

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Minutes**

Tuesday, November 12, 2019  
2:00 – 4:00 pm  
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

J. Pandya, N. Hultgren, M. Aliasgari, N. Meyer-Adams, ~~C. Cummings~~, D. Stewart, P. Hung, N. Schürer, K. Janousek, E. Klink, P. Soni, J. Phillips, D. Hamm, K. Bonetati, ~~J. Hamilton, S. Apel, B. Jersky~~, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda- MSA
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of November 5, 2019 – MSA as amended
4. Announcements and Information- next AS agenda has incorrect date, will be corrected. DH is co-president of CFA, will correct on agenda. AS hired new student assistant; Mir Abbas. NMA cannot make Campus Master planning cmte meeting 11-22-19, 9-11, would someone like to be her alternate?
5. Reminder
  - 5.1. Academic Senate meeting November 21, 2019 (and 2/20/20)
  - 5.2. Senate Exec meeting holds: 12/10/19, 1/14/20, 1/21/20)
6. Special Orders
  - 6.1. Report: Provost Jersky (At the CO: Academic Council meeting)
7. New Business
  - 7.1.1. Mishelle Laws, campus wheel project TIME CERTAIN 2:30- ML reports on wheel paths; trying to address complaints regarding the safety of the walkways with scooters, skateboards, bikes, non-motorized wheels. Upper campus is a concern, “no linkage” is a concern for bike riders. Safety in ED-10 parking lot speed increases in this area. People on phones are an added problem. A campaign is forthcoming to show where wheels are allowed and not. JK spoke about skateboards and bicycles, students were asked if they would follow the policy and they said “no”. Pedestrians have the right of way; “no matter what”. Pedestrians are supposed to be yielded to. The committee is trying to use the existing paths, proposed pan was presented. Yellow highlighted paths are dual paths. Decals will be every 30’ and are 24” across. More skateboarders than any other form of wheels. Will the PD commit the resources to give citations after warning period? PD has specifically designated 2

officers to educate and give citations. There will be dismount zones 4' across marked. There will be "walk your wheels" areas. Pilot will start at beginning of spring 20 and entire semester will be pilot time frame. During pilot program, no citations, only warnings.

- 7.1.2. Hiromi Masunaga & Deb Satterfield, AS Data Fellows Team, TIME CERTAIN 3:00- data fellows to focus on faculty service, RTP guideline policies, differences between various college models. Charge and requirement of each committee will be examined. Smaller colleges have larger responsibilities, what discrepancies occur at the various levels/committees. Focus groups and interviews to address discrepancies are planned. Workload will be examined for various committees. Not all assigned time is service; not all data is organized correctly. Assigned time for committee service has a specific code, how course classification are coded will be examined. JZP asks percentage of assigned time for service distribution. DS asks them to consider the absence rate of people who are on committees. Some committees are more labor intensive than others and perhaps should have different weighting in the RTP progress. Some committee members are frequently absent and should not receive credit for their service. NS asks if they might do a survey of former chairs of senate, council chairs from last few years. How many hours per semester would a member of this committee need to invest? Suggestion that they compare various committee service commitment. Lecturer faculty is uncompensated work and needs to be addressed differently. When comparing units, be careful for the work load versus the number of students. MA asks about the 3 levels of service, dept, college, university; how do you account for advising? Class level sizes with regards to instruction is available in data, is it needed for this data team? PS asks if teaching and service will be kept separate. Service data available at dept, college and univ. level. He says some colleges do not count service as important as others. JZP states there is also a list of all committees, some senate related some not. Can they design a tracking system?
- 7.1.3. AVP Jeff Klaus & Interim Director Mary Nguyen, BMAC, TIME CERTAIN 3:30- MN reports on faculty reference manual for BMAC, as well as BMAC grievance policy and how it intersects with university grievance policy. Reference manual is created to guide faculty with regards to accommodation. JK says this is a transition period with a leadership change with Mary Nguyen. NS asks if manual can have a shift in rhetoric, faculty rights and responsibilities, where it states as "faculty must legally...." Perhaps needs new language to be less abrasive. Change of culture would be in everyone's best interests. Also says the name "Bob Murphy Access Center" can be problematic; stating that it can be hard for students to find the center if they do not know the name previously. MN reports that this is currently a "draft" and may make changes as needed. JK says when a search occurs for DSS they are routed to BMAC. KB asks for fliers for the bookstore when finalized. JZP asks if there will be a faculty advisory board for the center forthcoming. MN says

she has reached out to the faculty center for guidance on this. The EO for this says an advisory board is required and will be formed. DS asks about advisory committee may be staffed by those whose it is their area of expertise. Will a section be added to the manual regarding the appeals process? It is not currently in the manual and is being examined. New counsel on campus currently. Disability accommodations received by student that did not meet their goals have various appeal levels. EO 1111 states there must be a grievance policy in place. NH asks about section on audio recordings may be misleading. NH also has an issue with the title of the center; he feels that faculty members are sometimes made to feel “scary” and not necessarily compassionate. The center occasionally presents “consideration” letters in addition to “accommodation” letters, students report that faculty have been very supportive of this. NS asks why students do not ask the faculty directly. Setting up the structure that faculty are “scary” and the center is “nice”. Center also works with students being self-independent; which is a need of current students. The letter states that the letter states they should be self-advocating. MA says guidebook is for faculty; is there a place for students to be educated as far as accommodation needs for certain students. How the faculty handles the rest of the students not just the “accommodated” student. Note takers are a popular topic of conversation. A sense of fairness in the classroom is wanted/needed.

8. Old Business

8.1. AS Beach 2030 Plans and Goals v.2- regarding the measure of success section, increase participation, create a baseline for comparison purposes. DS suggests that faculty service is not adequately explained at the beginning of their employment. Make a longer time period in their initial training delegated to faculty service. Create values related to service. Motivating people through their own self interests. NS says there is some awkward phrasing, needs to be rewritten. JC says measure of success should be directly related to what the goal is.

9. Adjournment- 4:02 pm