

**Senate Executive Committee**  
August 24, 2017  
3:00 – 5:00 PM, Academic Affairs conference room

**Abstract**

Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 5/11/17 approve. Chair report. President Report. Provost Report. Graduation form – request to digitize. Digitizing Operations and Relations with International partners. Debrief of Commencement. SEIE Grievance policy referred to SAC. Senate Agenda approved. Periodic Review of Coaches.

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

**Guests:** Matt Benny for Michael Young, David Croizer for Joyce Lopes, Jacob Yarrow, Bill Kidder

The chair welcomed everyone to the first Executive Committee and asked for introductions all around.

**Approval of Agenda** - Item added: Periodic Review of unit three coaches. **Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes of 5/11/17 – Approved.**

**Chair report - C. Works**

C. Works noted that the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) met in the morning and she thought the Provost would report on that meeting. She said she would like to see a report about the budget at the Senate. She noted that she had started to read the GE Program Review and found it very interesting. She reminded the members about the WASC visit in October and noted that everyone needed to be on the same page by October 15<sup>th</sup>. It was clarified that the actual visit would be on October 24 - 27. She discussed the recent changes to the Executive Orders 1100 and 1110. EO 1100 now states that upper division GE can only be from areas B, C, and D. The requirement will be three units from each area. The date of implementation for this change is Fall 2018. In addition, the cap on GE programs will change from 50 to 48. She thought this was a huge change in the GE program and questioned whether this could be done by Fall 2018. EO 1110 is focused on assessment and academic preparation. She said this eliminates "remedial" courses by next fall. The EPC chair noted that EO 1100 had quite a bit of detail beyond the number of units and upper division GE. She said the AVP of Academic Programs and the Chair of the GE subcommittee were still combing through the Executive Order to prioritize how it can be addressed. A member voiced concern about the consultative process for the change in EO 1100. A member asked if the Chancellor's office would be compensating departments or faculty that would have to implement this change. The member also asked if there were any Senate processes that could address the "ridiculousness" of the timeline. The Provost noted that many campuses had similar

concerns. There was funding from the Chancellor's office for the math changes. She said, in terms of consultation, everyone was feeling squeezed. She thought the campus would see the most impact with Early Start. The changes to GE were not funded. This effort was being driven by the Graduation Initiative and the Chancellor's office was responding to significant pressure from the legislature. EO 1110 was in direct response to legislation. The Provost said her office would help support the faculty in their efforts to do the curricular changes. As far as she knew, the deadlines were not soft. The President said the President's were also concerned about the timing and consultation. She believed that was heard by the Chancellor. She knew the Chancellor would be bringing this to the Statewide Senate. A member noted the difference in consultation between the two executive orders. The GE changes have been in the works for a couple of years. The Quantitative Reasoning Task Force helped kick this off. They encouraged the ASCSU to put together a GE task force. That was convened and they met three times. Unfortunately, the Chancellor's office went ahead with the Executive Order without getting the final report from the GE task force. He thought there had been a good process going, but the Chancellor's office jumped in earlier than they should. EO 1110 was a different matter. The campus received a letter about this on May 14, which was after the last Senate meeting and asked for feedback within 30 days. This precluded any meaningful consultation on campuses. Our campus along with others passed a resolution stating that this was not the way to go about changes:

<http://web.sonoma.edu/senate/resolutions/CodedMemoASA201714.html>.

All these resolutions were ignored and they issued the executive order anyway. There was no consultation at all on EO 1110 and it is very problematic.

### **President Report – J. Sakaki**

The President said the kickoff to the new semester was going well. She enjoyed meeting the new faculty. Move-in day was fun and the excitement was palpable. She thought there were opportunities for more engagement from other parts of campus with this process. She thought the barbecue was an excellent opportunity to talk with students, their families and their brothers and sisters and encourage those brothers and sisters to think about college. There could be tabling and other things going on at the same time to make it better. She said to stay tuned. Big Night was also a success. She and other members of her cabinet walked around during the night and they talked about, perhaps, doing a smaller version in the spring. For WASC, she would be meeting with Chancellor Leland who is the lead on the team that will visit the campus. She will talk to her about how the campus can best prepare for their visit. She reported on the Council of Campus Presidents meeting. Two items of interest were improvements to the Title IX area systemwide and campus climates and the activism that might be seen on campuses given current events. Two campuses, Fullerton and Bakersfield have been "selected" to host Milo Yiannopoulos. What they are finding is that groups outside of campus are selecting student clubs or organizations, to gain access to campus. Because we are a public university, all speakers can come to campus, but we must know what they are bringing to campus, so that we can make sure everyone is safe. A member asked whether our nondiscrimination policies and policies against hate speech, couldn't be used to prevent people from coming on campus that are not following those

