

Senate Executive Committee Minutes
September 21, 2017
3:00-5:00, Academic Affairs conference room

Abstract

Agenda approved. Minutes of 9/7/17 approved. Chair Report. President Report. Provost Report. Revision to Economics minor approved for the consent calendar. Strategic Planning dialog. EPC Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report (question). ILOs (Institutional Learning Outcomes) discussion. Follow up on Senate discussions of RSCA and EO 1100 and EO 1110. Senate agenda approved.

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

Absent: Ron Lopez, Joyce Lopes

Guest: Madeleine Klein for Jason Gorelick

Approval of Agenda – Item added: Follow up on Senate discussions. **Approved.**

Approval of Minutes of 9/7/17 - Approved.

Chair Report - C. Works

C. Works reported that she had participated in the process of hiring a new Chief of Staff for the President and appreciated the input she received about participating. She announced the brown bag lunches with herself and the Provost that will be starting on September 25th and the topic for that day will be WASC. It will be held from 12 to 1 in the Library conference room.

President Report – J. Sakaki

The President noted that she had just returned from the CSU Board of Trustees meeting. She said their agenda had been very full and the minutes from the meeting were available online. <https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2017/Pages/September-19-20-2017.aspx>. One of the exciting things that happened was the Trustees Award given to one of our students – Jennifer Juarez Yoc. She received a \$6000 scholarship. She has an amazing story given that her family had to flee Guatemala, and now she's posed to become a doctor. Her father was present and expressed how proud he was of her. The President discussed a new gift of art that will be received by the University – paintings by Joan Baez. The paintings will be displayed in the Green Music Center for an event and then will find a home elsewhere on campus. There is hope that, one day, the campus could have a building dedicated to social justice and the paintings could be in that lobby. She noted that the GMC Board will have a retreat on October 2nd and she had met with the Chair of the WASC visiting team. A member asked if

the Art department had been part of the discussion about the gift. The President said, yes, and it had been a very quick timeline. A member asked if the committee could receive the position description for the Chief of Staff. This was affirmed and a copy was emailed to the members. A member noted that she had heard from faculty and students that the police were videotaping people around the DACA protest event on campus. She wondered if this was standard practice of the police, and wondered what happened to the recordings. Faculty and students found this intimidating, particularly because it was around DACA. The President said she was not aware of this practice and would follow-up. She also noted that the CSSA and the faculty would be bringing a resolution to the Board of Trustees regarding supporting our DACA students and staff and the Board welcomed such a resolution.

Provost Report - L. Vollendorf

L. Vollendorf reported that the space utilization study had begun and they hoped to see it done early in the spring semester. She said the review of learning management systems had also begun and she had given J. Lipp the direction to have the LMS focus on teaching and learning. The 360 review of Information Technology will take place after the WASC visit. This will be a baselining review of IT and will be done with the help of the Chancellor's office. This will provide an overview that helps the campus quickly and efficiently look at the unit and what two or three top issues should be focused on in the short term and in the long term. She discussed the transition in OFRSP, and said that Gabby Utarid will take on some extra duties during the transition. They were starting to put together a position description for an AVP of Research and Sponsored programs. She said she hoped this would be viewed as an investment in faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities on the campus, and sets us up to strengthen this area. The Chair asked about the WASC meeting, and wondered if the attendees got the sense that the campus was preparing adequately. The President and the Provost said the meeting was primarily about logistics and understanding how the groups they would be meeting with aligned with the lines of inquiry.

Revision to Economics minor - M. Milligan

M. Milligan introduced the item. She said it was a very minor change to the minor. It was **approved as a consent item for the Senate** agenda.

Strategic Planning dialog - L. Vollendorf

L. Vollendorf offered her thinking so far about strategic planning. She thought that guiding principles are useful in a strategic planning process and thought that the Seawolf Commitment was a good place for SSU to start. Additionally, she thought inclusivity, integrity, respect, and follow through could be called out in addition to the Seawolf Commitment. She stressed the need for goals in the plan. The goals of the planning process are to articulate our mission, vision and values, as well as identifying areas of strength and pride, areas of improvement, and opportunities for growth, change, and adaptation. Her sense was that there are many ways to frame these ideas that could prove very powerful, and she wanted to do this process in a way that helped everyone dream to build the future together. She discussed the limitations of using a SWOT analysis. She thought the approach of *appreciative*

inquiry could be very powerful for SSU. She said a strategic plan should be a living document. She wanted to have multiple voices and multiple ways to give input into the process. A member suggested that “follow through” could be folded into the “integrity” principle. He expressed his belief that the campus was ready for strategic planning, and thought the appreciative inquiry method was a good idea. A member argued for more work during the strategic planning process regarding SSU’s distinctive identity. The Provost then discussed her ideas for the process, including a strategic planning task force. Her initial thoughts about the task force was that it would be co-chaired by herself and the Faculty Chair, and would include three faculty, three students, three staff members, a community member, and an alum. She discussed in some detail how the task force would reflect the diversity of the campus. She said a consultancy group would help us with the process. A member suggested that the tension between WASC asking the campus about its distinctive identity and the Chancellor’s office appearing to want the campuses to be more similar be part of the conversation about distinctiveness. A member voiced concern about the nomination process and the definition of diversity for the task force. A member argued for the faculty to be determined through faculty selection processes, such as an election or a nomination and appointment by Structure and Functions and the Executive Committee. He thought this would lend the process more credibility. A member thought that many faculty were interested in the strategic planning process and the amount of people that want to be involved may become overwhelming. He also suggested that the plan group ideas into two or three areas. A member suggested that the call could stipulate what was being asked for, such as faculty at different levels of their career. The Provost thought existing processes could be used, and further discussed her vision for the task force, emphasizing the members’ roles as facilitators and not advocates.

