted that S&F was working on recommendations from their 2005 self-study that had specific reference to APC's charge, so a visit to S&F was probably a good idea for APC.

### **Vice Chair Report – R. Senghas**

R. Senghas reported on the election analysis for the recent election. There was a precipitous drop in lecturer participation, 24% last year and only 8% this year. He said the overall voting turnout was also very low. The Senate Analyst noted that she had started an analysis of voting turnout among faculty serving in governance and so far had found that among assistant professors serving in governance at any level, only half had voted. R. Senghas said he hoped that the communication survey would help point to ways to improve participation. A member noted that perhaps it was more important to find out why people didn't vote rather than that they didn't vote. The Chair thought perhaps it was because it was more like an off election year.

### **Chair Report – M. Purser**

M. Purser reported on her trip to Sacramento for Lobby Day. She said there was a lot going on in the Legislature that concerned the CSU. A lot of trial balloons were being put out about linking outcomes assessment to funding, the shape of budgets for higher education, and clarifying the equivalency of courses. She heard the Chancellor speak and he said he had already gotten into trouble. He was asking the Legislature to really look at the cost of education and that they would either need to lower quality or get more funding.

### **Senate Agenda**

The Chair suggested inviting local Legislative representatives to the Senate in the Fall. The Chair asked for the committee members to think about how faculty governance could participate in the issues of campus climate and civility. A member suggested that the Senate have such a conversation. A member asked for M. Fabionar to come to the Senate to help with that conversation. A member suggested that it be a report from M. Fabionar and there was a suggestion to have a sort of committee of the whole discussion as well.

### **AGENDA**

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Margaret Purser

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – 2/21/13 & 3/7/13 - emailed  
Correspondences

**Consent Items:** None

**Special Report – Campus Civility and the HUB – M. Fabionar**  
– T.C. 3:15

**Special Report – Overview of Electronic SETEs – M. Barnard –**  
attachment T. C. 3:30

**BUSINESS**

1. Course Instructional Materials Adoption Policy –  
Second Reading – V. Montera – attached

**Approved.**

**Adjourned.**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström*