

Executive Committee Minutes

May 9, 2019

3:00-5:00, Academic Affairs Conference room

Abstract

Agenda – Approved. Minutes of 4/25/19 – Approved. Chair Report. President Report. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Associated Students Report. From S&F: Request to waive by-laws for URTP semester appointment – Approved. From EPC: Theater Arts BA - Minimal revision to Acting Concentration – Approved for the Senate consent calendar. From EPC: Theater Arts BA - Revision to Dance concentration. From EPC: Revision to GEP – all concentrations. More Provost report. Memo from S&F regarding appeals of Senate decisions – two motions made and approved. Senate Agenda approved.

Present: Laura Watt, Melinda Milligan, Carmen Works, Damien Wilson, Jeffrey Reeder, Mark Perri, Jenn Lillig, Rita Premo, Ron Lopez, Laura Krier, Carlos Torres, Judy Sakaki, Lisa Vollendorf, Wm. Gregory Sawyer, Neil Markley for Joyce Lopes

Absent: Erma Jean Sims

Guests: John Dunstan, Daniel Yoeono

Approval of Agenda – Approved.



Approval of Minutes of 4/25/19 – Approved.

Chair Report – L. Watt

L. Watt reported that the candidates for the Social Science Dean position will be on campus next week. Open forms for the candidates will be announced soon. She noted that meetings would be happening with the design/build team for faculty to specifically talk about classroom spaces. She noted she had sent out an email to all faculty about where we are with the GE curriculum revision. She talked about the membership changes to the Ex Com for next year and thanked those leaving the committee for their work.

President Report – J. Sakaki

- Elisabeth Walter is our new campus counsel.
- President Sakaki is looking forward to commencement.
- President Sakaki thanked everyone on the Executive Committee for their hard work this year.

- President Sakaki just returned from WACUBO (Western Association of College and University Business Officers), where she gave the keynote address.

Provost Report – L. Vollendorf

- School of Education dean search committee currently being formed.
- Admissions: we are still expecting to have a smaller than usual incoming class, so we are very focused on reducing the “summer melt.” We have our new AVP of Admissions and Recruitment, Barbara Godoy, on board now. She started May 6.
- Gmail migration on track to happen over Memorial Day weekend.
- Provost Vollendorf and the deans will be posting various faculty leadership opportunities soon, including: five (5) faculty associate dean positions for the academic schools that include up to 6 WTU assigned time plus a modest stipend (these positions will support the deans and the schools to move our strategic priorities of Student Success and Academic Excellence and Innovation forward and to support academic resource planning in the schools); a faculty director of sustainability to serve on the Sustainability Advisory Council (SAC) and to chair the academic working group under the auspices of the SAC; and a faculty director to support further implementation of the Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI).

Statewide Senator Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder reported that the ASCSU will meet next week. They will address the GE Task Force report. A member thanked J. Reeder for his assistance with newer members about being on the Ex Com.

Vice Chair Report – M. Milligan

M. Milligan reported that S&F will meet next Tuesday in anticipation of potential process issues of the Senate that may need review.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – N. Markley for J. Lopes

- Governor’s revised budget was published today. An additional \$8M was provided to the CSU, \$6.5M of which is directed to house homeless and housing insecure students. Other funding is for Project Rebound and other programs. <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/news/Pages/May-Revision-Continues-Proposed-Increases-in-Funding-for-California-State-University.aspx>
- We received approval yesterday from the fire marshal to open Marina Crossing in Petaluma. Hooray! June 1 will be the move-in day.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report – Wm. G. Sawyer

- We have a lot of graduation celebrations coming up! We had a wonderful Veterans’ graduation celebration May 4. EOP is today.

- The Turning Point recent tabling and lecture on campus gave student groups and students a chance to find a way to express themselves and show leadership in situations in which different opinions are being expressed. We were very proud of our students and the respectful approach they took.

Associated Students Report – J. Dunstan

J. Dunstan said the semester was winding down, so not much is going on in student government. He expressed his appreciation of the student groups during the Turning Point tabling and how well the event actually went. He offered to send the names of all the new student leaders to the Senate Analyst.

From S&F: Request to waive by-laws for URTP semester appointment – M. Milligan

M. Milligan noted that the Senate by-laws require that two names come forward for a semester replacement on URTP to the Ex Com for appointment. Since only one name is coming forward she asked the Ex Com to waive the by-laws and appoint Nathan Rank. The second person who volunteered realized they needed to serve on an RTP committee at a lower level. **The Ex Com approved the appointment of Nathan Rank as semester replacement to URTP.**

From EPC: Theater Arts BA - Minimal revision to Acting Concentration – J. Lillig

J. Lillig said EPC was requesting this item be on the consent calendar of the Senate. The changes made a more coherent program which included movement as well as voice. **It was approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

From EPC: Theater Arts BA - Revision to Dance concentration – J. Lillig

J. Lillig said EPC was requesting this item be on the consent calendar of the Senate. She said the department removed the “dance block” and added courses in teaching and broaden the concentration to include more varieties of dance styles. **It was approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

From EPC: Revision to GEP – all concentrations – J. Lillig

J. Lillig said EPC was requesting this item be on the consent calendar of the Senate. These revisions were a result of the comments from the Chancellor’s office after they reviewed the merger of ENSP and Geography in to GEP. **It was approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

More Provost report

L. Vollendorf discussed faculty associate dean positions that would be forthcoming. These positions would have common positions descriptions, additional salary and 6 units of release time. In Education and Business, faculty have already been identified for this position. A faculty director of Sustainability will be sought to oversee the Academic group for the President’s Leadership Climate Commitment. Another

faculty position will be created for ATI. These positions are all directed towards faculty leadership development.

Memo from S&F regarding appeals of Senate decisions – M. Milligan

M. Milligan introduced the item from S&F regarding more detail about how an appeal of a Senate decision would happen. The memo advises the Ex Com about the process, format and timing of appeals. Given what happened at the last Senate meeting regarding the proposal for a referendum, she asked the Ex Com to be clear about both processes and make decisions or refer any questions to S&F.

The Chair expressed concern about the short time left in the semester to hold a referendum. She noted that the last time the campus had a referendum was the no confidence vote in 2007. At that time, it took some time to gather the pro and con statements. She asked if only having a week to put a referendum together was reasonable. She was concerned about faculty being busy with Commencement and grading.

M. Milligan noted that such a vote could not move over to the fall because the curricular package would not have been approved by the Senate and it would go back to EPC as per our guidelines for carrying over business. She was concerned about how much fairness could be achieved gathering the pro and con statements and a resource statement in such a short time frame. She also asked the Ex Com to discuss what threshold a referendum vote would need to have to be valid and what percentage of votes would be needed for a decision.

The Chair cited the Constitution on holding referenda:

After being approved by the Academic Senate, the Senate election process shall be made available for faculty referenda on critical issues. Referenda shall include pro and con statements and resource implications statements. Only referenda that emerge from the Senatorial process shall be recognized by the Senate as reflecting faculty opinion.

Thus, pro and con statements are not optional.

It was clarified that if the curricular package was sent to an all faculty vote and the threshold for the vote was not reached, the GE curricular package would fail, because the Senate has not approved it. Not reaching the threshold would function as a no vote.

It was asked what version of the proposal would go to a vote of all faculty, the EPC approved version or the amended version from the Senate. There was discussion about this question. It was not decided which version would go to a vote of all faculty.

The Chair noted that for a Constitutional vote, 50% of the faculty need to vote and 2/3rd of those need to affirm for a constitutional amendment to pass. This was the only threshold for a full faculty votes in our documents.

It was clarified that an appeal would carry over to the next academic year, but an appeal can only happen once the Senate makes a decision.

A member asked: if the GE curriculum is voted down in the Senate or by a vote of all the faculty, it dies and would it not go back to EPC? The Chair noted that if the vote fails, then EO1100 will be implemented over the summer. EPC could take it back up in the Fall and determine what changes need to be made.

A member noted he thought that the folks who were promoting the full faculty vote had a desire to be heard. He recommended setting the vote requirement at 50% +1 instead of 2/3rds. If a low number of faculty actually vote, then it will be on the faculty what happens.

A member suggested reminding the Senate that the GE curriculum could come back to the floor in the Fall. The Chair noted that she thought this was actually the beginning and changes could come through our processes at any point in the future.

A member argued for a 50% threshold for the vote turnout as that would be equivalent to a quorum.

Discussion returned to whether a referendum could actually be held after May 16th.

A member asked if the folks that wanting a full faculty vote are thinking that being able to cast a vote constitutes having a "voice." This was affirmed.

It was noted that any changes to a new GE curriculum, could come to EPC and go through the normal curriculum revision process. If this GE curricular revision goes back to EPC, they will ask for guidance from the Senate. Amendments can still be offered at the second reading at the Senate.

A member said many faculty are just now realizing what is happening and had not fully digested the proposal.

The Senate Analyst hoped the history of GE reform at SSU she provided was helpful to the Ex Com and argued that, in her experience, particularly with the no confidence vote in 2007, she did not see how a referendum could be managed between the Senate meeting on May 16th and the end of the semester on May 23rd.

A member suggested that the pro statements were already written in the current GE proposal, so we might only need to gather con statements. He suggested that there were two main camps of con viewpoints – people who participated but did not see their ideas reflected in the revision and those who are just realizing what's going on at the 11th hour. He thought the latter group was the largest.

A member argued that it was important for the referendum to at least be heard on the Senate floor as she was hearing grumbling about faculty leadership on this issue.

The Chair noted she was one of the last people to know about the referendum petition and heard from more than three people that they did not understand what

the petition was for when they signed it and were seeking clarification. She was concerned about faculty wanting to have a protest vote about EO1100.

A member voiced concern that pro and con statements and a resource implication statement could be actually be written, questions debated, rebuttals given, statements vetted for facts and voted on in a week. She expressed the view that this was irresponsible from a workload perspective. We have a representative body to work through all the materials and get questions answered. She was concerned that most faculty did not have the time to do this and who would answer their questions after the end of the semester? This was not democracy.

A member argued that the referendum was calling for something that hasn't happened yet. For people who feel they haven't been heard, they need to go to their Senators, so Senators can do their job. He said the referendum smacked of arrogance since those wanting the referendum were disregarding the hard work of faculty for the past 18 months who had the best of interests for our campus GE program.

It was noted that the decision about the threshold for the vote could be referred to S&F.

The Chair wanted the Ex Com to decide whether the referendum item comes first on the Senate agenda or the GE curricular revision comes first.

A member argued that the referendum item should go first, so people feel heard. She argued that S&F should decide the details of any referendum and any voting threshold.

A member argued that since the referendum did not get a first reading at the last Senate, so they should go first this time.

A member argued it would not make sense to have the first reading of the referendum after the GE curricular item, especially if the GE curriculum revision was approved.

The Senate Analyst reminded the Ex Com that they could make a recommendation to the Senate about what the Ex Com thinks about the possibility of a referendum.

A member argued that the GE curricular revision should go first since it's been in process for longer.

A member agreed that the referendum should go first on the Senate agenda and perhaps there should be a limit on the time for each speaker.

A member noted that the Senate had already passed a resolution against EO1100.

Motion that the Ex Com recommend against the referendum due to it being logically impossible. Second. The Chair said she would send it out on email with the recommendation for the Ex Com to review. There was some discussion empathizing that the recommendation was only about process. **Approved.**

The Chair asked the Ex Com to refer the referendum voting threshold decision and logistics of a referendum vote overall to S&F. Second. Approved.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – L. A. Watt

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes – emailed

Consent Items: Theater Arts BA - Minimal revision to Acting concentration, Revision to Dance concentration; Revision to all GEP concentrations – emailed

Business

1. Resolution for referendum – all faculty vote on GE curriculum revision – S. Bryant – First Reading - attached TC 3:10
2. Elect At-Large to Ex Com – M. Milligan TC 3:25
3. From EPC: GE Curriculum Revision – Second Reading – J. Lillig (*please bring your 4/18 and 5/2 agenda, amended version attached*) TC 3:30
4. From SAC: Revision to SAC charge – Second Reading – R. Lopez –TC 4:00 (*please bring your 5/2 agenda*)
5. From APARC: Strategic Priorities for 2019-2020 – Second Reading – M. Perri – TC 4:10 – *updated document attached*
6. From SAC: Request to endorse Academic Advising Task Force Report – Second Reading – R. Lopez (*please bring your 4/18 agenda*) TC 4:20

Approved.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes