

Academic Senate Minutes
September 14, 2017
3:00 – 5:00, Student Center Ballroom D & C

Abstract

Chair report. Agenda approved. Minutes of 8/31/17 amended and approved. Questions for Chair, Provost and President. Senate Diversity subcommittee report. Discussion/Feedback on Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities. Discussion/Feedback on EO 1100. Resolution re: EO 1100 - First reading completed. iPads and electronic agendas for the Senate. Group Photo postponed. Good of the Order.

Present: Carmen Works, Laura Watt, Ben Ford, Richard J. Senghas, Sam Brannen, Melissa Garvin, Sakina Bryant, Carlos Torres, Ed Beebout, Joshua Glasgow, Damien Wilson, Florence Bouvet, Jennifer Mahdavi, Kathy Morris, Laura Krier, Matty Mookerjee, Mary Ellen Wilkosz, Michelle Jolly, Michelle Goman, Victor Garlin, Hope Ortiz, Michael Balasek, Judy Sakaki, Lisa Vollendorf, Joyce Lopes, Michael Young, Elaine Newman, Jason Gorelick, Christina Gamboa, Arcelia Sandoval, Michael Visser, Melinda Milligan, Armand Gilinsky, Ron Lopez

Absent: Jeffrey Reeder, Catherine Nelson

Guests: William Kidder, Thaine Stearns, Marge Limbert, Karen Moranski, Tom Targett, Amanda McGowan

Chair Report - C. Works

C. Works announced the first lunch with herself and the Provost will be held on September 25th and the topic will be WASC. It will be held in the Library conference room on the third floor of the library. She announced there would be no more ACT [Academic Coordinating Committee] meetings this semester. They were also entertaining the idea of having a Dean on the Senate. She noted a change in the administrative structure - B. Kidder would be the new interim Title IX administrator and consultant. She then asked the Provost to talk about this change. The Provost said the campus was restructuring the Title IX office. This was very timely due to our increasing number of Title IX complaints and needs for investigation. B. Kidder would be the interim AVP for Title IX and Strategic Initiatives. He will report to Joyce Lopes in Administration and Finance, which is consistent with the reporting structure of other campuses. In the CSU, all campus leadership has been asked to look at how we set up Title IX on our campuses to make sure we are delivering the promise of Title IX and fulfilling the responsibility of Title IX. The CFA rep voiced concern about the change in B. Kidder's salary as it related to the campus need to address inversion in faculty salaries. She was clear that she did not think B. Kidder's new salary was undeserved. The Provost responded that the final salary had not been negotiated and that all salaries are publicly available eventually. She said she wanted all the members to know that everyone in the leadership was very aware of the salary situation of the campus and wanted to bring the campus into the position

of more consistency within salary categories. A member asked for more information about the increase in Title IX complaints. The Provost said that across the nation there has been an increase in Title IX complaints and SSU was part of that trend. She said the hope with the restructuring was that people would feel safe coming forward and the campus would have strong investigative practices that people felt comfortable about. The President noted that this was a topic of discussion at the last Presidents meeting. She said that they could not wait months to do this restructuring, and since B. Kidder has expertise in this area, it seemed like the right way to go to improve Title IX investigation and education on the campus. A member asked if there would be a search for a permanent Title IX administrator and a new chief of staff. The Provost affirmed that there would be a permanent search for the Title IX administrator eventually. The President said she was evaluating a candidate right now for the Chief of Staff position. The Emeritus rep asked what committees of faculty governance would be connected to Title IX effort. The Provost said Title IX had been an HR function. There are laws and policies connected to Title IX, so the office has a compliance function and most of its activities are confidential.

Time certain reached.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Consent item: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – Approved.

Minutes of 8/31/17 – Amended and Approved.