policies. The President said we cannot. The university needs to be a place for the free exchange of ideas, even ideas we find offensive. She noted that the campus could prevent people from speaking in the Green Music Center, but not outdoors in the free-speech area. The Provost said the best "defense" is to have an updated Time, Place and Manner policy. B. Kidder discussed aspects of the current Time, Place and Manner policy. A member noted an article in the New York Times about campuses being a focus for amplification of the alt-right. A member said he had been approached by student to start a Turning Points USA club on campus. He said this kind of club was tangentially supportive of Milo Yiannopoulos. He was in conversation with the Student Affairs division about this request and thought this conversation was very salient. The Student Rep offered his understanding of free speech and noted that he was seeing more activism on campus. He thought it was important to keep communication open between students, administrators and faculty to talk about how students could respond to these kinds of events and keep the campus safe. A member said that denying one group, that is not liked, the right to speak, could deny other groups, that are liked, the right to speak, so it was a delicate balance. He said he thought it was important that faculty help students understand these issues and deal with them. The President shared her story of having to deal with the Ku Klux Klan at Fresno State. She thought these were challenging times and this may just be the beginning. B. Kidder said first, there would be an interim Time, Place and Manner policy and then it would go through consultation. The President updated members on the current executive searches.

The President introduced Jacob Yarrow, the new Executive Director of the Green Music Center. J. Yarrow discussed his vision for the Green Music Center and highlighted events upcoming. He hoped to see the GMC become central to campus life and to the community. He said they were seriously considering providing \$10 ticket prices to students for shows in the GMC during the school year.

The Past Chair asked about the status of the campus incident team. B. Kidder said there was a strategic preparedness workgroup. The Provost said that they were looking at this workgroup to see if it really met the need and had the right constitution of members. The Past Chair said he was the designee to the GMC board this year. He was interested in enhancing faculty interaction with the center.

### **Provost Report - L. Vollendorf**

L. Vollendorf said she had been doing a lot of listening and there was more to do. Overall, she understood that the campus had focused more on some areas than others. Of concern to her and to the CFO, was the low amount of money in the University reserves - only one half million. A member asked what the amount in the reserves should be. The Provost said there is no magic formula but perhaps \$7 to \$10 million. She said as they continued to understand the budget, they were being mindful of how changes may have a domino effect. It had taken her a month to understand the Academic Affairs budget and this was inappropriate. It should not be that complicated. The current budget model gives more money to schools when they lower their SFR year over year. At the PBAC meeting, she understood that, historically, the budget had not been presented in the most straightforward manner. She said they knew that salaries were an issue. She said they had done a wall-to-wall

review for staff and for administrators. The review for faculty would come soon. It will take a multiyear plan to remedy all the salary issues. In terms of technology, there will be a 360 review by a member of the Chancellor's office. They will assess the needs of all stakeholders and make recommendations to the campus. Some of the things that need attention are: the learning management system, basic classroom standards, refresh programs for everyone, and catalog management. She noted that the system signed an agreement with the Student Success Collaborative, which would give the campus predictive analytics and an early warning system. She then discussed the needs of the physical plant. She said she looked forward to continuing to learn from everybody.

A member said she would like to see the conversations about the Academic Affairs budget to be about the quality of the education, and not a measure such as SFR. While she appreciated that a strategic planning process would be undertaken, she was concerned that some decisions had already been made without campus conversations, at least with the Senate. The Provost said her understanding of the Graduation Initiative money was that it was talked about in PBAC earlier. One of the challenges with the Graduation Initiative money is that when it comes in, it appears un-earmarked, which it is not. She said she believed very strongly that to have these budget discussions, it was important to understand the parameters, then we can be smarter in providing feedback and understanding where we can and can't spend the money. The GI money could not be put toward an equity plan. The growth money was put toward faculty hires since that was identified last year through conversations as a priority for supporting student success. She thought the conversations around budgeting would be rich, and she looked forward to it. A member suggested that the campus needed to have a conversation about why students needed to graduate sooner as well. The Chair said she was scheduling brown bag lunches with the Provost for the coming year and this discussion could be one of the themes.

### **Graduation form - A. Gilinsky**

A. Gilinsky said three of his students were told they could not graduate within two weeks of Commencement because their graduation forms had been misplaced. He asked why we still had the arcane system of paper graduation forms for both undergraduates and graduates. He argued that changing this to an electronic form would free up faculty time for more meaningful conversations with students and free up space in department offices. M. Benney responded that Student Affairs was already working on this. They may provide an interim system until they get full functionality with the auto grad feature of CMS. The Provost said she and the CFO wanted to streamline forms and would be working on that very soon. A member said she appreciated forms that brought students in for advising, particularly in departments with high advising ratios. She thought there may be many unintended consequences to shifting to electronic forms. She hopes the process would be transparent and there could be more consultation. J. Mahdavi volunteered to be on any committee that re-looked at forms. The Chair suggested that M. Benney talk to the Academic Advising subcommittee about electronic graduation forms. M. Benney said he had been working with that committee and the campus was at an opportune time to change the advising model. He wanted to start having discussions about that

with everybody. EPC requested to be in the loop on this process.

### **Digitizing Operations and Relations with International partners - D. Wilson**

D. Wilson asked if there was a strategy for bringing the university into the 21st century. The Provost said that is what she and Joyce were committed to. She said the campus needs business process improvement to lessen the risk she saw in the current use of forms. The problem was that a lot needed to be fixed. There was further discussion about problems with forms and technology. D. Wilson also brought up digital publishing for faculty and the RTP process. He didn't think this was being recognized properly. The Chair said that such a recognition could be in the department RTP criteria which is reviewed by FSAC. She said it was important for departments to clearly articulate what they mean by scholarship. D. Wilson said he was surprised to find that there was no procedure or support for developing relationships between SSU and other universities internationally. He had been meeting with Hope Ortiz in International programs and with Rob Eyler in SEIE. He asked if anybody else knew about this and wanted to be part of the discussion to move this effort forward. The Provost offered to follow-up.

### **Debrief of Commencement - J. Mahdavi**

The Chair noted that Commencement had been different last year than previous years. There had been no debriefing since the ceremony. J. Mahdavi asked if the Commencement Planning workgroup was going to meet to discuss what went well and what didn't. The Past Chair said the workgroup did want to meet again and he would be happy to work with the Provost to have that happen. He suggested that the Senate's role in Commencement would be to discuss the faculty role in the ceremonies. He suggested that Structure and Functions discuss the faculty role in commencement and provide some recommendations for next year. He had attended all six commencement ceremonies and found the faculty role to be very different in the ceremonies. A member suggested a report to the Senate on this matter. B. Kidder suggested, that as part of this conversation, to discuss the cultural graduations as well. He noted that a number of these had overlapping times. He thought the campus was outgrowing the slender staffing and student run cultural graduations. This is this an important part of the student experience and he looked forward to strategizing how to do this better. The Provost volunteered to put the committee together to do the debrief and the Past Chair offered to send her the names of the previous members. A member noted that the Associated Students had passed a resolution requesting a fall commencement. It was clarified that approximately 600 students graduate in the fall semester. The Chair noted that the Arts and Humanities student speaker delivered a somewhat controversial poem and she hoped that the committee would also talk about parameters for speakers.

### **SEIE Grievance policy - information to Senate? - R. Lopez**

The Chair reminded the members that the Senate had not passed the revision to the Grievance policy because it referenced a policy in SEIE that did not exist at that time. SEIE had provided the draft in the packet to the SAC and the Senate office, however this draft is problematic. R. Lopez discussed the issues with the policy in more

detail. There was some discussion. A member, who has served on the Dispute Resolution Board, suggested that the board go ahead and hear all cases from SEIE. Another member argued that it was not appropriate for the campus to hear grievances from some of the programs in SEIE such as the Excel program. A member voiced concern about the unclear relationship between SEIE and the rest of campus. The Chair of APARC said that the relationship between SEIE and academics was on their agenda for this year. It was suggested that the draft policy from SEIE return to SAC for more review and for SAC to return next time with a grievance policy that could move forward. SAC accepted this task.

## **Senate Agenda**

### **AGENDA**

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Carmen Works

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – emailed

**End of year reports:** Senate, UPRS, AFS, GE - emailed

**Information Item:** Time, Place and Manner policy – attached

**Special Report:** SSU Budget – Laura Lupei and Joyce Lopes - TC 3:30

### **Business:**

1. New Presentation about Roberts Rules – attached.
2. Discussion of representative role – C. Works
3. iPads for Senate
4. Group Photo

### **Approved.**

## **Periodic Review of Coaches - A. Gilinsky**

The Chair said this item was coming to the Ex Com from FSAC and Steven Winter. She was confused about this item because the existing policy on the evaluation of temporary faculty specifically includes coaches. She had heard that this policy was for Head coaches. She thought this needed to be presented to the coaches by September 5th. A. Gilinsky said that this was coming forward for interim approval in the unlikely case that FSAC does not approve this during the academic year. He provided background on the policy development. He said FSAC had this on their agenda for the first meeting. He was not quite sure why it came to the Ex Com. The Chair asked if this was going to become “blue paper” policy. A. Gilinsky said, yes, they did want it to become “blue paper” policy. There was discussion about the

proper procedure for this item. It was decided that if any members had feedback on the policy to send that to FSAC.

**Adjourned.**

*Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes*