



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, January 31, 2017
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Cindy Wyels, Stephen Stratton, Sean Kelly, Jacob Jenkins, Dan Wakelee, Simone Aloisio, John Yudelson, Jeanne Grier, Greg Wood, Travis Hunt, Genevieve Evans Taylor
Staff present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:30pm
 - a. C. Wyels indicated intent to provide a review of the role of Senate in a few minutes once all arrived (see Agenda item 6 below);
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda amended to provide time to discuss two additional items of 1) reforming the faculty hiring process, and 2) academic program review policy; Exec agreed and approved amended agenda; (see Agenda items 6.5 and 6.6 below)
3. Approval of the Minutes from Nov. 29, 2016
 - a. Meeting minutes from 11/29/16 approved with no objections;
4. Continuing Business
 - a. Internship Policy (SAPP) (*doc to read*)
 - i. Discussion: clarification sought if this was sent back to the committee – answer was Yes and that they accepted our changes; no further objections from committee;
 - ii. ACTION: Internship Policy will move forward as a second reading item in Senate as SP 16-03;
5. New Business
 - a. MA in Psychology – Long Form (*doc to read*)
 - i. Discussion: summarized history of long form leading to present; referenced the 31-page long form and that Senate did pass a long form last Spring; Chancellor's Office then said that many changes were needed, then came recommendations that the revised version go back to Senate; feedback received was that it's much better now with its changes; question if we may run into similar issues as last time with Computer Science's Mechatronics proposal, being that this is now an MA in Psychological Research (title change from AMP); answer was that we weren't sure and would check on this; Exec agreed that these were not minor changes and seemed like a brand new MA, further agreed to keep it off the consent item calendar and that Senate will want to hear from S. Frisch on this;



California State
University

ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

recalled that Psychology program said there wasn't going to be any new faculty requested under resources, asked if this was still their position; comment that it may not be a good use of our time to compare to last year; further observations on the tuition calculations, not sure how it all fits into a half-time student; observation that if you look in their tuition box on how they calculate, doesn't seem likely that they would be paying full tuition; observation that on Page 5 the calculation is zero, which indicates that they'll be anticipating using their surplus, answer was "Yes"; appears that in the table their aim is to replace their full time faculty with adjunct faculty; suggestion if we could change nomenclature to "tenure track" and "lecturer" faculty; Exec agreed and referenced page 4-5); question if in addition to a discussion of the resources, can we also consider the curriculum to see if it's a viable program to support if the resources are available; observation that there are expensive programs and less expensive programs, and this is an expensive program based on the small number of students, opinion that Exec should weigh in on that; observed that this program may have one elective course, they have four options, but they may not be able to run these classes in the third year, i.e. you can only have 6 units max for a thesis, so they're not leaving any room if a thesis needs repeating; concern may be that they're going to have at least two semesters where students are paying full tuition for a part time program; noted that it's a 33-unit Masters in four semesters, so it's not a half-time program; observed that the long form does include information about tuition from stateside, but noted that these are not monies generated to the program, these are dollars generated to the university; observation that then they wouldn't be able to claim this at all, Exec affirmed no they cannot; example cited that e.g. if we have 1000 FTEs you can multiply this and figure out the revenue to the campus to build our budget independently, as opposed to a self-supporting program where you would directly tie revenue to such program; going back to this proposal, \$65,000 will not fund 1.95 FTE in faculty needs, so not a useful comparison; Exec was appreciative of their efforts here, as we don't normally get a breakdown of anything like this; question re program learning outcomes, asked if this MA needs their own set, would think that the Master's degree would need its own separate learning outcomes from the program;

- ii. ACTION: there are a number of questions that should be addressed before moving this forward to Senate; comment added with emphasis on the revenue questions, citing that on Page 6 the last line of the table seems to indicate that faculty are getting \$500 per student; further comment that this may also be an allocation for student research as managed by the faculty mentor; Exec agreed that further clarification is needed, suggestion that it come from both S. Frisch and V. Adams and that they provide a



unified response; further suggestion to please copy the Curriculum Committee chairs as well;

6. Chair Report

- a. C. Wyels reviewed that the role of Exec is to critically evaluate the items before us; when judgment calls our job is not to debate this but to decide if things are ready to move to the Senate floor; noted that as our institution gets larger, we need to be more mindful that we represent others so let's be active in soliciting input and sharing information back; noted that last Fall we didn't have a lecturer sitting here, J. Yudelson is back and we're happy to see him, but this is a reminder that we need to consider different perspectives from different campus constituents; J. Jenkins in turn will take the lead in asking whether we're considering the perspectives of our faculty of color; reminder to all to discuss things in a concise manner;
- b. Recalled lots of calls for faculty volunteers, and we may need to reconsider committee structure, not ready to bring it to you now, but I would like your blessing on waiting at least three (3) weeks between calls for service; thanked D. Daniels for his help for the giant spreadsheet, will have graphs this semester to see what this looks like, working on analysis and next steps;
- c. Intent to Raise Questions follow up: M. Cook asked a question about paying students via various non-pay-per-hour means; C. Wyels, B. Hartung and S. Frisch met with Diane Mandrafina (Controller for CI) to try to move this along; D. Mandrafina is new and mindful of our ability to sail through audits; asked Exec to seek out examples at CSUs where students are paid from sources other than hourly wages;
- d. C. Wyels asked D. Wakelee to cover the Graduation Initiative Task Force; D. Wakelee recalled correspondence received that our task force wasn't sufficiently diverse to represent our campus; may be advisable that this is opened up again to Senate; Exec did not recall this membership being announced; D. Wakelee agreed to distribute;
- e. Amended agenda item 6.5: S. Kelly recalled that the chairs met with D. Wakelee this morning, discussed the issue of reforming the hiring process, moving toward something decentralized; no intentions to disrupt the Search Coordinating Committee, and we would want to bring them in along with relevant staff to try to come up with a system that falls somewhere between the standard model and our highly centralized model; D. Wakelee recalled that the thought was that once we receive a recommendation we can open up discussions to see what everyone's comfort levels are; Exec recalled M. Francois receiving 4-5 proposals; Exec recalled that resolutions are on the Senate website that were approved and are relevant here; question on who is coming up with the proposal or what other folks should be involved – answer that lots of voices will be heard on this topic;
- f. Amended agenda item 6.6: S. Aloisio met with A. Wallace and reviewed her edits to our academic program review policy, these changes seem to offer clarity; will send it in for the next Exec meeting to be discussed; Exec wants to check to see if



an existing committee would be good to delegate this to, further discussion of University Committee vs. Senate Committee, since this is Senate business that makes sense why it is being conducted this way; Exec offered that we could also revise this so that it's not, e.g. a 20+ person committee that only shows up for donuts; Exec agreed this is an option, and what we have here is not really a policy, we actually have a whole other 30-page document with guidelines; recalled that an option presented itself to work with A. Wallace to come up with a policy to make an ad hoc Senate committee; Exec asked if there is there a reason being this review request at this point; answer was that feedback was to align the policy with practice and to implement feedback from WASC; Exec asked if this had been circulated; answer was no, not yet;

- g. ACTION: Exec suggested to circulate the aforementioned edits to our program review policy in order to provide feedback ahead of next meeting;
7. For discussion and/or decision making
- a) Exceptional Service Awards - consider guidance to PLC. (*SP14-12 and CBA Article 20, Section 20.37: <http://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017#article-20>*)
 - a. Background is that the CBA has not been renegotiated, we have 9.5 units to award; we have a process, understanding is that our union bargained for this to recognize exceptional service burdens on faculty from historically underrepresented groups, but it seems that nothing has been done to contribute to this on our campus, they have not been awarded it, so it may actually undo this intent;
 - b. Discussion: Exec recalled that we've only given out what has been applied for; suggested that our wording could be modified to be more consistent; further recalled that 2 out of the 3 applications were awarded, so there should actually be more units to award; further discussion on if we can go back and adjust the criteria if there's any question we might be missing the point, or perhaps just strike that section; suggestion to also add the section from the CBA; Exec commented that it's possible there could be folks out there that aren't applying with the assumption that they won't get it; Exec added that it's also due within the first two weeks of the semester; agreed that it may also be a timing issue, citing example that if we're not making a call now, chairs aren't going to know what's going on for Fall; question on when do they need to know – answer was Feb 24th;
 - c. ACTION: C. Wyels asked Exec to consider striking our criteria and in its place include Article 20 of our CBA; S. Stratton offered to re-read it and to work together with C. Wyels on this;
 - b) Priority Registration – Ask SAPP to investigate?
 - a. Background: recollection of a few example groups that receive priority registration, e.g. EOP and DRP eligible students;



- b. Discussion: Exec recalled that this semester S. Frisch and H. Dang were asked to look into graduating seniors so that they could get the classes they need to graduate, in keeping with the Graduation Initiative and Chancellor's Office recommendations; also, freshmen and transfers that are part of California Promise can elect to be part of this; summarized that over the course of four years, we may end up with lots of special preferences for multiple categories, which may end up negating the efforts overall; Exec noted that this is a worthy discussion here to ask SAPP what groups currently have preferences, and to express these numbers of students as a percentage of the student body; comment in agreement that this is useful, and further noted that a number of these groups are not within our discretion to deny this preference; comment added that then maybe this is our first step to determine; further comment added that this preferential consideration specifically applies to undergraduate classes; C. Wyels offered to request clarity in that we are talking about undergraduate courses; Exec added that we could look at the technical definition of "priority registration"; observation added that even after all of the California Promise gets rolled out, not everyone will sign up; question on what our end goal is; answer was in effort to understand where we stand as a campus; observation that there are technical issues in terms of blocking some students from some classes; some of us met with Enrollment Management, but this priority registration tackles bigger issues; another question on how this might affect the academic appeals process, in particular when students want to be reinstated they can't get the classes they need;
 - c. ACTION: Exec suggested that the SAPP committee discusses this, and the discussion question may be who gets what seat, i.e. should the seat go to the student that's going to graduate in four years, or the student that's repeating classes three or four times; further / concluding discussion about strength of courses;
- c) Possible waiver requests of GE requirements – process? (Sample: *Fullerton A3 Exc Request*)
- a. Example circulated for Exec to read;
 - b. Discussion: Exec recalled G. Buhl bringing this to our attention; our General Education Committee (GE-Comm.) is currently discussing a similar request at this campus, with concerns being noted with the GE-Comm. being the only body on campus asked to review this; further discussion on the goal of receiving an explicit waiver; observed that the system is saying that, e.g. when proposing a major with 128 units, can you get the total major down to 120 units; comment added that then what some campuses have done is to ask for a waiver; questions if we can just throw the GE nomenclature, or just double count;



answer recalled a case applying to Nursing in the past, but there was a question about Title V compliance; comment added that in the Fullerton example it went to the Academic Senate, so we may want to follow suit; in other words, if it's a possible change in policy that GE is going to accept, that they would need to come to the full senate;

- d) Modification of RTP requirements for new hires?
 - a. Background is that significant time is being requested to write letters for RTP (e.g. 49 letters recently written by Dean of Arts & Sciences);
 - b. Discussion: question is the burden of this time, along with consideration of first year faculty; noted that it may be a better ask of Faculty Affairs to make a modest modification of their policy; observed that PPC is going to meet in January, maybe they could look at these together; additional comment about the timeline, where you have first year reviews, third year reviews, etc., but seems that everything is bunched at once;
 - c. ACTION: Suggestion to check with B. Hartung to see if we're contractually obligated to this and do we have to do it this way;
- e) Reviews of all nine CI Centers and Institutes (*multiple documents*)
 - a. Displayed reports for each and went down the list for comments related to each;
 - b. Discussion: Exec noted awareness that CIA needs the assessment piece; regarding IGER, it appears that they have not done the work; recalled the Senate resolution for ceasing the statewide funding for IGER; suggestion from Exec member that we should consult A. Morris on this; further discussion that this institute is not meeting its outlined expectations; observed that it's now coming out of A. Morris' budget and not statewide, and that it is losing money / costing School of Business money; Exec member recalled working in business contracts and referenced a "cure letter," where within the 30 days the contractor "cures" the issue or loses funding;
 - c. ACTION: D. Wakelee offered his assistance in corresponding with the dean to indicate that the IGER situation is one that needs to be resolved; noted complications because due to it being externally funded, it may create other issues if dissolved;
 - d. Concluding remarks to please commend C. Nevins and others on CCI, as they did a great job with their report;
- 8. For consideration: what does Exec wish to take up and/or lead Senate through? How/who?
 - a) Tenure Density clarification of metrics, possible target, plan to achieve target, etc. Context as provided by budget presentation. Rationale for increasing.
 - a. Discussion: comment that if the university is going to set targets, then faculty should be involved with this, and Exec seems to be the natural



body to move this forward; question if we are setting a target this semester – answer was not this semester, but there is a budget target, and goal is to get the number of unfilled positions to single digits by next year; Exec agreed that this is actionable, and an immediate thing that can be dealt with;

- b) Service Load: nature of expectations (differentiated, made explicit), structure of faculty, expectations for individuals/ programs/ entire faculty
 - a. Background is that faculty are good at analysis and recommendation;
 - b. Discussion that we need to consider what junior faculty are tasked with, historically has been lopsided the other way, let's consider if we are building the university or are we still in adolescent mode; comment that it's a fundamental shift, and especially affects our sales pitch in faculty recruiting; observation that the CBA changed it, where new faculty are given a reduced load in the first two years; further discussion on how some programs are different and what assigned time is for; recalled previous surveys being circulated from the Faculty Development Advisory Committee, asked the questions of "what are you spending your time on" and "what would you *like* to spend your time on"; need presenting itself to sit down with faculty, where you have a teaching philosophy and a research agenda, but you also need a service philosophy; suggestion that we need to be telling faculty coming in that they need to think about this, i.e. in your first semester you shouldn't be serving on Curriculum Committee; summarized that if we as a faculty community have some sort of guidelines and expectations, then it's not on everybody to fend off requests; recalled that there is a service component with all of our program standards, maybe if Exec came up with what constitutes a rating of 3 or 4 or 5; answer that this may be too complicated; C. Wyels reiterated that the question is which of these are we wishing to take up, and are there appropriate Senate committees that could help, FDAC for example; suggestion that we could put out guidelines, but it's really up to RTP for service guidelines; other ideas could be Senate structure as the way to approach it; these items are all important, but not all are urgent; Exec agreed;
- c) Faculty representation: how to improve
 - a. Background is that we've been growing as a campus, initially we had 13 faculty and everyone was doing everything, but now there's 134 tenure track faculty and 320 lecturer faculty, so we can no longer rely on everyone doing everything; we run into things where "I didn't know" or "this could be more transparent"; we have other committees with four faculty and only one shows up to do the work; getting back to a one-page document with what it means to represent; question if there are requirements for minutes to be taken; answer was no there



California State
University

ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

isn't; observed that it's a staffing issue as well, it's currently too much work for the Senate Office to undertake; further examples cited where committee members can and should rotate note taking responsibilities;

d) Diversifying the Profession

- a. Background noted the catch phrase for "best practices in hiring" to mean efforts to ensure diversity in faculty hiring; clarification that then the term "profession" refers to the profession of being an academic; answer was yes and that it also includes academic administration, some folks may have these aspirations, and are we providing an environment where they would thrive rather than just survive;

e) Faculty Hiring – input into changing process

- a. Exec agreed that we can take this off of the Exec leadership table due to S. Kelly's involvement;

Pertaining to all: C. Wyels asked Exec members to pick one and to add bullet points and to flesh this out, that's our homework before the next meeting;

9. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration

- a. Report from the President (include)

10. Other Business

- a. C. Wyels asked T. Hunt if he had anything to add; T. Hunt noted interviews in progress for three ASI committee positions; also got the Food Pantry up and running; Exec question about how do we donate, and if they can produce a list of what they need most; answer was yes; C. Wyels noted that it will be in the Senate newsletter;
- b. Meeting adjourned at 4:07pm.