

**Senate Executive Committee Minutes**  
November 19, 2015  
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference room

**Abstract**

Chair Report. Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 11/5/15 – Approved. Revision to the Political Science minor approved for Senate consent calendar. President Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. EPC Report. Title IX Task Force. Revision to the Career Minor in Arts Mgmt approved for Senate consent calendar. FSAC Report. Associated Students Report. RTP Revisions summary document approved as information item for Senate. Revised APC charge and name referred back to Structure and Functions. Senate Agenda approved.

**Present:** Carmen Works, Deborah Roberts, Andrew Rogerson, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Ruben Armiñana, Laura Watt, Ed Beebout, Tom Targett, Sam Brannen, Suzanne Rivoire (via Zoom), Anthony Gallino for Matthew Lopez-Phillips

**Absent:** Richard J. Senghas, Ron Lopez

**Guests:** Kate Chavez, Catherine Nelson, Joyce Suzuki, Heather Fraser, Jennifer Shaw, Paula Hammett

Carmen Works chaired the meeting in R. Senghas' absence.

**Approval of Agenda – Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes of 11/5/15 – Approved.**

**Chair Report – C. Works**

C. Works gave a report on behalf of R. Senghas. R. Senghas would be attending the Council of Senate Chairs meeting in December and wanted to note items of interest on the agenda. They would be discussing the role of teaching in the CSU, the role of faculty in evaluating courses that transfer in upper division courses, and department prerogative vs. academic freedom for textbook selection. Structure and Functions received four responses to the call for a designee to the Dean of SEIE search. She said that there were changes to the faculty workstation refresh program. IT does not want to support workstations not from its standard offerings. In the past, if faculty needed specialized IT equipment, IT would support it if another source paid the difference in cost above the \$1000 offered. She said that conversations about this issue were happening. There were issues found with the President job description for the campus. There may have been oversights regarding the School of Social Sciences. A member noted that the job description did not mention the School of Social Sciences Dean and there was a lack of visibility for the School. She did not know of this was a problem of SSU or the search firm. A member noted that the Math department was very interested in a case at Fullerton where a faculty member was disciplined for not using the department required textbook in a multiple section course. The AAUP ruled that a department can require a common textbook for multi

section courses and that such textbooks need to be vetted by the department faculty and those who teach the course.

### **Revision to the Political Science minor – L. Watt, C. Nelson**

L. Watt introduced the item and noted it was a small change. C. Nelson described the changes which requested that students receive a C or better in the core courses in the minor. **Approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

### **Chair Report continued**

A member said that there seemed to be a move toward standardization for faculty workstations, and discussions with IT should begin. This was a particular issue in the School of Science and Technology.

### **President Report – R. Armiñana**

R. Armiñana said that the Board of Trustees meeting had great attendance and the meeting was very civil. Everyone “knew their role in the play”. He announced that CSU Stanislaus would also be searching for a President. A member asked if the President would have a retirement party. He said he did not want one, but that there would probably be one. It was noted that there were errors on the President position description for SSU. There was a discussion about the various initiatives of the School of Social Science and SYE.

### **Vice Chair Report – C. Works**

C. Works said that she already talked about the response to the call for a chair designee for the Dean of SEIE search and the charge for a new standing committee was a business item.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said there would be a retirement party for the President in early May. A notice would go out early in the Spring semester. The President said it sounded like an Irish wake.

### **EPC Report – L. Watt**

L. Watt said they are receiving more curricular changes now. They would hear proposals from Music and Early Childhood Education. She said she met with the University Program Review Subcommittee and had a good conversation about the program review process and the program review policy. D. Roberts said she was the Chair of the SEIE curriculum committee and thought EPC wanted something from her. L. Watt said a task force of EPC was looking at implementation of the SEIE policy and the definition of an academic certificate versus a minor.

## Title IX Task Force – J. Suzuki, H. Fraser

J. Suzuki said that H. Fraser was one of their new Title IX investigation and training specialists, J. Andrews was the second. These two and herself were now the Title IX team. They were putting together a formal Title IX task force. This was required by last year's audit of Title IX. Last year's committee was more informal and worked more on sexual assault awareness. The task force wanted to expand and be more task and project oriented. It would still be focused on sexual assault awareness, as well as communication and changing the culture of the campus so that affirmative consent was not only understood, but practiced. H. Fraser said they wanted faculty participation on the task force. They hoped to have passionate people and people with expertise. They were hoping to convene the task force soon and start meeting in January. They want to create a visible dialog for students and a public forum for discussion about sexual violence. They had spoken to student government already. J. Suzuki said they would have four interns to help develop materials and do trainings with student groups. They find peer to peer experiences very effective. A member asked if faculty would also do training. J. Suzuki said that might happen. The task force needs to look at what activities would be prioritized. Some training is mandatory, such as with Coaches, student athletes, and the Greek organizations. Most faculty are getting the online training. She thought that more training regarding consensual relationships for faculty would be good. A member said he had heard that consensual relationships were not illegal, but were seen as not a good idea and asked if the perspective on consensual relationships between faculty and students had changed. J. Suzuki said that Executive Order 1096 was now in force and would need to be followed by faculty. That Executive Order deals with power differentials in relationships. (<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1096-rev-6-23-15.html>). The President asked if the difficulties with the online course for students had been resolved and where that process stood now. J. Suzuki said they had chosen another vendor for future offerings, and were waiting for the system to provide a CSU wide contract with "Campus Clarity." Their goal was to roll out refresher training by December 1<sup>st</sup>. Two trainings were now required for students, once when they first arrive, and then a refresher every year. The President said that at the Board of Trustees meeting they made a change to Title V to make it legal to withhold registration if this training was not completed. Previously, it was not as formalized. A member asked if employees had to do this as well. J. Suzuki said there were quite a few trainings on such topics for all employees. She said once the training was ready, she would work with Melinda to send out a notice to faculty. If any faculty member wanted to demo the training, they could send a email to J. Suzuki. A member asked if there was any data about the effectiveness of online training versus in person training. J. Suzuki said the new vendor would provide different trainings each year, they are more targeted and students need to get the answers correct before they can move on. She did not know of any survey that looked at the difference between online training and face to face training. She noted a health survey was coming out in February which will include information on sexual assault. H. Fraser said they wanted to keep the conversation about affirmative consent and sexual assault awareness going throughout the year. A member asked how the conversations would happen. H. Fraser said they were putting that together now. There would be theater/skits, workshops, the clothesline project, etc. They also wanted to create a self-sustaining peer to peer program as well. A member asked about the "timely warnings" that come out from the police and what to tell students

who are worried. A member noted that while people may be curious, the issues were very sensitive. J. Suzuki said when an sexual assault was reported to the police and Title IX is notified, but they do not get a name. She said that when reports are sent out, there was concern about people who would try to figure out who it is. The President reminded the members that sexual assault was primarily done by someone the person knows. J. Suzuki said students who are concerned when they hear reports of sexual assault should make sure they are safe, and be clear about what affirmative consent entails. C. Works thanked J. Suzuki and H. Fraser for attending.

### **Revision to the Career Minor in Arts Mgmt – L. Watt, J. Shaw**

L. Watt noted that the name of this minor was changing to Career Minor in Gallery and Museum Methods. J. Shaw said that previously this minor was linked with performing arts and visual arts and was set up to help artists with their own careers. However, it had changed over the years and was now completely in Art History and Art Studio, and focused on applicable skills for gallery and museum work. She discussed the details of the changes. L. Watt noted that this had unanimous consent through all levels. A member asked what the term “career” minor meant. J. Shaw thought it signaled to students that the minor taught skills. This minor taught students how to curate. A member asked for learning outcomes in the document. There was some discussion. **Approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

### **FSAC Report – E. Beebout**

E. Beebout said FSAC had completed the RTP revisions and the discussion of the summary document would happen later in the meeting. Soon, they would be putting out the call for the Exceptional Service to Students award. He said this was part of the faculty contract and they wanted to get the award decided soon for planning purposes. FSAC was concerned about the funding for this award as the Chancellor’s office was not providing funding for it.

### **CFA Report – C. Works**

C. Works reported that there was a demonstration at Long Beach and it was reported that 1000 people turned out to support the contract negotiations. Twelve faculty from SSU attended.

### **Associated Students Report – K. Chavez**

K. Chavez said they had resolutions in the works and would bring more information soon. She noted a demonstration happened the day prior to support the students at the University of Missouri. They were talking about making sure the Library could extend study hours and talking about support for transfer students.

### **RTP Revisions – First Look – E. Beebout and P. Hammett**

P. Hammett said this RTP revision had been a multiple year process, issues had been identified, and contractual issues were identified. The guiding principles they used were to: Simplify and clarify whenever possible, streamline faculty workload

regarding evaluation and make the process less onerous for the candidates. She said there were so many changes and restructuring, that a strike through version would be confusing. They did have a form of the policy that did show the changes in comments. She went over all the changes in the summary: CBA requires evaluation every year. FSAC proposed Periodic Evaluation – This brief evaluation (cf. CBA 15.20) occurs in the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> probationary years. Performance Review – This longer and more comprehensive full review (cf. 15.31) occurs in the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> probationary years, and for tenure and promotion. How can we shorten Periodic Evaluation (brief) for candidates? CBA only requires SETEs. Include CV, self-assessment, peer observations? FSAC recommends: Candidate will provide: Updated CV, SETEs, 2pp self assessment discussing continuing strengths and areas for growth and 1 peer observation. How can we shorten Periodic Evaluation (brief) for department committees? Departmental 2pp review will consist of two questions: What are the candidates continuing strengths? Explain. Does the RTP committee have any concerns or see any area for growth in the candidate's performance? Explain. To address workload issues, does brief Periodic Evaluation need to go to school-level committees and URTP? FSAC recommends: Department and Dean only, not school or URTP Dean, as President's designee, writes letter of reappointment for Periodic Evaluation. Map evaluation categories more closely to CBA professional responsibilities (20.1) by combining university, professional, and community service. FSAC recommends - Combine into Service to the University, profession and the community. Two year reappointment not as helpful as planned, & CBA requires annual performance review or periodic evaluation. FSAC recommends - Eliminate two-year reappointment. Can we combine tenure and first promotion into one document? FSAC recommends - Combine document but retain separate recommendations, unless candidate requests either early tenure or promotion, at which point two documents required. Ranking of candidates for promotion – FSAC recommends - "The University RTP Subcommittee may forward a separate ranked list of candidates recommended for promotion to the President. " Department committees, School committees, and Dean no longer rank. Contrary recommendations between levels of review. FSAC says this section is redundant. The candidate is protected and can request a meeting if they receive negative recommendations. No provision in CBA for different committees meeting over a contrary recommendation; all levels of evaluation are moved forward. CBA requires Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness for all classes (15.15). Current policy allows candidates to choose two for self-assessment, but committees have access to all SETEs. FSAC recommends - Eliminate reference to two SETEs. "Student evaluations are required for all faculty who teach. Summaries for all classes are included in the WPAF" Add language about candidates (and committees) are encouraged to discuss themes and strengths or areas of growth across their classes rather than focus on SETEs for specific courses. February 15 deadline for 2<sup>nd</sup> PY 2<sup>nd</sup>@SSU increases committee workload and may disadvantage candidate. There was an option to move it to June 1, given CFA approval. CFA declined feeling it would disadvantage candidate. Date remains February 15. Peer observations currently vary considerably, from one page checklist to multipage evaluations. FSAC will provide guidelines on what to cover, but not part of policy. 1<sup>st</sup> year meeting with department RTP in spring. FSAC recommend this be omitted. Where should we put professional development: teaching, scholarship or service? FSC recommends - Add the intro to II. Criteria "Note: professional development may be included in teaching effectiveness, scholarship, or service, as appropriate to the activity and department." Can we omit

the Document Review Committee and run questions by URTP instead? FSAC says Yes. These were the general areas of revision recommended. There was discussion about what could happen at the Senate with this document. Senators could ask for changes, but it will be a discussion item and return to FSAC to incorporate any suggestions. Then the full policy would go to the Senate at the last Senate meeting. P. Hammett discussed a handout showing a workload analysis of the RTP process comparing the current policy with the proposed changes. There was discussion on workload and particularly peer review. There was a suggestion to remove the item about changing the deadline for 2<sup>nd</sup> year review since it did not change. **Approved as an information/discussion item for the Senate.** E. Beebout thanked P. Hammett for all her hard work.

### **Revised APC charge and name (APBC) – C. Works**

C. Works introduced the item stating that this was actually creating a new committee to replace APC. She noted that planning and budget were being combined. There were some grammatical and language suggestions. It was noted that PDS was bringing to FSAC that the academic technology piece would be part of this committee charge and recommended the Faculty Center director as liaison to this committee. A member asked if program reviews would come to this committee. L. Watt said that the University Program Review reports would certainly go to this new committee. The member said one of the challenges of APC had been issues with helping the committee have activities of the day. She proposed that the committee charge be short and then list what tasks would be done to meet that charge. She thought the path needed to be more teased out. **It was referred back to Structure and Functions.**

### **Senate Agenda**

#### **AGENDA**

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Richard J. Senghas  
Approval of Agenda  
Approval of Minutes - emailed

**Consent Items:** Revision to Political Science minor, Revision to Career Minor in Arts Mgmt - emailed

**Information Items:** Academic Calendars 2015 -2020 - attached

**Information (and discussion) Item:** RTP major revisions overview – E. Beebout, P. Hammett – attached TC

#### **BUSINESS**

1. Revised Senate Diversity Subcommittee charge (by-law change) – C. Elster - Second Reading TC 3:15 - attached

### **Adjourned**

*Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes*