

Academic Senate Minutes
September 30, 2010
3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda amended and approved. President Report. Provost Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Adding Senate Budget Subcommittee to the by-laws approved. Chair-Elect Report. Special Report: Faculty Workstation Refresh Program. Final Report from the Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee. Statewide Senator Report. Revision to Learning Objectives for Areas A and C – First Reading.

Present: John Wingard, Ben Ford, Susan Moulton, Maria Hess, Catherine Nelson, Brian Wilson, Michaela Grobbel, Sam Brannen, Edith Mendez, Steve Wilson, Helmut Wautischer, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Janet Hess, Ed Beebout, Chip McAuley, Mutombo M'Panya, Terry Lease, Florence Bouvet, Kathy Morris, Rick Robison, Tom Buckley, Nick Geist, Sharon Cabaniss, Matty Mookerjee, Michael Cohen, Karin Jaffe, Noel Byrne, Laura Watt, Margaret Purser, Sandra Shand, Marisa Thigpen, Ruben Armiñana, Saeid Rahimi, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Alex Boyar, Nicolas Carjuzaa, Paul Ramey, Dolores Bainter, Art Warmoth, Richard Senghas, Jennifer Mahdavi

Absent: Sarah Baker, John Sullins, Edie Brown, Andy Merrifield

Proxies: Matt Benney for Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Thaine Stearns for Elaine Newman

Guests: Jason Wenrick, Elaine Sundberg, Melinda Barnard, Timothy Wandling, Barbara Lesch-McCaffry, Emiliano Ayala, Andre Bailey, Cynthia Boaz, Craig Dawson

Chair Report – J. Wingard

J. Wingard reported that Senate bill 1440 was passed and signed into law. He said there were still implementation questions, but it was not part of the CSU “landscape.” He announced the creation of a Multicultural Competence Faculty Learning Community and noted that flyers were available at the name tent table for those interested. He noted that the 10th anniversary of the Library in the Schulz Information Center was upcoming and offered the Library representative to comment about it. A special section of the Santa Rosa Business Journal about the Library’s anniversary was handed out to all Senators.

Approval of Agenda – The Chair announced that the GE Unit Policy was postponed as EPC and GE were still working on it. **Motion to have the Information item: Revision to Learning Objectives A and C moved to a business item. Second. Approved.**

Minutes delayed.

President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana also noted SB 1440 and said it would be implemented in Fall of 2011. He thought it would certainly make the transfer of community college students to the CSU easier. If they take the 60 units required, they will be admitted. He commented that there was still no budget. The Chancellor requested that on September 27th, the CSU campuses admit more students for the Spring. SSU's target number for new admits was 110. This changed the overall target and annualized, it represented 220 more FTES admitted and enrolled. He said the campus was ready to do that and had normally admitted students to the Education program in the Spring.

The Chair asked about the status SB 330. The President said it was on the Governor's desk for signature.

Provost Report – S. Rahimi

S. Rahimi reported that the additional FTE referred to by the President had been distributed to the Schools. He noted that the Academic Affairs portion of the one time Federal stimulus money was in two parts – one for instruction and one for one-time patches for critical situations. A member asked if the stimulus money would help create more sections in the Spring. The Provost responded yes, he thought a number of lecturers would be brought back. A member asked if faculty were on any campuswide team working on implementation of the Graduation Initiative and if it was correct that Dean Leeder was now the facilitator of the President's Diversity Council and thus would the Provost still be involved in the Council. The Provost responded that four faculty were actively involved in the Core Implementation Group and he and the Senate Chair were attending a conference on the Graduation Initiative soon. Regarding the President's Diversity Council, he said that Dean Leeder was convening the Council and working on a day-to-day basis with the new Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence. They would be making regular reports to him about implementation of the Diversity Plan. The Chair asked about the task of the Core Implementation Group. The Provost said the Core Implementation Group was working on the Graduation Initiative, that all parts of the university were represented and were charged to talk to their constituencies and bring information back to the committee. It was clarified that the Early Start program was not part of the Core Implementation Group.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported on the first meeting of the PBAC of the term. They had decided that he should give a more detailed report when the budget was signed. He noted that instruction was funded, issues with the scholarship funds were addressed, issues with the Extended Education disbursements were addressed; and issues with the Endowment earnings for endowed programs were addressed. He noted that he had passed out information about the achievements of the Athletics program. SSU was ranked in the top 5% of all NCAA in terms of athletics and in the classroom. SSU was 15th nationally. He said he was very proud of SSU student athletes, both on the field and in the classroom. He then spoke about issues arising from the Campus Safety Committee and potential inspections from the Fire

Marshall. He introduced the Director of Environmental Health and Safety, Craig Dawson, to speak to the issues. C. Dawson said the Fire Marshall had already gone through 8 or 9 buildings so far. He thought it was a routine matter and said that SSU had a very good relationship with the Fire Marshall. They looked at earthquake safety and fire safety. He said the information sheet he had put together was changed when it went out to the campus. He said there would be no fines for problems or code issues. There was plenty of time to address them when they were found. He said he would start sending out information to a broader audience and said he was available for any questions. He noted that power strips were the expected solution to most electrical issues. He said appliances had to be plugged directly into the wall and that coffee pots were considered appliances. He noted that the Health and Safety website listed a vendor that could provide power strips up to 25 ft long. Miniature nuclear fusion power sources were deemed not appropriate, except for the NASA group, since they were quite knowledgeable about that power source. He said he was happy to work with anyone on issues that were identified.

Adding Senate Budget Subcommittee to the by-laws – First Reading – B. Ford

B. Ford introduced the item. Last year, when the Senate approved the Diversity Subcommittee, Structure and Functions found that the Senate Budget Subcommittee was not in the by-laws even though it had existed for a number of years. He said the language of the amendment to the by-laws was taken from the original charge given to the SBS when it was constituted.

Motion to waive the first reading. Second. Approved.

Vote on by-law amendment – Approved.

Questions for Vice President of Administration and Finance

The Staff Senator asked for a staff member to sit on the CRC. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said there was a tricky balance between staff unions and staff appointments to decision-making committees. He said he was meeting with the Labor Council the next week and would bring it up.

Chair-Elect Report – B. Ford

B. Ford brought forward faculty names for **Senate approval for the Campus Planning Committee – James Dean and Michael Smith and for the Copeland Creek Committee – Dan Karner and Scott Horstein. There were no objections.** He announced other appointments S&F had made to the Space Committee – Elaine McHugh and Richard Whitkus and to the ACE Redesign Committee – Patricia Kim-Rajal. S&F also appointed Deborah Roberts as a one-semester replacement on APC for Dan Karner.

Special Report: Faculty Workstation Refresh Program – J. Wenrick

J. Wenrick talked about the two-phase approach for the faculty workstation refresh program. In the first phase, IT staff will be contacting each faculty member to

discuss their options in the refresh program and if faculty have extra computing needs, they will need to get approval from their Department Chair, Dean and the Dean's Council. J. Wenrick thought that after all workstations were refreshed, there might be a small amount of money left for special needs. If the need was greater than the amount leftover, the Schools and Departments would have to come up with the difference. He hoped that the new machines would be out to users in the Spring. All computers from tenure-track faculty would be brought back to IT to assess whether they were still usable or not. Those that were still usable would be refreshed back out to lecturers. Phase two would be to determine if other usable computers were needed in other areas. He noted that IT would be able to stock some batteries and mice, since now the computers would be more uniform. A member asked about faculty with medical needs. J. Wenrick said that they would follow the same process as faculty with special computer needs and bring DSS into the conversation. He discussed how the files from older faculty computers would be transferred to the new computers. A member asked if there was any prioritizing going on and J. Wenrick asked that faculty let himself and Robin Marshall know if their computers were extremely old or were needed sooner than later. A member asked if more software would become available too. J. Wenrick said he wanted to do an inventory of what departments were using and see if site licenses would be possible for some of the software needs and by doing an inventory he would also be able to categorize what departments were using. A member suggested that departments have a laptop for the department as a whole. J. Wenrick said he would think about that. It was noted that FERP faculty would be in the group with lecturers for getting better equipment. It was clarified that people with ADA requirements should go directly to the Deans for special requests. A member asked about charge backs for turning on an Ethernet connection. J. Wenrick announced that all IT charge backs have been stopped. He said off campus people may have to pay for SSU IT services. A member asked about information that is stored on computers and if the university uses that and how that relates to intellectual property rights. J. Wenrick said that information that the university has on its servers was not looked at unless asked for. He noted that all information on those servers was subject to the public records act.

Final Report from the Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee – B. Lesch-McCaffry

(This material was provided by B. Lesch-McCaffry. To hear her comments about these items, please listen to the meeting on the SSU-5 server)

Looking back to three years ago when the Senate and the faculty expressed concern about a number of issues on campus, including diversity, it is clear that the campus has made significant and tangible progress in a number of areas.

- creation of the Senate's Ad Hoc Task Force on Diversity at the end of the Spring 2008 semester;
- creation of the President's Diversity Council at the beginning of the Fall 2008 semester;
- open forums on diversity (one was held for students on November 19, 2008 and three additional sessions for the campus community were held on March 24, 25 and 26, 2009);
- creation of a web page for the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee with assistance from

Laurel Holmstrom that includes basic information about the committee's charge, as well as all of its reports (during the Fall 2008 semester);

- a Town Hall Meeting on Diversity involving the AHDC, the PDC and the California Faculty Association's Affirmative Action Committee on March 19, 2009;
- return of the Center for Culture, Gender and Sexuality (now named the Multicultural Center or MCC) to the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management in July, 2009;
- referral of the Senate of three faculty members to serve on the advisory board of the Multicultural Center (MCC);
- funding of Halualani and Associates to complete a diversity mapping project whose final report was presented to the campus on 9/28/10;
- funding of a part-time three-year appointment of a Faculty Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence as of the Fall 2010 semester;
- part-time reassignment of three professional staff in Residential Life to provide consistent professional staffing of the Multicultural Center (MCC) as of Fall 2010; and
- creation of a permanent Senate Diversity Subcommittee as of Fall 2010.

In addition, there were resolutions in the Senate:

- creation of the Senate's Ad Hoc Diversity Committee (AHDC) on May 22, 2008;
- passage of a Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes Against Members of the Campus Community that the Senate approved on October 30, 2008;
- approval of a Resolution which contained recommendations regarding the Center for Culture, Gender, and Sexuality (CCGS) that was endorsed by the Student Affairs Committee and the Senate on May 7, 2009; and
- creation of the Senate's Diversity Subcommittee through changes to the by-laws of the Senate (Spring, 2010).

We know that several programs and many people at SSU are engaged in excellent work in support of diversity, but we need to take action with intention and coordination in order to continue to move forward. We are also mindful of the current budget situation that may mean that many of the recommendation that involve funding are unlikely to be implemented immediately.

The following recommendations are either a restatement of those contained in our initial report to the Senate last Fall, or ones emerging from our current report. We have grouped the recommendations into those for students, faculty and staff, university-wide and the Senate and ranked them as "highest priority," "secondary priority" and "tertiary priority."

Recommendations re: Students (Highest Priority)

1. Identify the resources to augment the SAEM budget to fund a minimum of one full-time SSP II or III position in the Multicultural Center (MCC) to work with the three primary groups it was designed to serve. The director's position for the Center still remains unfilled, which has made it especially difficult for students from diverse backgrounds to see the MCC as a resource.
2. Request that the University identify the resources (outside of the existing SAEM

budget) to fund an additional full-time counselor position in Counseling and Psychological Services who can again provide victim's or student advocate support to these students, many of whom have left SSU due to their traumatic experiences and a lack of on-campus support. We urge that it be established and filled this semester so that the students entering SSU this Fall will have an on-campus resource available to them that will be a critical asset in their recovery and retention at SSU (and hopefully avert another complaint being filed with the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights).

3. Request that the University restore funding for the positions in Advising, Career and EOP that were eliminated upon the departure of their incumbents. These are critical positions that actively support retention, especially for low-income, first-generation students.

Recommendations re: Students (Secondary Priority)

4. Request that the Student Union return the third room to the Multicultural Center (it was formerly the Intercultural Center and is currently being used for storage). In addition, we urge that any decision about this space not be limited to ASI, but also include discussions with the Interim Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and the faculty representatives to the newly created advisory board for the Multicultural Center (or the full board).
5. Request that SAEM create a permanent Women's space in the Multicultural Center and develop programming and staffing with expertise in issues specific to the concerns of women.
6. Continue training students in the residential community regarding cultural sensitivity.
7. Request that Advising, Career & EOP Services (ACE) staff who deliver EOP services to a similar special population with a proven record of success continue to serve all RUP students. However, we are concerned about the ability of the currently reduced staff to continue to provide this support in the coming year.
8. Restore funding for programming to the Multicultural Center in conjunction with the history months, the Heritage Month Lecture Series, and Unity through Diversity month.
9. Request that programming through the Multicultural Center and ASP be done in consultations with relevant academic schools and departments (including, but not limited to the history months, the Heritage Month Lecture Series, and Unity through Diversity month).
10. Improve coordination of the specialized graduation celebrations for under-represented students and communication about them to the campus community, especially invitations to those students being honored.
11. Appoint the advisory board for the Multicultural Center and schedule a meeting as soon as feasible. It is also recommended that the issue of a permanent name for the MCC be on the agenda for this advisory committee.
12. Request that SAEM designate a person to be responsible for the recruitment, retention and graduation of students from diverse backgrounds.
13. Request that the University identify ways to support existing diversity efforts and provide enough funding to programs that specifically support diverse students including, but not limited to, the Multicultural Center (MCC), EOP (Educational Opportunity Program), Summer Bridge, the History Month

Celebrations, Unity through Diversity Month, the Heritage Month Lecture Series, Commencement celebrations (Black, Raza and Rainbow), MESA, and Disability Services for Students (DSS).

14. Request that the University restore funding to SAEM at all levels such as advising, career, counseling and psychological services, Disability Services for Students (DSS), Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), University Support and Preparation Services (USPS) and Campus Life. Of particular importance is the need to devote more resources for the Outreach and Recruitment of underrepresented students.

Recommendations re: Students (Tertiary Priority)

15. Restore funding for paid Work-Study internships in the Multicultural Center to ensure more diverse students supporting the clubs that serve under-represented students.
16. Schedule receptions in the Multicultural Center (MCC) based on gender, disabling condition, and religious belief, as these are also groups served by the MCC according to the flyers available at its opening reception.
17. Request that the University identify funding to offer training on best practices for creating effective learning environments in which students feel safe, respected, appreciated, included, motivated, and effective human beings and learners; this includes facilitation of difficult dialogues.

Recommendations re: Faculty and Staff (Highest Priority)

18. Request that Employee Relations and Compliance gather and disseminate relevant and accurate information about the diversity of SSU faculty and staff, as well as strategies for increasing the diversity of our workforce, with department chairs/managers, search committees as searches are initiated, and relevant Senate committees (including Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee (FSAC) and the Diversity Subcommittee).
19. Request that Employee Relations and Compliance provide accurate data to the university and recommend pro-active solutions for any issues related to diversity that are identified (and that the Division of Administration and Finance support increasing the staffing of the ERC for compliance support as soon as budgets permit).

Recommendations re: Faculty and Staff (Secondary Priority)

20. Request that Employee Relations and Compliance, in conjunction with Faculty Affairs and Employee Services, analyze data regarding current faculty and staff with disabling conditions and recommend any necessary pro-active solutions to barriers that are identified and share their recommendations with the Cabinet, SSU Managers, and relevant Senate committees (including Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee (FSAC) and the Diversity Subcommittee).
21. Request that the Vice President for Administration and Finance designate a person to be responsible for the recruitment, retention and promotion of staff and administrators from diverse backgrounds.
22. Request that Employee Relations and Compliance verify all of the data in

PeopleSoft in terms of sex and ethnicity (which is in progress) so that accurate and complete reports can be generated which will allow the University to engage in meaningful planning to enhance its diversity.

23. Request that Employee Relations and Compliance consult with Faculty Affairs and Employee Services in generating the Affirmative Action Plan to ensure the accuracy and relevance of the analyses and that relevant data (including historical trends) be shared with the Cabinet, SSU Managers, and the chairs of academic departments.
24. Request that the University ensure that its Affirmative Action Plan complies with current federal regulations, as well as state and / or system-wide guidelines, and is an accurate reflection of the current workforce.
25. Request an analysis of the staffing and funding of coaches for women's athletics programs in light of the differential salaries of male versus female coaches and the limited number of women coaching women's athletic teams.

Recommendations re: Faculty and Staff (Tertiary Priority)

26. Request that the University provide support for those appointed to any Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence positions and identify funds to provide relevant training to ensure their success in these roles.

University-Wide Recommendations (Highest Priority)

27. Request that the President or the President's Diversity Council establish a prompt and effective system of immediate response to acts of racism, sexism, homophobia, etc. through opening campus dialogue through workshops, town halls, open forums, etc.
28. Request that the President's Diversity Council reinstitute annual Campus Climate surveys of faculty, staff and students to identify areas of concern and recommend appropriate remedies to address them.
29. Request that the President, his Cabinet and the President's Diversity Council take a leadership role in aligning the University goals, funding, and policies to ensure a sustainable diversity infrastructure.

University-Wide Recommendations (Secondary Priority)

30. Request that the University provide sustainable funding to programs that specifically support diverse students: CCGS, EOP/Equal Opportunity Programs, Summer Bridge, History Month Celebrations, Multicultural and other clubs serving underrepresented groups, Commencement celebrations (Black, Raza and Rainbow), and Disability Services for Students/DSS;
31. Request that the Faculty Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence (and those hopefully filling comparable roles for students and staff) address the issue of recognizing that majority professors, staff and students have a crucial role in moving the diversity agenda forward and assist them in so doing.
32. Request that the University review its policies regarding rentals and other charges (use of the dorms, food services) for programs serving underrepresented, low-income and / or first generation students (including the space currently used by the Multicultural Center).

33. Request that the University create a centralized campus resource to effectively communicate and coordinate diversity-related activities and actions.
34. Request that the members of the Senate Diversity Subcommittee, other relevant Senate Committees, the President's Diversity Council and the Director of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence review the University's progress on the recommendations contained in the AHDC reports submitted to the Senate on 10/1/09 and 9/30/10.

University-Wide Recommendations (Tertiary Priority)

35. Request that the University continue to identify ways in which it can provide financial assistance to all students whose citizenship status (AB 540) makes them ineligible for most forms of federal and state support.
36. Request the President's Diversity Council synthesize the recommendations from the Senate's Ad Hoc Diversity Committee into the final version of the campus Strategic Diversity Plan.
37. Request that the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs utilize the existing process through the Senate's Structure and Functions Committee to fill all faculty seats on the President's Diversity Council (which are listed as being annual appointments) and also clarify the terms of service for its current members.
38. Request that the University identify funding to offer training on best practices for creating effective learning environments in which students feel safe, respected, appreciated, included, motivated, and effective human beings and learners; this includes facilitation of difficult dialogues.

Recommendations to the Senate (Highest Priority)

39. Request that the Senate's Structure and Functions Committee ensure that remaining vacant seats on the Senate Diversity Subcommittee are filled as quickly as possible (Student Services professional and a student appointed by the Associated Students).
40. Request that EPC, as well as the Senate and school-wide General Education Committees, follow-up on the curricular issues component of the Diversity Mapping Project report and the need to address issues of diversity across the curriculum.
41. Request that the Senate Diversity Subcommittee follow-up on the recommendations in this report, conduct an analysis of our current curriculum (in conjunction with EPC) in terms of diversity issues, and, on an on-going basis, review the University's progress in addressing diversity issues and, in conjunction with the Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee (FSAC), increasing the diversity of its faculty. We also request that they review the feedback (raw data) received as part of the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee's Open Forums in March of 2009 to determine if further strategies and recommendations should be developed.

Recommendations to the Senate (Secondary Priority)

42. Request that the Senate Diversity Subcommittee (in conjunction with the Faculty

Standards and Affairs Committee) have as part of its responsibility request and review an annual report from Employee Relations and Compliance (ERC) and Faculty Affairs including new hires, promotions, separations and salaries of faculty and staff and request that ERC create a system for ensuring that the reports are based on as accurate and complete sex and ethnicity data as possible.

43. Request that the Senate Diversity Subcommittee and the Senate's Student Affairs Committee review the work of the Multicultural Center, its staffing and its funding on an annual basis.

44. Request that the Senate and its Diversity Subcommittee sponsor an annual campus-wide Diversity Forum to assess our status, monitor the progress of diversity efforts and identify any areas of concern.

CLOSING REMARKS

Diversity has been identified as one of the top priorities of this campus by different entities and it is included in several strategic plans, materials, and reports, as well as the charge of many committees:

- The President Diversity Council (PDC),
- The Academic Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity,
- CFA's Affirmative Action Committee (Sonoma Chapter),
- The Senate Diversity Subcommittee,
- The University's responses to WASC in 2007 and 2009,
- Academic Affairs Strategic Plan,
- GE Reform plan,
- Recent reports from the Academic Senate's Academic Planning and Educational Policies Committees,
- University 102 classes (specific learning objectives),
- New Student Orientation programs (diversity education component), and
- Mission statement of the University and several divisions on campus.

As we stated in our report to the Senate in October of 2009: "*... the question remains: how can we maintain the morale and trust of our SSU community if we do not start taking immediate action despite the current budget crisis? If diversity is a top priority, what will it take to be effective in obtaining funding to [continue to] move the diversity agenda forward in a coordinated fashion?"*

How can we sustain that forward movement? As we said last year, "*We need to align our goals, resources, and actions to invest in and support our current students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds and focus on their success in order to create a truly welcoming, inclusive environment (that is also mirrored in the surrounding community). Only then can we make significant progress in terms of recruitment, retention and graduation or promotion and create an increasingly diverse community at SSU.*"

We know that there are many at SSU who are committed to moving us toward the next steps so that the progress that has been made in the past three years can be both sustained and amplified. We are pleased to have been part of that forward motion on behalf of the SSU community.

A member commended B. Lesch-McCaffry and S. Cabaniss for their hard work on

the Ad-Hoc Diversity committee. He also argued that the campus needed more visible diversity among the students and a way to track the progress of the campus. A member asked how input could be given to the people discussing the use of the other room in the MCC and how would the campus know that an counselor focused on helping victims of sexual assault had been hired. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that the room on the MCC was owned by the Student Union and he had asked the Student Union, the ASI and from hearing this report, would add a person from SAEM, to meet together and talk about what they want to do with that room. He noted it was a student-controlled space. The AS representative asked the Senate Diversity Subcommittee to come to the Associated Students for information and feedback on diversity issues. A member noted the student report from the Ad-Hoc Diversity Committee was online:

<http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/AdHocDiversity.html> and thought the Senate Diversity Subcommittee could look at the data again to see how the campus was doing. A member asked why it was difficult to get information about faculty and staff. B. Lesch-McCaffry noted the complicated process of collecting data and said that since staffing was low in Human Resources, it further complicated the issue. She noted that HR was trying to obtain better data now. The member asked about the mention of a gang rape and whether that was communicated to the campus community at large. B. Lesch-McCaffry said she was aware of two gang rapes that had been reported to the police. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he was confident that the police followed their procedures correctly in these cases and reported correctly since the new Chief of Policy was a nationally recognized expert in this area. The President reiterated that every employee had mandatory reporting requirements if students came to them with reports of sexual assault. He said that to his knowledge such a report of previous gang rapes have not been reported. A member noted the Cleary Act reporting requirements.

(<http://www.sonoma.edu/ps/home/jeanneclery.html>)

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson noted the written report in the packet. She highlighted a few items in the report. She said that SB1440 had been signed by the Governor and the CSU was putting together a task force of community college faculty and CSU faculty to help with implementation. She noted that the Graduation Initiative conference on Oct. 8th was geared toward the graduation rates of under represented groups and that she would attend for the Statewide Senate. She noted that long time members of the Statewide Senate were saying they had seen a great deterioration in the relationship between the faculty and administrators statewide and that every administrator that attended their meetings the previous week had said they wanted to “repair” the relationship with the faculty. She reported that the Governor had still not appointed a faculty trustee. She described the regular process the Statewide Senate usually went through to send faculty trustee names to the Governor that was underway again.

Revision to Learning Objectives for Areas A and C – First Reading - T. Stearns

T. Stearns introduced the item by reminding the Senate of the process by which the learning outcomes had been created. He noted that previously when the learning

outcomes were first generated, they came to the Senate as information items. With the approval by the Senate of the Arts and Humanities GE reform proposal, the faculty working groups were re-convened to re-look at the learning objectives for areas A and C. There were questions about whether an information item could become a business item. The Chair responded that since all Senate committees were advisory to the Senate, the Senate could not be precluded from addressing information that was brought to the body. The member asked if the learning objectives could be amended before approval. The Chair said that at a first reading suggestions could be made and the Chair of EPC could then take those back to committee for the second reading. T. Stearns advised the body that the GE Subcommittee had sometimes amended the learning objectives that came from the faculty working groups, but that the faculty working groups did not always accept those amendments. There were further process comments. A member suggested EPC re-number the areas since Area A1 went away. T. Stearns noted that the articulation agreements made renumbering the areas problematic. The Chair of FSAC noted that FSAC asked the Senate to respect the work of their colleagues and **moved to accept the learning objectives as they were. Second. The Chair noted that it was still a first reading and that a motion to waive the first reading was in order.** T. Stearns noted a discussion in EPC about the nature of learning objectives where they decided that learning objectives were guiding language and not curriculum per se. A member argued that the learning objectives were linked to resource allocations. T. Stearns argued that the learning objective were not linked to resources, specific courses and GE reforms might be linked, but not the objectives. The member then noted the disappearance of the philosophy department in the learning objectives revision. A member asked if the absence of Area A1 also presented articulation problems. T. Stearns responded that the question was part of the A&H GE reform implementation and articulation questions would be handled during the implementation.

Further comments about Final Ad-Hoc Diversity Report

A member noted that the commitment to diversity had been taken up by the university and so it should find a space for diverse students to gather together. A member noted that graduate students in the MFT program were always looking for internships and perhaps the more advanced students could do an internship for student advocate counseling. The Chair of SAC said she thought that if the VP of SAEM had the money, he would hire such a position.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström Vega