

Academic Senate Executive Committee
November 17, 2011
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

Abstract

Agenda approved. Minutes of 11/3/11 approved. Chair Report. President Report. EPC Report. Provost Report. Associated Students Report. Budgeting Principles in Academic Affairs. Statewide Senator Report. Chair-Elect Report. Vice President of SAEM Report. APC Report. FSAC Report. Faculty Retreat. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Ben Ford, Richard Senghas, Deborah Roberts, Sam Brannen, Terry Lease, John Wingard, Margaret Purser, Jennifer Mahdavi, Kelly Estrada, Carmen Works for Armand Gilinsky, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Andrew Rogerson, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Brian Wilson

Absent: Andy Merrifield

Guest: Paul Ramey

Approval of Agenda – item number one was withdrawn. Approved.

Minutes of 11/3/11 – Approved.

Chair Report – B. Ford

B. Ford reported that the conversations about academic identity were continuing, but he thought the conversation was starting to lose steam as people have said what they wanted to say. The ideas had gathered around the terms “collaboration” and “leadership” as distinctive features of an SSU education. He said the ideas were ready to take to the consultant that University Affairs was hiring who would test it on faculty, students, alumni, parents, etc. and help craft the ideas into a catchy phrase. A member asked about teaching excellence as an identity and B. Ford responded that most universities said that about themselves, so it did not distinguish SSU. It would be said, but not as what was distinctive about the university. He noted all the effort into finding what was distinctive about SSU was in the service of academic excellence.

President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana reported on the Board of Trustees meeting which was very interesting. He described the meeting as hectic. He described the protest that had happened there and noted that he thought a significant number of the protesters were not students and were from Refund California (<http://www.makebankspaycalifornia.com/>). He said that these people were talking more about national issues, not student fees. After the public comment section of the meeting, some of the protesters were disruptive and when the people in the building started leaving the building, more started to come in and it escalated from there ending with people being arrested and pepper spray being used by both the protesters and police. He reported that the Board of Trustees Finance committee approved the budget put forward by the Chancellor that asked

for 397 million dollars additional, of which 180 million was the equivalent amount of the tuition increase. In the original budget, the request for additional money noted that it would “buy out” the tuition increase. A member of the Board, who was very tied to the Governor, made an amendment to take out the language about buy out. He did not explain why he made that amendment. The President thought it was political coverage for the Governor. He said the amendment passed. The student fee increase was passed by a 9 – 6 vote. He reported that the Board approved the new University Center for SSU. A member asked when the tuition increase would apply. The President said in the Fall. The President also noted that everyone thought the “trigger” would happen because the State was under revenues and in deficit.

EPC Report – C. Works

C. Works said that A. Gilinsky asked her to attend as he was suddenly called away. C. Works reported that the GE Unit policy from the GE Subcommittee had come to EPC and been approved, but she was not sure it should go on the last Senate agenda of the semester. She provided the highlights of the policy and asked for feedback. She noted that the GE Subcommittee had been asked how they would approve new GE courses that came through at 4 units. The GE Subcommittee had done some analysis on Areas D and E courses and determined that if an average of 83.3% of 3 units courses were kept in that area and it was a pedagogically sound course, then a 4 unit course would be approved. Once the 83.3% had been exhausted, no more 4 unit courses would be allowed, but there would be a cap and trade system. It was clarified that the 83.3% referred to seats. There was discussion. C. Works said she would take back the Executive Committee comments to the GE subcommittee. She also reported on the Academic Calendar that had come before EPC. EPC hoped to bring the calendar to the Executive Committee before the end of the semester. EPC had asked E. Sundberg to move Spring break more towards the middle of the semester and recalculate the calendar. It was clarified that the guidelines were effected by this suggestion. There was discussion.

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson reported that he had a very positive interaction with students the previous day who were protesting the fee increase and the lack of classes. He wanted to have more communication with the students. He noted that increasing the unit load to 18 units had helped, but there were still concerns, particularly about University 238 not being offered. They also asked other questions about the administration of the university. A member asked about the increase to 18 units. The Provost said it was difficult to convince the student body that 16 units was enough and they also found out that the previous plan could not have been implemented in CMS. He said he was nervous about the 18 unit load and would be watching it very closely. He said he discussed this with the students and thought the students had learned a lot.

Associated Students Report – P. Ramey

P. Ramey started by thanking the administrators that came out to the protest and genuinely answered questions. He said students said over and over again, that they appreciated getting honest answers. He said it was different for the students when they could actually hear the information from the people who make decisions. He

said the AS needed to a better job communicating with the students. He thanked the faculty for their support during the action and said that it was a very inspiring and motivating experience. He was glad that the students were not angry, but they were frustrated and when the answers started coming, they were very proactive. He hoped the communication would continue and thought SSU could hold their students up to say this is how you protest, this how you ask for things. Things were very peaceful and respectful.

A member asked the Provost when students who petition to go above 18 units would be informed that they were approved to do so. The Provost said they would look at that timing and that students could get their petitions in early. He said they were asking the Chairs and the Deans to sign off on the petitions and really look at them to help keep the numbers down and help students get classes if they really need them. A member asked where the “crunch” was for undergraduate students in the schedule. The Provost said it would show up in the GE. The member asked to see the information about what part of the GE was impacted most. The Chair echoed P. Ramey’s interpretations of the “lawn circle” conversations. He noted there was a specific request for a “budget town hall” that would need to be a conversation. A member said that the current students were an impressive group. A member suggested that core courses in the majors should be looked at closely before they were cancelled for “low enrollment” during registration. The Provost said they would do that.

Budgeting Principles in Academic Affairs – B. Ford, A. Rogerson

B. Ford said the Provost asked for a faculty group to provide input on guiding principles for budgeting in Academic Affairs. B. Ford noted that initially members of ACT were going to constitute that group, but Structure and Functions said that it should go to the Senate Budget Subcommittee. He suggested that SBS create a sub-group which would include three department Chairs and asked if there were any major objections to this idea. There was a suggestion that members of SBS join the ACT group. There was a question about whether the Department Chairs would be selected by School. B. Ford said that Department Chairs would be asked to submit a statement of interest and S&F would take into consideration the Schools already represented on the SBS when recommending Chairs for the group. There was a suggestion that SBS visit Department Chair meetings in all the Schools instead of creating a new committee. B. Ford said he would take the discussion under consideration.

Statewide Senator Report – B. Wilson

B. Wilson said they had not meet since he last reported. He noted that the Statewide Senate listserv was very active and they were forwarding items of interest to Senate-Talk. He noted that the new faculty trustee, Bernadette Cheyne, was contributing very well. He said the budget of the Statewide Senate was in question.

Chair-Elect Report – M. Purser

M. Purser said Structure and Functions was working on the proposal for a Sustainability structure on campus. She reported that S&F decided to hold the constitutional vote on the change to the Chairship in the Spring. She noted that calls

had gone out for the various search committees. She said to P. Ramey that she was proud of the students during their “protest.”

Vice President of SAEM Report – M. Lopez-Phillips

M. Lopez-Phillips said about 125 students were sitting-in at the Library and that the Provost’s staff was doing a good job answering questions. He said they had 34 applications for the Director of the Multi-Cultural Center and a good pool for the Judicial Officer. He praised the Associated Students for hosting a conversation on Tuesday night and the students for bringing good questions and being peaceful and respectful.

APC Report – K. Estrada

K. Estrada asked about the APC item on the Senate agenda. She said she would be writing an APC resolution about the suspension of the CSU online initiative and wondered if the item should be on the agenda. It was clarified that she could move to substitute a new resolution for the one on the agenda at the Senate meeting.

FSAC Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas noted that FSAC would look at the revised Disruptive Student Behavior policy and offer their support on the floor of the Senate. He reported on the progress on the SETE issue and said they had reached out to DSS for input and wanted more feedback about how faculty were using them in a reflexive way. He noted some historical information on the SETEs that had come to light and that he would pursue. He noted it was good to see the Provost’s email about textbook ordering and he hoped textbook ordering would become a faculty issue too. They were talking to the ATI group about how they might be able to encourage faculty and departments to move forward on making educational materials accessible. There was a question about the ability to customize SETEs. R. Senghas said he had heard that some departments do supplemental evaluations that were more qualitative, but he did not know if the scanned SETE’s could be customized. A member asked if FSAC was talking about putting the SETE’s online. R. Senghas noted that the equipment for scanning SETEs was about to break, so electronic options were being considered. A member asked about comparative data on the SETEs and noted that some departments would appreciate that information.

SAC Report – J. Mahdavi

J. Mahdavi said SAC was very busy and had nothing new.

Faculty Retreat – B. Ford

B. Ford updated the committee on the progress of the Faculty Retreat planning. He noted that the collaboration theme emerging from the “academic story” conversations did not readily bring to mind the rich discussion that ensued when people started talking about it more. He thought that the theme of the Retreat would be collaboration. He said the current thinking was to have something at the beginning that highlighted the different forms of collaboration, then perhaps a poster session showing what was being done currently followed by smaller groups

gathered around the types of collaboration focused on the how-to of collaboration. This would, hopefully, end with a proposal for a type of collaboration the faculty would like to develop. The proposal would ask the participants to identify where they might get resources for the project and what campus support they would need to do it. He wanted it to become productive. He thought it could run from 9:00 to 1:00 and asked for ideas about who might be good to contact for current collaborative projects. A member thought that creating proposals that would have funding would be very attractive. The Chair thought perhaps the Sponsored Programs subcommittee might attend to help people to identify funding sources. A member noted that SSU seemed good at starting collaborative projects, but not so good at sustaining them. A member asked if there would be a Spring Convocation. The Chair said he was not planning on that. A member suggested the Arts and Humanities learning community as a collaborative effort. A member suggested information about Universal Design be included.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Ben Ford
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes - emailed
Correspondences
Consent Items: None

Special Report: Jeff Langley and Robert Cole:
The Green Music Center and SSU's Academic Mission TC 3:30

BUSINESS

1. Revision to Priority Registration Policy – Second Reading – J. Mahdavi - new attachment
2. Resolution Regarding Endorsement of the CSU, San Bernardino Resolution Calling for Suspension of the CSU Online Initiative – Second Reading – K. Estrada – new attachment handed out at meeting

Approved.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström