

**Senate Executive Committee Minutes**  
September 7, 2017  
3:00-5:00, Academic Affairs conference room

**Abstract**

Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 8/24/17 approved. Chair Report. Provost Report. Resolution regarding EO 1100 approved for Senate agenda. Discussion: Graduation Initiative 2025 allocation plan. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status approved for the Senate's consent calendar. Discussion of ACT meeting. FSAC Report. SAC Report. CFA Report. Associated Students Report. Senate agenda approved.

**Present:** Carmen Works, Laura Watt, Ben Ford, Richard J. Senghas, Jeffrey Reeder, Michael Visser, Melinda Milligan, Armand Gilinsky, Ron Lopez, Damien Wilson, Jennifer Mahdavi, Lisa Vollendorf, Joyce Lopes, Michael Young, Elaine Newman, Jason Gorelick

**Absent:** Judy Sakaki

**Guests:** Catherine Nelson, William Kidder, Elias Lopez, Karen Moranski

**Approval of Agenda** - item added: Resolution regarding EO 1100. **Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes of 8/24/17 – Approved.** There was discussion about the format of the minutes and the reason the meeting is recorded. **Motion to refer format of minutes and whether to keep recordings of meetings to Structure and Functions to recommend best practices to the Senate. Second. Approved.**

**Chair Report – C. Works**

C. Works reported that she and the Provost formally sent a letter to the Chancellor's office requesting an extension on the timeline for EO 1100 for Fall 2019 instead of Fall 2018. She expressed her appreciation to K. Moranski for her help with the letter. She praised the statements coming out from campus regarding the DACA decision. The students have organized phone banking for every Friday. The Chair said she would be participating with the students. She reported on the first meeting of the WASC steering committee meeting. The committee was focused on the five lines of inquiry and will be developing language to help others in the campus community talk to WASC about the lines of inquiry. She strongly encouraged faculty to attend the meetings with the WASC team. Tuesday, October 24 beginning at 4:15 PM is the tentative general faculty meeting. The Provost introduced Elias Lopez, the new AVP of Academic Resources. He comes to us from UC Davis and has an incredible depth and breadth of experience in areas that the campus is currently lacking.

**Provost Report – L. Vollendorf**

L. Vollendorf reported that she asked J. Lipp to take the lead with ATISS and look at learning management systems to see if there is a learning management system

faculty and students would prefer over Moodle. Results from an annual survey of students indicate that they would like a broader array of learning management tools in the classroom and out. Data from the Faculty Center will also be used. She described the value of having the new AVP of Academic Resources as part of the Academic Affairs suite. The Chair asked if Google Classroom would be a resource that could be investigated. The Provost said ATISS would investigate learning management systems. She also wanted to do a 360 review of IT to assess other technology issues. The Chair asked that in the instructional spaces review they include research space. The Provost said she had started to review some spaces and was not clear that the campus had accurate analytics and inventory of all instructional spaces. Once that was understood, she would share that with the Executive Committee. There was a brief discussion about how the CSU understands instructional space and the need for a more strategic and analytical approach to scheduling and space utilization.

### **Resolution regarding EO 1100 – C. Nelson**

C. Nelson introduced the resolution and reviewed the resolved clauses and rationale. The resolution distilled comments she had heard from a variety of venues. There was a suggestion to include the tension between our accrediting agency that is asking us to be distinctive and the implications of the EO to make campuses more similar. It was also suggested to reference our membership in COPLAC. The EPC Chair said she had sent more detailed information about which programs would be affected by the executive order and argued that the order would actually increase time to graduation. There was a suggestion to include another resolved clause that indicated the unintended consequence of increasing time to degree. **Motion to include the resolution on the Senate agenda. Second. No objection.**

### **Discussion: Graduation Initiative 2025 allocation plan - M. Visser**

M. Visser noted that the campus had received \$1.26 million in base funding for the graduation initiative 2025 plan. Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have collectively put together a plan for allocating those funds. Version 16 of the plan was included in the agenda packet. He asked K. Moranski to talk about the highlights of the plan. He also noted that the Graduation Initiative group and APARC had both discussed the plan. K. Moranski said the plan was focused on ensuring student success, increasing tenure system density, helping students move beyond remediation, helping students with policies and procedures that may be holding them back from graduating in a timely fashion, ensuring that we have enough courses to meet the needs of our students, and providing the support structures that students need. She discussed how underfunded and understaffed many of our student support services were currently and how the allocation plan addressed those issues. A member questioned the need for the Stretch Math coordinator given the directives of EO 1110. K. Moranski responded that the position would be even more needed as they comply with EO 1110. There was discussion about faculty advising and professional advising as addressed in the plan. It was clarified that release time for faculty advising was "still on the table." A member suggested that this topic be a topic for the Brown Bag lunches and encouraged figuring out how to attract more faculty. The Provost noted that assigned time currently for faculty

totaled over \$2 million. She thought the campus community needed to discuss what was wanted in terms of assigned time. M. Visser said that the plan needed to be sent into the Chancellor's office by Friday. He hoped this discussion was helpful. K. Moranski noted that the plan was a living document and could still change.

### **Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status**

The faculty eligible for emeritus status were presented to the Executive Committee. **It was approved as a consent item for the Senate.**

### **Discussion of ACT meeting - C. Works**

C. Works reminded the members that ACT [Academic Coordinating Team] is a meeting between faculty governance leaders and the Deans. She wanted to hear from the standing committees. The Provost said she had been asking around, but still did not understand what ACT was supposed to do. One of the things she had heard was this was an opportunity for the Deans to meet with faculty governance, which she supported. She was surprised that a Dean did not sit on the Senate. She suggested having a Dean sit on the Senate and have the deans rotate each year to help them understand faculty governance processes. The history of ACT and its precursor JCAP [Joint Committee on Academic Planning] was discussed. The ability to bi-locate could come in handy. The Provost noted that she could not attend the ACT meeting now as the Cabinet time had changed. A member offered that ACT was seen as a way for communication to happen that would benefit governance, but was not a decision-making body. The Chair of EPC said that standing committee chairs found the meetings useful and gave them access to the Dean and other administrators and provided a place for conversations to happen that didn't happen in other venues. She said that she had questions from faculty about the agenda of ACT and found they were somewhat suspicious of it given that it was not a typical Senate committee. A member, who had served on JCAP, noted that some of the reason for the committee was the previous lack of trust between faculty and the administration. She hoped this was changing and thought perhaps the ACT structure should be revisited. The Chair of APARC suggested that since there was a scheduling conflict, it was reasonable to wait and see if needs were identified that are not being fulfilled by that group. He said he did believe that it would benefit governance to include the Deans in some way. A member suggested having a retreat to have the sorts of conversations that could happen in ACT. It was decided to refer the issue of including Deans more in faculty governance to Structure and Functions.

### **FSAC Report - A. Gilinsky**

A. Gilinsky reported that FSAC had approved three department RTP criteria. He said the coaches performance review policy would undergo further editing and refinement and would return to the Executive Committee later in the semester. FSAC will also take up a discussion about guidelines and processes for department RTP.

## **SAC Report - R. López**

R. López reported that SAC had two main policies to work on - the Time, Place, and Manner policy and the Grievance policy. A member asked about the status of the interim Time, Place, and Manner policy. B. Kidder said the interim policy was approved as of the end of this week.

## **CFA Report - E. Newman**

E. Newman expressed her appreciation for the resolution regarding EO 1100. She said CFA has requested an official meet and confer with the CSU administration about the recent executive orders. The meet and confer addresses issues of faculty workload. CFA was beginning to bargain for the successor contract. The current contract expires next June. There will be an all members meeting on October 18 and members of the bargaining team will be present. The CFA social will be held on October 4 in Lobos with free beer and pizza for members.

## **Associated Students Report - J. Gorelick**

J. Gorelick reported that he had helped put together a video about the rollback of DACA. It was great to see student leaders come together for that purpose. He encouraged faculty to show the video to their students. He thought many students did not know what DACA stood for. Every Friday at noon in the AS office, they would be phone banking for DACA. He said the AS would have a conversation about EO 1100 at their next meeting. He would be inviting the Deans and asked Chair Works to help them with that conversation. He said he was aware that some faculty governance committees did not have student representatives. He was working on filling those positions as soon as possible.

## **Senate Agenda**

### **AGENDA**

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Carmen Works

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – emailed

**End of year reports:** FSSP – emailed

**Consent Item:** Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – attached

### **Business:**

1. Discussion/feedback for Research – TC 3:30
2. Discussion/feedback for EO 1100 – TC 4:00
3. Resolution re: EO 1100 – attached TC 4:30

4. iPads for Senate – C. Works & L. Holmstrom-Keyes TC 4:40 – attached
5. Group Photo TC 4:55

**Approved.**

**Adjourned.**

*Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom – Keyes*