



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 27, 2016
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Steve Stratton; Sean Kelly; Cindy Wyels; Jenn Perry; Jeanne Grier; Mary Adler; Travis Hunt; Simone Aloisio; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Dan Wakelee; Jacob Jenkins;
Staff Present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:29pm
 - a. Noted that G. Wood will be unable to attend, G. Evans Taylor will arrive late;
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda was approved with no objections;
3. Approval of the Minutes from Sept. 6, 2016
 - a. Meeting minutes from 9/6/16 were approved with no objections;
4. Continuing Business
 - a. Liberal Studies Online Degree – proposal slightly modified (attachment)
 - i. Call to Exec for feedback or comments on this proposal;
 - ii. Observed that in item number 18 it referred to 24/7 academic online coaching via “Inside Track,” asked for clarification about this; answer was that it is something believed to be used in the School of Business; recalled previous online tutoring portals via “Vista”;
 - iii. ACTION: this item will be placed on Continuing Business for the next Academic Senate meeting
 - b. Honorary Degrees: Confidential consideration of nominees (presented in meeting; process document re-attached)
 - i. Summarized that we’re at the stage where we’re reviewing candidates to access viability, not ranking yet; recalled several campus entities that submitted names; Exec members reviewed information printed on handouts;
 - ii. Question if someone can receive an honorary degree while in a political office; answer was no, but once the term in office expires they are then eligible to receive an honorary degree;
 - iii. Comment that it’s nice to see the connections with CI with these applicants;
5. New Business
(none received)

6. Chair Report

- a. C. Wyels offered thanks for nudge to remind Office of President that faculty are interested in knowing / participating in on-campus visits by CSU Trustees, people from Chancellor's Office, etc.; C. Wyels did remind OoP and received enthusiastic "yes, we know and are on it";
- b. Referenced 2025 graduation initiative, campuses came to CO-called symposium to report what they're doing to improve graduation rates; reinforced the sense that the CSU is a cool place to work if you're interested in places that provide education to communities and populations who haven't always had access to it;
- c. Question if we have been given graduation targets, or have our targets been advertised; answer was that we have been given new grad targets, more info will be sent out on this and how we're getting organized to do this; observed that some campuses appear to be well organized around this, other campuses are in the same state that we are, so we'll need to form a coherent approach; comment that SDSU is doing some good stuff education wise; agreed that some campuses are making some good headway here; further observed that at the time it wasn't that clear that any movement was happening, i.e. no dollars or "teeth";
- d. Question if these targets focus on time to graduation or first year progress; answer was that the Chancellor has made targets focusing on four-year graduation rates for freshmen and two-year rates for transfers, and also to eliminate gaps for particular subpopulations by 2025, each campus also has a set of 4 and 6 year targets;
- e. Question if there was any discussion on remediation; answer was that there were talks on this, some of the approaches are currently accessible, but some are more elaborate and encompass a range of approaches;
- f. Question if this will be reported on at the next Senate; answer will need follow up, Provost is in Long Beach, perhaps another member of the Provost's Office can report on this;
- g. Exec member recalled that in the recent chairs meeting someone suggested having an outside consultant help provide a broader perspective on the university's current/future curriculum planning; and there was an outside person who did some work on the fiscal master plan in the past. This study was much lighter on the academic side and heavier on the facilities side;
- h. Question if we can see 4-year and 6-year graduation rate data; , information has been requested and is in the cue (via CI Dashboard); comment that our challenges will be different than other CSUs, i.e. we're growing and there isn't a long wait list for particular sections of courses, while other campuses can address barriers by just adding more sections;
- i. Recalled that the Chancellor was talking about funding a tool so that we can add sections and predict where the demand for sections is, or other courses with high demand to teach; could also find data intersections where there is a high demand

to teach a course but a low demand to take said course; question on what this tool is called – answer was “Poly Planner” and “Smart Planner” is another; Noted that the practical goal is course planning, but the subtle outcome is student agency and what we need to do; observed that the tool would have a feedback loop to advising (i.e. this student failed a certain course);

- j. Summarized that the conversation was about time to degree but at the same time it’s important to be focusing on the quality of degree; also contradicted perspectives that “in order to do this we’ll have to lower our standards,” but optimistic that we can do both;
 - k. Member suggestion that once Provost Office determines who gets the portfolio that maybe we should outline a task force that would take this up; observed that this is also a campus resource discussion, we have a whole portfolio of different programs designed to support student success, but some are coordinated and some are not;
7. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration
- a. Requests for time to share information with faculty
 - i. Teaching and Learning Innovations (Jill Leafstedt) – flipped announcement, wants Q&A time only.
 - 1. J. Leafstedt has flipped her presentation, helping us to demonstrate this model as an example; so her video will go out with the Senate Blog;
 - ii. Housing: Venessa Griffith
 - 1. Received feedback for two-minute video presentations, J. Leafstedt / V. Griffith will provide these videos; recalled that it was also discussed that community time could be used for this; answer referred to feedback received in that community time is just that, it’s meant to build community, and that watching presentations doesn’t really do this;
 - 2. Suggestion that since V. Griffith is the coordinator for the residence at Santa Rosa that she be asked to speak broadly about housing; agreed, this was the essence, i.e. how housing can support our academic efforts;
 - 3. Suggestion to view such videos after our business is conducted, recalled challenges in previous Senate meetings to keep presenters to their time limits; Exec member(s) recalled the use of a green light / yellow light / red light scheme in other occasions that seemed to work well;
 - 4. Suggestion if we may be able to set up a TV to view these announcements outside; agreed, D. Daniels will look into how this can be done;
 - iii. Parking consultant (via Terry Tarr, F&S)

1. Noted that T. Tarr is an architect, we have hired him as a consultant on how to solve parking issues; recalled that he was more than willing to shorten his presentation, asked if he could do a short review; suggestion that this be one of the items that goes last;
 2. Question that didn't he have a survey that he was going to refer us to; answer was that this is a mandatory compliance survey and is different; comment that we're not opposed to an hour long meeting with faculty on this topic, but not at our Senate meeting time;
 - iv. IRPE (Michael Bourgeois)
 1. Comment that it may be best to think about the questions we want to hear from IRPE rather than a more general presentation, wasn't clear on what kinds of questions this presentation was intended to answer;
 2. IRPE = Institutional Research and Program Education;
 3. Suggestion that maybe we can ask for an update on the status of the data analysis project, recalled that a year ago started this, so we could get an update on progress, timeline, etc.; agreed, could add process and priorities, could also ask if they can provide something that we can link to and reference outside of Senate; could ask for a status update on the data warehouse, i.e. what's our future in using data in getting better at what we do? Recalled that M. Bourgeois wasn't in a rush, wanted to come sometime this year;
 - b. Salary Compression: Share open letter with faculty? (attachment, same as last Exec meeting)
 - i. Noted that initially wasn't sure where it came from, then located name at the bottom, read the signature line indicating source was from a faculty member from CSU San Bernardino;
 - ii. Recalled that this was already published, possibly in a recent CFA newsletter;
 - iii. Suggestion that since there are 14K total faculty members, maybe the proper venue thorough proper CFA channels; noted concerns about an open letter format;
 - iv. ACTION: item will not be shared via the Senate faculty channels; G. Wood can be a resource here and could potentially share letter through proper CFA channels;
8. Other Business
- a. Discussion on divisional restructuring; noted that productive conversations are occurring at the President-Provost level, with lots of ideas on the ways of conducting business at CSU; summer is a great example to add capacity, but after talking to Extended Education, they could easily add capacity but most students

will have already exhausted their aid; so, the concepts of stateside summer was discussed; also funding model could change from enrollment-based funding, the CSU could move away from this in terms of funded net FTES, and in place of this is the idea that if you're graduating more students the pipeline has more capacity; which for us could be significant impacts, question is if we would still be a campus with 12K or 10K students;

- b. Provost began this semester looking at our organizational structure, right now it's clear that we don't know where the CSU is going – the time to have this discussion is at the end of the fiscal cycle, where is the legislature going to put the money where their mouth is; the organization structure task force will be emailed and thanked for their work, but this work will be tabled at this time so that people are not put through another process that ends up gathering dust; email will go today but this will also be echoed in Senate;
- c. Noted that this discussion will also be ringing with funding models, right now we have 4% of our stateside funding for graduate students; recalled this being echoed at the CSU-wide meetings where people stood up and mentioned graduate programs and creative studies; added that let's be mindful when we say that the funding model will change, that this means that turning the battleship around is going to take time; further noted that the CO is asking for one percent growth from a \$150 million base;
- d. Question on how this affects our forthcoming interim dean positions; answer that should have more info on this in a few weeks or so; current School of Ed. dean search has been cancelled, rethinking how this will go forward; recalled that last year there was an initial effort to think about the reorganization of the Division of Academic Affairs (DAA), and now that we're in a position that our current organization isn't optimal, question if there are things we can do "on the cheap"; this information will be solicited;
- e. Question referencing that in student government that they are talking more about winter sessions, and also Friday or Saturday sessions, how would these work; answer that classes on Saturday requires that we have buildings in operation with support services that are not regularly open, versus Friday classes just being a matter of scheduling; we would need to be mindful of not just turning on the faucet and assuming that services would flow; recalled that we've learned that turning on the faucet in Santa Barbara that there ended up being no services for those students; comment that maybe situations like lab experiences or three-week studies might work for this; Exec member(s) recalled that they took winter terms like this, seemed to be too accelerated; noted that if we were to do that we would need to have an earlier start to Spring semesters; suggestion that we may want to put in certain literacy skills in these types of classes, without the pressure of a full course load, so that way they would have a chance to build these skills for the forthcoming full terms;



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

- f. Summarized that this year what we're grappling with is that the current legislature appropriated 35 million that has to be spent this year; as such, the CSU really wants to move people who were scheduled for 4.5 years to 4.0 years – we have about 180 students that are within 12 units of graduation, suggestion that we could institute some sort of priority for these students, along with additional advising support; added that the idea was to think creatively, but the thought was that we wouldn't have the ability to do this, very few campuses are year round... so we couldn't, for example, buy out Extended Education courses and offer them at CI, the money can't cross these lines;
- g. Discussion (ongoing) about the best uses of Senate time, optimal use of Senate as a partner in shared government; recalled that we've always done what our bylaws tell us to do, what hit last week is the realization that there isn't a clear sense about how Senate can be more proactive, yet have more efficient uses of Senate time as an institution – first thought on this is that we're doing a good job, one thing though was about the FPC recommendations and similar items, maybe instead of giving five minutes to external entities, those things should be reported back to Senate and Senate Exec; this would be similar to the structure task force last year, i.e. holding people's feet to the fire; added that we have new President and new Provost, let's make sure when seeking out faculty for new committees that our Senate Chair continues to be the point of contact for this;
- h. Observed that in a recent read of the bylaws is that ALL committees are supposed to come to Exec and not just Academic Senate; example is Curriculum Committee (CC) who made huge changes that many may still be unaware of, these things process wise might need to be vetted a little more; recollections with different CSU-wide conversations, i.e. "I don't care if you call it practice, policy or procedure we need to come talk about it"; recalled that sometimes when other topics come up in Senate that they are important conversations, could be a community time topic, but when we're trying to pass policies and we just end up expressing feelings about a certain topic, sometimes the debate is spurred in a tangential direction;
- i. Regarding Curriculum Committee (CC), recalled that they sent an email blast out to chairs and that their business was presented to Exec last year but with only two meetings left, so we couldn't get through all of the business; impression is that CC is an "unwieldy beast," due in part that they're getting 400+ proposals;
- j. Question if anyone from CC can be a liaison for them to come to Exec; answer that we could ask them, question if it would have to be a faculty member; comment that this could be tough since many of those folks serve on multiple other committees; further comment that this was noted, but that we also don't want Exec to tell CC what to do, and maybe communication is improved if there is a standing rep on Exec; noted that all of the committee heads are on there, so it builds on this idea; recalled that in Exec we've tried reading their minds without much success; added that it could be seen in cases where there are 100 proposals

at hand, agreed that this would be helpful; added that a key point is the CC does not have the expertise on everything that is submitted, the campus is too big; suggestion that in the past we've thought to remove some of the workload from the CC, noting that there could be a better way of doing this, and we would hate for this type of committee to go away on this campus, seeing the value they have on other campuses; suggestion that maybe we don't put as many untenured faculty on the committee, they've often said that they might not have the background to make the go or no go decisions; agreed that a lot of the minutia or penny-ante stuff is too cumbersome for this body; cited example of course mods, which is certainly needed, but shouldn't require nine people weighing in on it; on the other hand we do want this full group reviewing say our new Mechatronics Degree program; observed that they don't have a context in which they use to review proposals, a rubric, or some sort of guiding principles to evaluate proposals; have never had tools / guidelines by which these are evaluated to determine what is good curriculum or not; this would not be dependent on who is on the committee year over year;

- k. Question if could maybe one of Exec be there instead of the other way around; answer would caution against this as an "outside observer" stigma, some kind of watchful eye rather than a colleague / collaborator – added that perhaps an invite to come to Exec is less threatening in this way;
- l. Suggestion in terms of expertise and workload, maybe we rethink what the duties of CC are and ask that schools / programs take on some of their workload; agreed that if after the proposals get through the schools then it goes to CC, this way they won't have to do the penny-ante stuff; also noted that now that we have someone in the Academic Planning office we're in better shape; if they're getting 400 proposals, how can we get all of these in the catalog;
- m. Noted that Chair and President have a meeting scheduled for later in the week, called for Exec to consider topics to bring up; first answer was tenure density, and what is our target for this; recalled that there was a target given in the School of Ed meeting, maybe a discussion of tenure density targets would be helpful; second answer was that the Senate Chair should be a member of the Cabinet; third answer was maybe an emphasis on diversity in hiring, let's see if we can get tangible goals on that as well;
- n. Noted that Senate Officers met this morning on University Committees, we were able to fill all of the requested slots together; we tried to be protective of people's workload estimates; these results will be circulated soon; we also have left overs, people left in the pool that we can assign as needed; added that this could be useful if and when other search committee requests come in;
- o. Pleasure to announce that the campus was recently informed of a new HSI grant for \$6M that is STEM focused; congratulations all around; question if it starts Oct 1st – answer was yes;



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

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

- p. Question on how the search is going for RSP replacement for T. Knight; answer that there is now a candidate pool, faculty connected to RSP will be on search committee;
- q. Meeting Adjourned at 4:00PM.