**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES with NOTES**

Tuesday, February 14, 2017

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Academic Senate Conference Room (AS-125)

N. Schürer, J. Pandya, D. Stewart, C. Brazier, R. Fischer, D. Hamm, T. Yamada, D. Hood, P. Soni, M. Flores, D. Domingo-Forasté, B. Jersky, C. Lindsay, M. Stephens, A. Montes

Guests: S. Olsen, Craig Stone, M. Gardner, D. Salazar

Absent: E. Klink, J. Moran,

1. Call to Order
2. Approved Agenda
3. Approved minutes: Meeting of February 7, 2017
4. Announcements and Information—Chair may try texting last minute changes.
	1. Interview with Candidate #1 for Vice Provost for Planning, Thursday, 2/16, 11:15 am-12:15 pm, AS 125
	2. Interview with Candidate #2 for *Dean of the College of Education*, Friday, 2/17, 10:45-11:45 am—EED 18c
	3. Interview with Candidate #2 for Vice Provost for Planning, Monday, 2/20, 10:15-11:15 am, AS 125
	4. Interview with Candidate #3 for Vice Provost for Planning, Wednesday, 2/22, 10:15-11:15 am, AS 125
	5. Meeting with CSU Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard, Friday, 2/24, 9:30-10:45 am in BH 302
	6. Senate chair attended CSU Academic Conference—senate chairs, presidents, provosts, ASI presidents—closing the achievement gap was topic. Four reasons folks don’t graduate in four years: Academic, social, emotional, and financial. First three don’t matter if don’t solve the fourth. Improving graduation rates doesn’t automatically improve the achievement gap.
	7. Blanchard meeting upcoming—a strategic plan for what we bring up.
5. Reminder
	1. Academic Senate meeting on February 16, 2017, 2:00 – 4:00pm, PSY-150
6. Special Orders
	1. Report: Provost Jersky
		1. White supremacist posters: whites betraying race; why not ban such things? Interesting point about students—how do we know what students are actually thinking about these issues. Could sweep social media for what people are saying—nice way to find out or ominous? JP: Univ. poster policy—if poster not approved it must be taken down—see student life regulations. Colleges can add rules such as “not on walls.”
		2. HVDI meeting yesterday—cross-college SEF funds spearheaded by CLA for career-readiness. Lots of faculty on the taskforces.
		3. Blanchard’s visit—the more we are able to come up with substantive questions, not just arguments, the more he might/would listen to requests. We’ve responded strongly to his request. Want him to be confident in our ability to lead. Take a constructive and positive approach.
7. New Business
	1. Ethnic Studies survey results—TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm—C. Stone and T. Yamada: see attachments of survey results with emailed agenda for meeting.
		1. BJ: These results come from 300 fac+300 staff+1100 students—with such “interest samples” you can infer about sample but not group. Not sure what many of the answers meant. Responses don’t seem to give much info about what we’d like to know. So what we have is a bifurcated response from the passionate. Rather have another survey than rely on this. Yet it is a good start and addressed the basic need—but we could go forward and design a representative survey with qualitative questions. If someone says “it’s the best class ever”—why? ACTION OFFERED: Provost would volunteer some resources to do something scientific to get information that which is difficult to survey. Maybe we can survey two colleges. CS: Great to use real research methods. BJ: This is important to get right on multiple levels. NS: But what about an actual dialogue? BJ: What might do in scientific quantitative survey: limit questions to a few; and then add more in-depth qualitative interactive discussion in small groups. E.g., “How might ethnic studies courses change your thinking?” Ask questions that inform action.
		2. SO: folks worried about inclusivity/exclusivity in comments—what about sexual diversity? DS: conflation of human diversity GE with ethnic studies agitated people. CS: Human Diversity GE used to be domain of ethnic studies. Once HD opened up, it became a runaway horse. In CLA some have thought: “Let’s make HD real again.” Another thought: It would be cleaner to build a new requirement—but takes time to build the infrastructure. AIS and other ethnic studies now interested in “authentic partnership” and deference to inner-disciplinary understandings and approaches.
		3. RF: Students said don’t want more “studies” courses. They’d prefer to diversity integrated directly into the general curriculum we have. Would also like to see follow-up study. Could code even the qualitative responses we have to analyze further. CB: Students appreciated courses that looked at multiple ethnicities not localized to one—liked intersectionalities. CS: but did you “connect” with a particular ethnic group? Did you benefit from being taught by a person from a group or teacher who had the ethnic studies disciplinary approach, or found out about experiences of actual people? AIS has 20 partnerships with other depts. in COTA, CLA, CHHS, COE. ChLS has a partnership with CBA. SO: incorporate in majors and get less pushback? CS: but not siloing; siloing doesn’t work—be rhizomatic. Folks don’t give disciplinary deference to ethnic studies.
		4. RF: How to communicate the results to students?
		5. Non-polite things to say: who’s expendable? Answer: Non-white faculty during the downturn in ethnic studies.
		6. JP: Come back to the recommendations in the Ethnic Studies Report.
		7. BJ: Can’t change the past—let’s move forward to strategic planning, perhaps under the three strategic goals: intellectual achievement; inclusive excellence, the public good. Use the chairs’ council to float up idea to colleges.
	2. Campus Planning report—TIME CERTAIN 3:15 pm—M. Stephens, D. Salazar (facilities) and M. Gardner (planning):
		1. “Foresight Planning” presentation: USU/UDP/Bookstore [Central space]. What is the future of textbooks and online? Future of food service in 5 years like composting? (We have people on campus who are experts! These faculty should be involved). Have student and faculty focus groups on food and society, entertainment, and online world. Prepare-foresight—insight—action model from Institute for the Future – iftf.org. “The need for creators, designers, thinkers, and entrepreneurs is critical …”—J. Conoley. Could add floor to SU—what might we want to do that we can’t do now in the SU? MS: Imbed this thinking in Univ. NS: What we want and what people like about the future could be different? MS: We needed smart classrooms. We don’t want to foreclose your futures. DD-F: what about intellectual options in buildings; what about assisting communal experience around food? DS: Big tables to sit around? Considering the human part. MG: what should a building be? NS: We’re thrilled to be part of the conversation—how to move on from here. DH: the future is without books? Probably wrong. JP: What happened to the Student Success Center? MS: have plan but no money yet to renovate Ph2. UDP is falling apart—want to renovate it soon.
		2. Next step? ACTION NEEDED: Bring more succinct proposal about potential meetings needed. Bring to Senate Chair who can recruit faculty. MS: have a link to get a sense of this. philosophers of space, food science people, etc. get involved. Maybe a Fri and a Sat. MS will support. Not about conformity but teaching creative thinking.
	3. ACTION NEEDED: Select slate of three members of research foundation board out of former members
8. Old Business
	1. SPOT evaluations text:

“All classes that have both a C classification and more than five students (so at least six) shall be evaluated every semester, or at the end of the year if they are year-long classes.”—BJ: better “six or more students.” X: “by the end of the class/semester” or “shall be evaluated” NS: Put on agenda for “policy meeting” on 3/2/17.

* 1. Syllabus Policy (AS 11-07)—no discussion
	2. CIO on Academic Senate—no discussion
	3. Coffee with a Cop—no discussion
	4. CBA 20.37—no discussion
	5. Committee list—no discussion
1. Adjourned at 4:01 pm