Senate Executive Committee

MINUTES

Tuesday, October 17, 2017

Provost’s Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

1. Meeting called to order at 2:32pm: Chair, V. Adams
2. Approval of the Agenda: S. Stratton motioned to approve the agenda, A Jiménez Jiménez second the motion – no objections, agenda was approved
3. Approval of the Minutes from September 26, 2017: A Jiménez Jiménez motioned to approve the minutes, J Perry second the motion – no objections, minutes were approved
4. Update from Provost: Dr. Geoff Chase

4.1 EO1100 – GE. There is an addendum that allows for institutions that can’t make the deadline, for exceptional and dire reasons, to apply for an extension. Primarily directed at institutions moving from trimester to semester system. Addendum states that most institutions should be able to fulfill EO1100.

4.2 EO 1110 – No exceptions will be made in regard to 1110, which effects developmental Math and English

4.3 Attended the Graduation Initiative Symposium in Long Beach:

Brought together Provosts and VPs for Business Affairs. The results were a fruitful conversation. Received a clear message that the there is a sense of urgency from the State Government and the Board of Trustees regarding the Grad Initiative. Everyone is working hard to figure out how to best move forward on the metrics.

4.4 Received information a week ago Friday from CO about CI efforts to hit targets they have set for us. One of the things some of the provosts reminded CO about is that it only takes a few students to show change. CI shows positive change.

4.5 Announced launching search for permanent Dean of Arts & Sciences (A&S). This has been discussed with the Interim Dean Meriwether, as well as with other Deans and people in A&S. He feels it is important to have permanent leadership in A&S. This will be a national search, using the same search firm currently searching for Dean of EU and Chief Academic Business Officer.

4.6 Questions?

S. Stratton asked if A&S will keep the current structure of one large unit. G Chase stated he will begin to have that conversation with a permanent Dean.

J. Yudelson inquired about a time frame for the possible restructuring of A&S. G. Chase stated that there is no sense of time frame for that, yet. He would like to have a new dean in place and give that person time to get their feet on the ground.

1. No Continuing Business
2. New Business

6.1 GWAR Task Force update: The taskforce is almost ready with a policy. V. Adams has seen a draft and provided feedback. A few items mentioned in the policy are to have all students take a writing class to get substantial feedback, and to limit class size to 20. Some of the feedback V. Adams will be providing is that this will create a bottle neck, especially with large programs, such as Psychology, which has 1200 students. Paying for a class limited to 20 will prove to be problematic. Regardless of the policy details, it must function for programs of all sizes.

V. Adams opened for discussion:

J. Perry asked if the task force has had any conversations about the implications regarding meeting targets of FTES? She mentioned that Anthropology recently met with the Curriculum Committee and discussed this requirement. She agreed that a cap of 20 would be very difficult for a program like Anthropology as well.

6.2 Strategic Imitative Subcommittees: Invitation to present at Senate

V. Adams suggested that since there is no new business for Academic Senate that the time could be used to hear from the four subcommittees.

K. Tollefson asked if the committees have had time to make substantive progress to have something to present? G. Chase assured that there is plenty to report at this point. Reminded Senate Executive members that on November 8th, the Subcommittees are hosting a World Café exercise. The subcommittees will provide consultative, interactive set of sessions to present and to receive feedback. The deadline giving to the committees to submit their proposals to the Strategic Initiatives Steering Committee is the Tuesday before Thanksgiving.

A. Jiménez Jiménez asked if at the Academic Senate there would be an opportunity to hear feedback from faculty. V. Adams explained that each subcommittee would be given 10-15 minutes. They can ask for feedback during their 10-15 minutes. He stated he would also want to hear from GWAR task force, Curriculum Committee, and GE.

G. Chase stated that the subcommittees are open to receiving feedback; intended to be an interactive process. S. Kelly voiced his concern how the presentation will be perceived. People may think the die is cast, all is already done, when it’s not. He stressed that we want to be cautious – let people know this is something in process. We need to be prepared to remind people that no decisions are made at that point. Attendees voiced their agreement with providing an opportunity for feedback. G. Evans suggested having a point person to monitor the discussion and remined that decisions have not been made. A. Jiménez Jiménez suggested keeping feedback comments to a minimum amount of time. If more time needed for comments, the subcommittees should allow them to send an email. Also, have a schedule so one committee doesn’t end up taking all of the time. V. Adams suggested 7-8 minutes to report; 5 minutes for questions.

V. Adams asked if the Task Force on Inclusive Excellence would also present? S. Stratton responded that the students are wanting faculty to be more aware about student activities following posters. José Alamillo was at the Student in Solidarity. S. Stratton suggested he could speak to what students are working on. V. Adams confirmed that an invitation will be extended to this committee as well.

V. Adams inquired about the timing for Standing Committee reports. K. Tollefson suggested prioritizing CC and GE, and then let other committees follow to make sure those two have time to report.

1. Chair Report: Dr. Virgil Adams

7.1 V. Adams attended State Senate last week. Senate Chairs drafted a letter. S. Stratton and K. Tollefson advised V. Adams not to personally sign but bring to Senate for consideration. S. Stratton had observed that letter is written as policy position, not personal position. V. Adams read letter: Open Letter to Timothy White from Chairs of Campus Senates.

7.2 J. Yudelson: As reported previously, there is a lot of anger in the Statewide Academic Senate. Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard came, said the Board of Trustees has given the power to the Chancellor to do whatever he wants with curriculum. Chair of Academic Senate received a letter on a Saturday for a Monday meeting – not a consultative process. Currently, resolutions to hold the two EO’s in abeyance, pending real consultation and shared governance. Currently, 11 campuses have all passed resolutions (Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus). In addition, 10 other campuses have resolutions under consideration (Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, East Bay, Long Beach, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo). All are asking for EO’s to be held in abeyance because there was no shared governance, nor any shared consultation. Talk in Academic Senate about a possible vote of no confidence for the Chancellor. Yudelson utilized the San Bernardino resolution stating we want it held in abeyance and modified it for CI appropriateness. That’s the background. Student CSSA representative has strongly suggested that we push back. Students weren’t ever consulted, either.

V. Adams stated that he would like to see us stand in support of our President and Provost. Have not seen evidence from current administration that anything inappropriate is happening.

J. Yudelson: From the other campuses, one of the biggest areas already have been to be hit; the ethnic studies programs. They are being tremendously up and down the state. Robert Collins from San Fran State and faculty member in Native American studies have already been told they’re not hiring people, already cutting classes, and hearing similar actions across state. Full-time lecturers already being told they will not have full-time work. Although our campus is in a different place, it will impact a lot of our other campuses and eventually will impact us.

A. Jiménez Jiménez mentioned that it’s a question of the principle. The principle is there was no due consultation, no shared governance, regardless of the topic. Even though we are in a different place, we are making progress, so this won’t affect us that much. However, we should stand behind that principle. He is in favor of bringing this resolution to Senate. He doesn’t believe it would speak against our President or Provost, as it is not related to them. This is about the Chancellor’s Office and pushing these Executive Orders without due consultation. S. Kelly, K. Tollefson concur.

C Lincoln asked that if this gets pushed through, what the timeline would be for the Executive Orders to be in place. V. Adams responded that they would be in place Fall 2018.

V. Adams assured that the resolution is stating a position where we are philosophically, but that from a practical standpoint, we’re still doing the work. S. Kelly confirmed we are proceeding with the work.

S. Stratton asked for clarification regarding J. Yudelson’s comment about the ethnic studies issue. J. Yudelson responded that he received second-hand information. V Adams clarified that in changing GE, Area E, where many Ethnic Studies courses were housed, some students are cutting their Ethnic Studies programs. S. Stratton claimed that last year, the Chancellor’s Office report was advocating Ethnic Studies programs.

K. Tollefson concurred with A Jiménez Jiménez that there a principle to be defended.

V. Adams sought guidance from Executive members regarding the resolution and the statement from Senate chairs. S. Kelly offered that if the resolution passes, V Adams should sign it. K. Tollefson concurred and stated that he would be signing as a representative of the whole, rather than as an individual.

S. Stratton asked J Yudelson if he would ask about the security and status of our Ethnic Studies programs during Intent to Raise Questions. J. Yudelson said he will and will also ask for a first reading waiver, so we can vote on the resolution.

S. Kelly clarified that a motion requires 2/3 approval. Then it would move to a 2nd reading.

V. Adams provided some back ground on the Executive Orders explaining that the Governor and state legislature hope to increase graduation rates for in-state students, particularly HUGs students that are in remedial classes. Some students can take upwards of 15 units that don’t count toward graduation. He acknowledged that this puts faculty in a difficult predicament; for example, 105 Pre-calculus, what happens to the 32% of students who don’t pass that class?

J. Perry stated that essentially this is about these being hasty decisions made without consultation with faculty, and she feels that alone can result in other negative consequences, e.g., negative impact on Ethnic Studies programs.

S. Kelly asked if the resolution states that “We the Senate approve V. Adams signing Chairs’ resolution?” J. Yudelson assured him that it does not. To which S. Kelly suggested that statement be added. Also, would like to have the statement “So little meaningful consultation…” be removed.

V. Adams proposed editing via email, with final draft in time to send out because Senate Executive members must agree on resolutions. Members instructed to take their time, send changes to all of Senate Executive members via “Reply All” to V. Adams email by 5pm Wednesday. Final draft produced by J. Yudelson by Thursday morning. Then it will be sent out to all Senate Executive members. If approved by noon Thursday, it will be included in Senate materials by 5pm Thursday. Will also add open letter from Statewide Chairs so people can see these issues together, in context.

C. Lincoln asked how faculty can make decisions for students that may have negative consequence for students? She explained that taking college classes and not getting credit is problematic. She expressed her concern that if this is pushed back to 2019 that it becomes stagnant. She would like to see a timeline J. Yudelson responded that he can only report what English and Math faculty said at state senate. One of the issues related to getting rid of remedial classes is that you’re taking a student, who isn’t prepared, out of classes and trying to build them toward higher success, but getting rid of the support and putting them into advanced studies when they’re not ready. This may be setting them up for greater failure. Some aren’t ready for lower level work; if they don’t have that opportunity to get them ready for more advance work you’re really setting them up to fail. C. Lincoln shared that the subcommittee is working on finding ways to help students to be successful, rather than dropping them into advanced courses. She inquired what would be the point of pushing it a year back? S. Kelly assured her that it is highly unlikely the Chancellor’s Office will postpone anything. Students don’t have to worry that anything will change. V. Adams also assured her that we have yet to hear anyone say Executive Orders will be rescinded. They are going forward. On our campus, we’re already in transition.

1. Senate Agenda Review - Approved
2. Other Business

9.1 Brittany Grice : How to handle lactation issues in classrooms?

Brittany Grice and Jean, Manager of Educational Equity are drafting guidelines and procedures regarding lactation and breastfeeding on our campus. This is in response to a situation that occurred within a department last year. It was determined that there are inconsistencies with how the student accessed her opportunity to breastfeed and the lactation rooms. Students are sharing that they don’t want to use lactation rooms. By law, a mother has right to breastfeed anywhere a mother and child have the right to enter. Breastfeed L.A. and other organizations are pushing for more progressive guidelines. She explained that our nondiscrimination policy covers the issue of breastfeeding, so we won’t create another policy. Would like to give faculty the flexibility to navigate this issue in a way that allows them to make sure their classroom is not disruptive. Additionally, they don’t want to put parameters around what constitutes disruption. She confirmed that language regarding testing will be added stipulating that if accommodations needed for breast feeding can be made through DASS. Brittany will send guidelines, which will be grounding everything in disruption. Goal is to provide something that gives flexibility to faculty allowing deference to them to constitute disruption, but also clearly states our responsibilities.

V. Adams asked if is OK for faculty to ask a woman that is breastfeeding to sit in the back of the room? B. Grice responded that it would depend on the reason for your request. If students aren’t paying attention to the lecture, then, OK. We’re in this balance of trying to normalize breastfeeding while ensuring no substantial disruption. We trust faculty judgment, as we do with other situations of disruption. She senses from the students that they’re willing to work with faculty, as long as a statement is made that breastfeeding is permitted in the classroom.

A. Jiménez Jiménez inquired if the guidelines will be meant for students or faculty? B. Grice informed the members that the guidelines will be public and meant for all. Intended mostly for students to understand what their rights are, while helping them to understand the need to defer to faculty judgment to ensure that classrooms are not disrupted. A. Jiménez Jiménez suggested guidelines for faculty, too. As non-U.S. born faculty, need help knowing what is and is not appropriate. He also suggested that the guidelines include scenarios. B. Grice concurred and shared that there will be an education campaign that includes that. However, she doesn’t want to include this with guidelines and communicate restrictions.

C. Lincoln asked if there will be rights for students who do feel uncomfortable, i.e., leave the classroom, leave seats? Will those accommodations be made, or will they have to just deal with it? B. Grice assured that any reasonable accommodation needs to be requested and the faculty members can grant those. Everyone should have equal access to instruction.

J. Perry inquired about where one would you go to find out, from student perspective, where lactation rooms are located? How can faculty support students in finding those spaces? B. Grice explained that they are working with Faculty Affairs on optional language to be included in syllabus and are launching Title IX web page, which will have guidelines and a map of those rooms. It will also include photos of the rooms and description of specific facilities in each room. Also providing same information for all-gender restrooms.

V. Adams asked specifically what B. Grice’s office needs from Academic Senate Executive members. B. Grice stated that her office would like the Academic Senate Executive members review the document and provide feedback. Her goal is to have the guidelines completed by the end of semester. She shared that faculty and academic administrators are reviewing. She wants as many people weighing in as possible, including students, to guide process.

10. Other Business

10.1 V. Adams will contact each strategic initiatives subcommittees to request that they present at next Senate meeting.

10.2 J. Edwards reminded attendees about the Academic Senate photo scheduled at 3:15 during the Academic Senate meeting on October24. This reminder was sent to senators and the lecturer representatives.

K. Tollefson moved to adjourn; J. Yudelson, second. Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 4:04pm

Minutes prepared by: Jeannette Edwards, Academic Senate Coordinator

Minutes approved by: