



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, November 8, 2016
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Cindy Wyels; Stephen Stratton; Simone Aloisio; Jacob Jenkins; Jeanne Grier; Jennifer Perry; Mary Adler; Sean Kelly; Travis Hunt; Greg Wood; Beth Hartung
Staff Present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:31PM
 - a. Noted that B. Hartung is in attendance in D. Wakelee's absence, and G. Evans Taylor will be late;
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. J. Grier recently attended the Business and Continuity Planning meeting, offered to update Exec in asking if this could be added to the Other Business section in agenda; no objections from committee;
 - b. B. Hartung updated that item 8.(a.) is almost ready, but asked to please postpone this item for now; no objections from committee, agenda approved as amended.
3. Approval of the Minutes from Oct. 18, 2016
 - a. Meeting minutes from 10/18/16 were approved with no objections;
4. Continuing Business
 - a. Add Policy (SAPP)
 - i. Summarized that there's been some back and forth on this with SAPP, track changes are displayed; these were to clarify a few things and to put the percentages in;
 - ii. Discussion: SAPP noted that originally the policy may have violated an Executive Order (E.O.) for withdrawals in the fourth week; Exec observed that our current policy does reflect this; further observation that the E.O. referenced only drops, and this is about adds; the percentages allow it work with any length of semester; asked for clarification re the first page says 16 weeks, but on back page says 15-weeks; clarified that this is due to having 15 weeks of instructional time plus one week of finals;
 - iii. Question if 20 percent always corresponds to census; answer that this is determined by administration; further noted that this is system-wide, thought to be that the week cut-off markers were there to conform with system-wide norms; recalled that usually the 8-week classes don't have a finals week;

- iv. Discussion: suggested that they may need to put in the equivalent of a couple of examples, because students may be confused when reading this; answer that it's referred to in the Purpose section of the policy and we may want to keep it more general / as written; observation that the confusion may lie in what the 27% refers to; further discussion by Exec on adding corrective language that refers to instructor approval between 20 and 27 percent, after 27 percent they cannot add; committee agreed "correct"; further suggestion that we could clarify that since most of the campus uses 16 week semesters, we could provide that percentage, then note that if you have an alternate semester use the other percentage;
- v. ACTION – M. Adler offered to write some suggested language on this; will move to a second reading item in Senate after further consultation with SAPP.

5. New Business

- a. Policy on Course Numbering (Curriculum)
 - i. Discussion: opening question on how this is substantially different from what we're doing now, appears that some of these are the same, such as GE; other observation that if the point of the policy is to "do it," should we change the language to be something more firm, e.g. "we ask that"; or, "programs are expected to..."; maybe under the Policy section that language could be "programs are expected to use this..." ; noted that it should be SP 01-03 and not SP 03-01 (got reversed); suggestion that we may be able to just keep the first sentence in the Background section, i.e. if it's a policy then we don't need to ask, the policy is simply followed;
 - ii. Question if anyone has a sense of where the problems are – further discussion of this and which ones require prerequisites; identified that it could be in the 490 range, such as improper labeling of capstones and/or internships, so this grouping may attempt to just bring everyone into policy;
 - iii. ACTION – C. Wyels will send Curriculum Committee these revisions; this is otherwise ready for a first reading item at next Senate;
- b. Tenure Density Resolution (Statewide Senate)
 - i. S. Aloisio referenced the Support for the Board of Trustee (BoT) Budget Request document, displayed on screen;
 - ii. S. Aloisio recalled the resolution from statewide in support of BoT budget request; scrolled on projected document and read aloud the budget request (line 46); \$75M is what they're asking for the Graduation Initiative (GI); as a system, the Governor said he's giving us \$150M more; summarized that ASCSU is asking that half of the GI money be used to help us with tenure track density; in our CI resolution, requesting that half of the net tuition growth number be used for this as well (i.e. \$20M);

- iii. Question if this is tied to base budget; answer was that it is not clear if this is one-time money or tied to base budget, or how this is going to be treated; noted that we're about 1.5 percent short of our FTEs; if we get a proportional amount, it's about \$900,000 for tenure track faculty on this campus;
- iv. Question if this resolution is made with standardized language in order to then go to all campuses; answer was yes that's the plan, if we pass this then it can go to the ASCSU; reply that if that's the case, then we could ask for more money, which would address "campuses with acute needs," which happens to include us; example cited that at CSULA they have a 6% four-year grad rate, so they have problems we don't have; certainly an argument could be made that we could ask for more; Chancellor said it's a campus level decision, as if as a campus we haven't hired enough tenure track faculty; Exec suggested edits to the resolution, made while being displayed;
- v. Discussion: one of the reasons why we're listing percentages is that tenure-track faculty are being pulled out to be PI's on grants, which help to bring resources to campus to ensure student success; these efforts are good for the campus but end up hollowing out teaching resources; comment that this may not be why our numbers are low, that we're not being bought out; separate issue could be that we need get to 50% tenure track faculty in order to establish shared governance;
- vi. Question on faculty advising, is it meant to be faculty advising faculty or faculty advising students; answer was faculty advising of students; noted that when we get new lecturers they need help with advising; comment added that we may not want to dilute the argument in referencing graduation initiatives;
- vii. Discussion in full support of these ideas, but feeling frustrated that our Advising Center Director noted a ratio of 1 to 1200 advisors to students, discouraging that we don't have the money that we need to do everything we need to do; noted that in our request we're just asking for half, and in our Provost's presentation that advising is one of the three identified needs;
- viii. ACTION – will move to first reading with changes;

6. Chair Report

- a. Referenced prior conversation that there's no need for S. Frisch's attendance today;
- b. Summarized ongoing tension this year between Curriculum Committee (CC) and what their responsibilities are and the responsibilities of Academic Planning; example cited when CC received a Masters in History proposal which was

essentially a shell of a proposal, and this had been done without any consultation with S. Frisch / Academic Planning;

- c. Updated Exec in a heads-up to expect a Psychology Master's coming forward; question if this is substantive enough to bring a new policy, or is this merely a course modification; will check with S. Frisch and CC;
 - d. Discussion from Exec: question re what happened with Exec's invitation for CC representative to come to Exec meeting; answer was that they liked the idea, have yet to initiate it, but they are providing tri-weekly updates to Senate chair;
 - e. Discussion from Exec: S. Stratton attended privacy issues meeting, citing that UCLA has had a lot of violations on privacy; our IT department has been engaging the same issues, how to protect the rights and records of students, where does the balance lie, and they're looking for feedback from the Privacy Academy on how to draw this line; noted that M. Berman didn't want to do anything that may have unintentional consequences; suggestion that Exec should stay in contact with them and keep tabs on what they're doing, we could possibly assist with policy to assist;
7. For discussion
- a. The role of Senate Exec in recommending faculty for university committees
 - i. C. Wyels summarized that our practice in recent years was that one person in the President's Office collects the committee service desires from everyone; fast-forward to what has been a mish-mash where not everyone realizes that we only want to go through this process once; this year has been the mode of cooking up a different way of doing this, in order to be more strategic; for example, one change we learned about midway through was that for all the committees for which the President designates the faculty, we needed to provide more recommendations than open positions; question becomes what are the advantages and disadvantages of Exec weighing in on university committees;
 - ii. Discussion: recalled that in the past DSA, President's Office, and others were simply appointing people without letting Senate know; the attempt was then to set up a mechanism for conversation, in that the officers would get together to hold this conversation back and forth; fast-forward that it may not be efficient for us to continue to fulfill committee slots for other divisions, not sure if it's the best use of Senate time to be involved at the granular level; referenced that our bylaws state that Exec shall elect our university committee representatives; suggestion that if we wanted we could have a sub-committee where we pick a few people to do this, sub-committee would still be underneath Senate; comment added that if these are divisional committees than we shouldn't be doing it; other comment added that if a faculty member is supposed to representing faculty on a committee, then it needs to come to Senate and Exec may be the best

- vehicle for this; cited example of Food Committee where they wanted two faculty members to serve, but we gave them one due to various factors;
- iii. Question re what about junior faculty, when they receive a call that the President asked that you serve on this committee, may be harder to decline... but if more of these go through the Senate then it may make it easier for decline; reply was that this is understood, but then that person gets asked anyway outside of Senate; noted that objective is to keep people doing their research and not being obligated for service;
 - iv. Discussion: observation that once we push this out to everyone, we never hear about what they're doing with their time; Exec member(s) recalled sitting on some of these divided fee committees and they haven't met at all; it would certainly help us next year if we asked "is this a heavy committee or a light committee";
 - v. Agreement to implement the Fall 2016 model again next year, survey format worked; suggestion added that some didn't know that the notifications we received from Senate were the official notifications; agreed that we should have reports from these committees and get them into our records; noted that it's in our bylaws that they are appointed by Exec and that they also report back to Exec;
 - vi. Question about if we know where we stand about having the Senate Chair as a member of Cabinet; answer was that this has been brought up a few times, could perform more follow up on this; further discussion on what an email could look like to the President, including the topic of faculty searches in our tenure density efforts;
- b. SR 11-03 and "implementation of innovative and affirmative initiatives" regarding faculty and administrative hiring
- i. Discussion: the question for Exec is how are we doing on this, and how do we know how this implementation is going, i.e. are we making any progress towards this; right now we get data on this after the entire search is done, and we also get info on who is invited to campus and who is hired; noted that we do lose people, in terms of the actual results, referenced a leadership program under Karen Carey, but to best of knowledge that this may be gone;
 - ii. Discussion: observed that in last paragraph that it can be broken up into three pieces; referenced our faculty mentor program, "Evolve," that helps with one of these aspects; suggestion that we still revisit this; recalled that previous Provost Hutchinson provided a report on how and where we hired; comment added that it's been made clear that the program has to fund the advertising; also what we don't want to happen is that we are getting installed on every committee, and further that we shouldn't be told that we're being supervised;

- iii. Question on what the conception is for “outside member of the committee,” are they voting members or not; reply was that what we don’t want to see is our Title IX officer appointing people and placing them on a search committee;
- iv. Discussion: comment getting back to programs funding the advertising for faculty searches, would like to be able to reach out and recruit as much as possible, but the budget is a big factor, a big limiting factor in smaller programs; suggestion that maybe we ask Faculty Affairs to have a pool of money for recruitment; observed that in this document there are “enhanced strategies,” member(s) of Exec are DSA chair(s) and would love to know what these strategies are; comment that best practices mentioned here are in practice figured out after the fact, would be helpful to have this in the pre-planning;
- v. Question if other people spending a lot of money on hiring firms (nursing, school of business cited example), if they have best practices can we mirror them; noted it might be an onerous task if we were to request to know all of the staff that were hired; suggestion that this could be a divisional question, or to HR; further suggestion that it could be to just distribute that list more, sending more proactively and/or repeatedly, i.e. every time you talk about hiring, please send this; also noted that we’re really supposed to have the same person to do all of the reference checks, and also that they have to tell all candidates all of the information about the offer; it would be a real shame where candidates get an offer for a position that was later withdrawn because the university did not follow the procedures; suggestion that we may need someone beyond the Dean to look at this, because there are multiple divisions involved, maybe more from Teaching & Learning; C. Wyels offered to ask Faculty Affairs to get more info about this;
- c. IRPE presentation feedback
 - i. Summarized prior conversations in wanting to ask questions on the Senate floor during the presentation, but we ended up not doing that, let’s discuss why;
 - ii. Discussion noting that a question was raised about specific program data; recalled that the reply was “coming soon”; also recalled that it apparently exists, but heard it’s not “official yet,” a little confused about why it’s not official yet, perhaps due to a cleanup of mistakes; C. Wyels recalled circulating our three questions, but these were not addressed on the floor; summarized that we want to understand what IRPE does and what we can ask; Exec member(s) recalled it was a little tricky for them to get us the numbers we asked for, but they did provide it, because we asked in the meetings when we were under program review; further noted that we’ve never had this data and so may have been difficult to ask the questions;

observed that what was inherited may now be just adding data tables on top of one another; observation that they're spending a lot of time trying to make uniform definitions in this kind of "data dictionary," but it may be more useful to understand that we shouldn't try to cram it into one, i.e. if we ask H. Dang for data it may look different from other sources; noted that a point of interest was in who is actually talking to our students about why they're leaving, was under the impression that M. Bourgeois' office that is doing this; question if this wasn't this the survey that was in development – recalled that reply was that "they are working on this";

8. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration
 - a. FAC presentation of possibilities for electronic portfolios?
 - i. Tabled until next time per discussions with B. Hartung
 - b. Proposed presentation w/Q&A for University Glen Phase 2 Housing project
 - i. Recalled that T. Tarr is requesting time in Senate again about Phase 2 Housing; asked Exec if a time certain at 4pm would work so that people who are interested could stay; comment that there is interest here, but that it doesn't sound like Senate business and might not want to subject people that don't live there; comment added that we could announce it, Exec agreed;
 - ii. C. Wyels summarized that the answer will be "no," and here's some alternatives;
9. Other Business
 - a. J. Grier recalled her attendance at the Business & Continuity Planning Task Force meeting, which has to do with campus preparedness and their desire to provide more information to faculty; may put us in touch with Maggie Tsouras; suggestion that they could spend five minutes in Senate, then send out email that provides links to resources; question raised re to clarify about training for preparedness roles / jobs; reply was that there is desire to reach out to those who want to do more, but in their original outline they did not cover teaching along with payroll, HR, staff jobs, etc.;
 - b. C. Wyels summarized that it sounds like nothing is ready to be distributed by Thursday on this; Exec agreed, noted that this was a planning discussion to prep for a forthcoming presentation in Senate;
 - c. Meeting adjourned at 4:22pm.