Questions for Chair, President and Provost

The Emeritus rep continued to voice his dismay that faculty were not involved in the organization of Title IX and noted that in the past the Academic Freedom subcommittee had been involved in such matters. He thought both faculty and students should have a say in any Title IX policy. B. Kidder noted that shared governance is also about a set of values, practices, and sensibilities. To the extent that Title IX is an aspect of shared governance, he thought he had the track record of being an important shared governance partner. He offered an example. A member asked if Title IX complaints should now be sent to B. Kidder. The Provost responded that such complaints should go directly to B. Kidder.

Senate Diversity Subcommittee report - L. Morimoto

The Chair thanked L. Morimoto for giving this report during her sabbatical. She noted that L. Morimoto is the Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence. L. Morimoto said she was giving this report on behalf of Charles Elster. She noted the new chair of SDS is Brendan Hamel-Bissell. She reviewed the charges of SDS that had been changed in 2015. SDS worked with the President's Diversity Council to clarify the roles of each committee and came up with a plan to present to President Sakaki to integrate the faculty members of SDS and the PDC. They were also interested to have a representative from the GE subcommittee and the Faculty Center as ad hoc members to SDS. The PDC formally added her position and the Faculty Center to the committee. SDS met with the chairs of CALS and AMCS to

find out how they could best support and advocate for them. They also met with the Dean of Education, Carlos Ayala, and Sean Johnson to talk about bottleneck courses in ethnic studies at the upper division level. They were still trying to get a definition of *bottleneck*. They invited the members of the Modern Languages department to talk about how to diversify language offerings at Sonoma State. Related to that, they designed a survey for students to determine interest in language offerings. They made suggestions to the scholarship office about the application essay process, specifically requesting that the essay rubric be made known to students ahead of time. For next year, they want to continue to collaborate with the PDC, work with the GE subcommittee to strengthen the cohesion between GE courses regarding diversity, inclusiveness, globalization and social justice and how to promote ethnic studies within GE. They continue to promote diversity in modern language offerings and the integration of modern language into the SSU curriculum. They would like to send out the analysis and information derived from the survey about language offerings. They want to work with the Faculty Center to provide workshops for new and senior faculty around diversity and inclusiveness. They wanted to suggest that Excellence in Teaching Award recipients could be part of the spring faculty retreat and share teaching practices including engaging and accepting all students. They want to reach out to schools and departments about Title VI requirements in their teacher prep courses. They want to explore the possibility of having a Black Studies department at SSU. They want to monitor the implementation of the campus receiving Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status and the UndocuResource Center. A member voiced concern about the gender imbalance in the Excellence in Teaching Award recipients over the past seven or eight years. She hoped this could be explored further. C. Works said she had been in conversation with D. Roberts about the award and the composition of the selection committee.

Discussion/Feedback on Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities

The Chair introduced Matthew Clark, the Chair of the Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs (FSSP) who would help facilitate this discussion. M. Clark said FSSP had been very busy last year, particularly because pre-award and post-award had merged into one office – OFRSP. He said they had been talking quite a bit about research on campus and now there was a new opportunity because J. Wilson was leaving. He wanted to provide some information before the discussion.

Research Development Associate (RDA)

Interim Provost Echeverria, AVP Roberts, and Jeff Wilson created a Research Development Associate (RDA) faculty position, with announcement on April 7. Sean Place (Biology) was selected as RDA. The RDA reports to the Provost and works closely with the Senior Director for OFRSP, the Director of the Faculty Center, and FSSP. Duties are (more details in the announcement):

- Promote and facilitate a climate on campus that values research and scholarship.
- Facilitate faculty professional development and engagement regarding research and scholarship.
- Increase the visibility of faculty research and scholarship on campus; and within the local, regional and national community.

- Serve as a collaborative member of campus leadership regarding research and scholarship.
- The RDA will not duplicate the efforts of the OFRSP Senior Director but will work in collaboration with OFRSP to provide support for research and scholarship at SSU.
- This is currently a one-year position, but could continue with Provost Vollendorf if found to be useful

OFRSP Director Position

The Senior Director of the Office of Faculty Research & Sponsored Programs (OFRSP), Jeff Wilson, will leave SSU on September 22. The Provost is envisioning a replacement position for Jeff Wilson, possibly as an AVP of Research and Sponsored Programs. She is seeking feedback on the future direction of the position and how to better support research, scholarship and creative activities (RSCA) at Sonoma State going forward. In FSSP, she mentioned that the position should support RSCA at a broad level of a liberal arts university, but also emphasize sponsored programs.

For our discussion

- How can this position better support funded RSCA, in terms of finding funding and post-award management?
- How can this position help promote, nurture and value a culture of faculty RSCA at SSU, in all forms and regardless of funding?
- How can undergraduate and graduate students be better connected to faculty
- What are some key qualifications for the position?
- Not to emphasize: Does this need to be an AVP position?

Highlights of discussion: concern was expressed about whether this position should be an AVP in the current salary situation; the Provost appreciated this opportunity to discuss how to better support research, scholarship, and creative activities on the campus in a holistic way; we don't have a way to get faculty ideas turned into a funded project or support people whose disciplines do not have funding from national organizations; suggestion that undergraduate research and faculty research be more integrated; suggestion that key qualifications for the new position be a strong background in compliance issues and also an accounting background; suggestion to streamline the bureaucratic processes and to figure out how to work with all students on undergraduate research, not just the stellar students; it would be great to offer financial support to grad students to work with undergraduate students; it seems post-bac research on this campus is an afterthought; due to the high requirements for service by faculty, three units for research and advising are not enough; request to talk about all students not just undergraduate students; another suggestion for key qualifications was an understanding of publishing research; suggestion to have staff available for faculty to sit with them and do an elicitation interview and help faculty writing their grants; another key qualification would be to produce boilerplate's to help with grant writing; suggestion to foster recipients of grants to be good communicators about their research and their

findings; request to help Arts and Humanities faculty specifically due to their lack of outside funding sources.

M. Clark noted that FSSP had discussed many of these issues. He was glad to hear people express interest in graduate students. He noted the Senate resolution from last fall: <http://web.sonoma.edu/senate/resolutions/CenterResearch2017.html>. He asked what Senators thought about the resolution now and if a physical space was a priority. C. Works noted that members could email him if they have other ideas or more remarks.

Discussion/Feedback on EO 1100 – M. Milligan

The Chair noted that SSU was granted an extension on the timeline of EO 1100 and she thanked the Provost and AVP Moranski for their work on that. She asked M. Milligan to lead a discussion to get a sense of how the campus might address the complicated problem before us. M. Milligan noted that she had passed out a revised version of the resolution on the agenda. In this revised version, the rationale was very detailed because the Executive Committee wanted a summary of the complexity of the EO to help the Senate have this discussion. EPC is concerned about the cascade effect of EO 1100 since so many departments and programs have woven GE courses into the majors, so revision to the GE program has significant implications for almost all programs. She asked each of the school reps to discuss issues about EO 1100 for their school.

Arts and Humanities: There was a question about the need for three-unit courses in areas C and D. It was clarified that EO 1100 allows four-unit courses in those areas and wants there to be enough three-unit courses so students can complete that area with those courses, if desired. This has the impact of forcing the campus to create enough three-unit courses for all undergraduates, which is problematic for our campus. M. Milligan said there was a further complexity in that the order refers to “seats” not “courses.” Another concern from the school was that in area A1, the proposed changes would disadvantage lecturers who may have to go from teaching four units to three units.

Business and Economics: A general sense in the school was a feeling of being overwhelmed, and appreciating the work of the Senate and the resolution. Economics does not have any three-unit courses. They have one upper division GE course and two lower division GE courses in Area D. Would the EO mean that their students could not take the upper division course? M. Milligan noted that it was this kind of issue that would extend time to degree for students.

Education: The chair of their undergraduate program told them that the EO did not simplify anything, and we would need help finding open courses for students in this new configuration. Two of their post-bac programs do have GE requirements. They are all three-unit upper division courses that are required for the credential programs. Most students do come through SSU, and if they were not able to take those upper division courses, it would increase time to graduate. Or they would have to do those upper division courses post BA, which is costlier. Two of the courses are in area D and one is an area E.

Science and Technology: The school has created a committee to look at the implications of the EO and many of the concerns raised so far are also concerns of Science & Tech. Questions that they heard: Would there be guidance for changing GE courses? Will the current GE learning goals and objectives be strictly followed or will these be modified? Will SSU have definitions of upper division GE that differ from the EO or will we follow the EO definitions? M. Milligan said that EPC and GE would be working on providing that guidance. She advised all schools to not move forward yet with planning, as GE was working on putting together more information and guidance.

Social Sciences: A plea for accurate and clear information going out to faculty in as many ways as possible to quell rumors. How will the University deal with targets during this transition? It was clarified that Area E upper division courses could satisfy GE, but not upper division GE.

M. Milligan said that EPC endorsed the resolution on the Senate agenda regarding EO 1100. She asked for more questions or comments. A member asked how this change would get rolled out to students. M. Milligan said students are under catalog years and the requirements for the catalog year they begin with remains with them throughout their time at SSU. The issue is going to be how to mount the courses under the new program. First time freshman and transfers will have different needs. The CFA rep noted that CFA has requested a meet and confer with the CSU over the workload issues implicit in EO 1100. A Lecturer rep said that the workload implications of this EO were so serious that many lecturers were strongly considering leaving the campus, including many longtime lecturers. She offered an example of how shifting the units of courses could result in lecturers having part of their work unpaid. She encouraged the Senate to consider the issues of having courses understaffed. To say that this issue is widespread is an understatement. Lecturers are over 50% of the faculty. There was a request for a document that would bulletpoint the main points in the EO. M. Milligan said they were waiting for a series of coded memorandum coming from the Chancellor's office that would explain what is intended by EO 1100. AVP Moranski said they have been trying to craft a document that describes the major issues of the EO and the implications. She thought that the extra year provided by the extension gives the campus time to be creative in terms of dealing with the catalog year and potentially needing to teach multiple courses issue. There are a variety of ways to deal with this issue. She said the letter they received granting the extension came with "strings." The "strings" are that the campus needs to teach enough Math and English courses for freshman in their first year, so that they can meet the requirement. We also need to find a path for the fall 2018 cohort to graduate with a 48-unit pattern.

Resolution re: EO 1100 – First Reading - L. Watt, M. Milligan

L. Watt noted that the resolution also addresses EO 1110. She reviewed the resolved clauses and encouraged the members to read the rationale. The resolved clauses:

1. Resolved: That the Sonoma State University (SSU) Academic Senate express deep apprehension about the short timeline for implementation of the revised Executive

Order (EO) 1100 General Education Breadth Requirements and the new EO 1110 Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses; and be it further

2. *Resolved:* That the SSU Academic Senate further express its grave concern about the lack of adequate consultation with statewide and campus faculty constituencies about the significant curricular and resource implications of the revisions to EO 1100 and EO 1110 prior to their adoption; and be it further

3. *Resolved:* That the SSU Academic Senate express particular concern that changes to upper division GE requirements and the emphasis on 3-unit courses in EO 1100 create major implementation and workload issues for faculty, deeply altering the delivery of affected majors/minors—several of which not only directly address the issues affecting underrepresented populations but have a greater proportion of underrepresented students than the campus as a whole—and slow time to graduation for students in those majors/minors; and be it further

4. *Resolved:* That the SSU Academic Senate convey its serious concern about the implications particularly for lecturers of the extensive revisions to GE required by EO 1100, including work available and entitlements, and the extra workload on *all* faculty the revisions will cause; and be it further

5. *Resolved:* That the SSU Academic Senate strongly urge Chancellor White to rescind EO 1100 until sufficient consultation with Academic Senates in the entire CSU has occurred, consistent with faculty authority to oversee the curriculum as laid out in Section 3561(b) of the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA); and be it further

6. *Resolved:* That if EO 1100 is not rescinded, the SSU Academic Senate strongly urge Chancellor White to extend the deadline for implementation of EO 1100 revisions and EO 1110, to Fall 2019 for *all* CSU campuses; and be it further

7. *Resolved:* That the SSU Academic Senate urge Chancellor White to accord campuses as much autonomy and flexibility as possible in the adaptation of campus GE programs to the EO 1100 revisions, and grant exceptions to the requirements as needed in order to preserve characteristics of GE programs distinctive to the identity of each campus; and be it further

8. *Resolved:* That this resolution be distributed to Chancellor White, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Loren Blanchard, the Academic Senate CSU, and campus senate chairs.

A member suggested that if the Senate gets "bogged down" in the rationale, that EPC could provide a report detailing the complexities of implementation to go with the resolution. He supported including the rationale with the resolution. L. Watt asked the members to contact her, or M. Milligan or C. Nelson if they have suggested changes to the rationale. A member thanked the writers of the resolution for their hard work and suggested that the last two resolve clauses be removed, so

the resolution just addresses the problems with the EO order and asks that it be rescinded. If it's not rescinded, then another resolution could go forward in the spirit of those last two resolve clauses. A member suggested that the campus is not "concerned" about these changes, they "object" to the changes. He also wanted to see in the rationale that our faculty do not agree with the content of the EO. L. Watt said that she had heard from some faculty that they liked parts of the EO and they are trying to make the resolution a campus response. A member agreed with striking the sixth resolved clause as proposed by a previous speaker. He also suggested that resolved clause 5 include EO 1110 as well. The Student rep thanked C. Works for visiting their Senate and discussing this issue. After talking to their constituents, the students have decided to stand with the faculty on this topic. They are also working on a resolution, similar to this one, to send to the Chancellor's office. A member voiced concern about resolved clause 4 as she thought SSU might be in a different position than faculty at other CSUs. A small campus with departments that have very small numbers of faculty will be differentially impacted by this EO. She did not think that a year extension was enough time to take into consideration these concerns. The Emeritus rep noted that many of the emeriti created the current GE program that was being dismantled. He said they were worried about the procedural issues, the lack of consultation and the seeming lack of understanding about the law, such as Title V and HEERA. His plea to the Senate was to focus on the lack of consultation and ask campus administrators to communicate to the Chancellor's office how upset the faculty at SSU are about this EO. He urged the Senate to be aware of the political context and ask where this EO was coming from, who it was coming from and why it was developed.

iPads and electronic agendas for the Senate – C. Works & L. Holmström-Keyes

C. Works noted that the Executive Committee was already using iPads. She said the proposal in the packet described pros and cons for going this direction. IT is willing to provide iPads to everyone, if they are needed. L. Holmström-Keyes noted that the iPads would be overseen by IT and nothing but approved apps can be on them. After a year of piloting this with the Ex Com, the only thing they asked for was to have a paper agenda cover only at the meetings. She encouraged the Senate to seriously consider this direction. A member asked to use another type of software than Dropbox for the agendas. A member advocated getting the agendas in paper in advance and argued that taking notes electronically was not as effective. Another member agreed and was concerned about her ability to comprehend while taking notes electronically. An Ex Com member supported going toward more electronic agendas stating people will read or not read whether it's electronic or paper, and going electronic was more sustainable. A member noted that studies have shown that taking notes electronically tends to make people try to capture the discussion verbatim and that it was the process of talking notes that was the problem, not that it was electronic. He endorsed the move to electronic.

Motion: Postpone the group photo to the next meeting and to do it early in the meeting.
Second. Approved.

Good of the Order

One of the SSP reps discussed the hostile bargaining atmosphere for them currently. She asked the faculty to acquainted themselves with SSPs in their area and value their contributions to campus and particularly to the Graduation Initiative. A member said in the Dropbox was a resolution regarding the initiative of “It Won’t Happen Here” and asked residents of Rohnert Park to encourage their city council to adopt a similar resolution.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmström-Keyes