EPC Report - M. Milligan

M. Milligan said that with the specter of EO 1100 so prominent, she had not had time to let the committee know the other things EPC was doing. She reported that K. Moranski was working on a document that would clearly indicate a lot of the implications of EO 1100. She said that the interpretation of EO 1100 seems to change every day, and they continue to learn new things from the Chancellor’s office. On September 29, there will be a webinar about EO 1100 at 2:00 p.m. in the same room as this meeting. They were preparing questions for the webinar in advance. She reported that the GE subcommittee decided today to pause review and approval of any new GE courses or revisions that are substantial in nature for all of Fall ‘17. A memo regarding this will be sent out soon to all faculty. She discussed the current curricular review process that now included deadlines. They had asked departments and programs to send them a message of intent to revise their programs. Now, they had quite an extensive list of programs that expect to change their curriculum in ‘17 - ‘18. She described how the catalog process would be a bit more flexible due to this change for programs that filed an intent to revise. She reviewed the EPC deadlines for curricular changes. She said EPC was working with SEIE to fix issues with courses being mounted in SEIE that were not fully approved. She reviewed curricular items that will be coming forward next time. EPC was working on a policy revisions for the Discontinuance Policy. This revision was based on the seeing a number of discontinuances last year. They will change it to a discontinuance and suspension policy to give more flexibility to programs. It was clarified that all

certificates would be listed in the catalog now.

Statewide Senator Report - J. Reeder

J. Reeder reported that most of the discussion at the Statewide Senate meeting was focused on EO 1100 and EO 1110. The Senate passed a second resolution to preserve the DACA program. The Senate endorsed SB 19. It allows community colleges to have the first year of the college be free of tuition. Statewide Chair Miller addressed the Board of Trustees and her remarks are available on You Tube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=3961&v=-apBv6JABvQ. The GE Advisory Committee passed a resolution requesting more time for implementation of EO 1100. All the committees of the Statewide Senate, independently, put together one or more resolutions opposing both executive orders. The Senate tried to put the various resolutions together. There was significant debate. The final resolution addresses the timeline issue primarily. He listed the reasons used in the resolution. They want time to: assess the cost of modifying the GE structure and academic preparation; analyze the effect on resource allocations on a campus particularly with an emphasis on ethnic and cultural studies; ensure that multiple measures are used for qualitative reasoning; and monitor the efficacy of the changes. He said two out of the 23 campuses were granted delays in implementation. He noted they told him that the collaboration between our Faculty Chair and Provost helped us get the delay. A member asked if most campuses were as upset as we are. J. Reeder said yes, but for different reasons. For example, Humboldt was particularly upset that chocolate wasn't being offered to every student who managed to complete the full GE requirements within 8 semesters.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report - M. Young

A member asked about the status of the search for a permanent VP of Student Affairs. The Provost said they hired a search firm to help now since the campus had done their due diligence. They wanted the most robust and diverse pool as possible.

ILOs (Institutional Learning Outcomes) - C. Works

C. Works noted the ILOs that had been developed at the last Faculty Retreat, and hoped these could be used in strategic planning. In the WASC Steering Committee meeting, they heard about "common law" ILOs, and she wondered if these from the retreat could be a potential line of evidence for WASC. The Provost thought that WASC would task the campus with developing ILOs, so it was worth thinking about. A member argued that developing ILOs should be part of the strategic planning process. The Provost suggested sending theses along to K. Moranski as a point of evidence that ILOs are being worked on.

Follow up on Senate discussions of RSCA and EO 1100

C. Works asked the members what should be done with the information received from the Senate regarding the two topics. She wanted the members to talk about how to prepare faculty before the holidays, and then have a working faculty retreat, particularly around the implementation of EO 1100 and 1110. She was already hearing faculty talk about making "land grabs" and voicing concern about FTES,

asking how to get more FTES for their departments or for their Schools. She hoped there would be direction from the Provost's office about the implications. She also suggested that a group could work in the summer, on a stipend, to reform the GE program. There was discussion about the idea for a summer intensive to implement EO 1100. The Provost thought this was an opportunity for the campus to rethink GE, even though the timeline proposed was extremely difficult. She encouraged all campus leadership to frame the discussion as rethinking GE to better serve our students. It was clarified that throughout the year, there would be structures and opportunities for input and feedback, so that the summer group knew where they were headed and could do the "heavy lifting." A member noted that there was no discussion in EO 1100 about additional resources from the Chancellor's office for implementation. He also argued that GE reform should follow strategic planning. A member noted that the GE program review was just waiting for the final report from the external reviewer, so they would use that information in the EO 1100 discussions. Additionally, the budget model needed to be reviewed. She said she was hearing from many people over the last two weeks that GE needed to be where people come together, and that specific schools or programs should not "put their tent" on a specific area of GE. The Student rep argued that it was very important for students to be part of this process and voiced concern about how students would be included over the summer. A member hoped that the campus Senate and the Statewide Senate would continue to push back on the executive orders and the statement by EVC Blanchard that faculty do not have purview over the curriculum.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Carmen Works
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes – emailed

Consent item: Economics minor revision – emailed

Business:

1. Group Photo TC 3:15
2. Electronic agendas for Senate decision – C. Works
3. Resolution re: EO 1100 – Second Reading – L. Watt, M. Milligan – attached TC 4:00

She reminded the members that the Senate meeting will be held in the Sonoma Valley room.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes