



**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**

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

Senate Executive Committee  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, September 06, 2016  
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185  
2:30pm

Attendees: Cindy Wyels, Steve Stratton, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Jennifer Perry, Sean Kelly, Jacob Jenkins, Jeanne Grier, Dan Wakelee, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Travis Hunt, Greg Wood

1. Meeting Called to Order
  - a. Meeting called to order at 2:30PM;
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Approved with no objections;
3. Introductions of Senate Exec members
  - a. All members of Exec went around the table for introductions; President Beck also dropped in to say hello and to wish everyone a successful semester; funny anecdote / commentary on how Dr. Beck led the policy initiative at NSU that prohibited administrators from attending Senate Exec unless specifically invited;
4. Charge and Practices of Senate Exec
  - a. Discussion of ex-officio, norms for Senate Exec participation; Charge of Senate and bylaws was pulled up on website for display; noted that language of "not limited to but including" may end up giving us some latitude;
  - b. Suggestion to strike the term "senate of the whole," since we are not, but in reality a faculty senate; we have 5 lecturer reps for 300+ lecturers, and we have T. Hunt who represents the entire student body; asked S. Kelly to play dual role as at-large and also a resource who will keep us all mindful of lecturer perspectives, chair wanted to make this public and to acknowledge thanks;
  - c. Senate Goals slide was then displayed; discussion that this helps to advocate for a stronger faculty voice in shared governance; reminded that at convocation it was mentioned that the authority rests with the Board of Trustees; stated goal that we need to have a culture of informed critical and civil debate; reminder that the charge in Exec is to use this debate to determine if a given policy is ready to go to Academic Senate or not, we don't have to "get in the weeds" of the merits of the policy or whether or not to pass it; reminded that in terms of Exec meeting procedure, we don't have to vote but we do strive for consensus; we'll strive to reach balanced decisions as a group with everyone's voice being heard;

- d. Referenced a 2/27/16 article entitled “what Google learned to build the perfect team”... Google has tons of data, noted two trends common to highest functioning groups: 1) members usually spoke in the same amount per person, sense of turn-taking and encouraging lots of voices; 2) sense of social sensitivity, or being skilled at intuiting how others feel based on tone of voice; full article available here [http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/28/magazine/what-google-learned-from-its-quest-to-build-the-perfect-team.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/28/magazine/what-google-learned-from-its-quest-to-build-the-perfect-team.html?_r=0)
5. Approval of the Minutes from May 3, 2016
    - a. Question to clarify the amount of financial support for the new Mechatronics program; this appeared to be left undecided from the last minutes from 5/3/16;
    - b. ACTION: Exec will make a note of this to perform follow-up; hearing no further objections, Exec moved forward with the agenda;
6. Continuing Business
    - a. Liberal Studies Online Degree
      - i. Discussion on steps taking place before this point, remembering that it was not a formal resolution to continue discussion, but rather an agreement with B. Bleicher to continue discussion of this in Fall 2016; recalled that Liberal Studies was submitted to Curriculum Committee in Fall 2015, but was delayed; at subsequent Exec meetings it was determined it wasn't ready; B. Bleicher held brown bags to accommodate concerns; timing was too late to take this up in last Senate meeting, so agreement was made to continue discussion in Exec and possibly bring it to the first Senate meeting;
      - ii. Observed that no ethnic studies courses were in this proposal, and given the new report on ethnic studies, this draws attention to the options for students, given that the intent was a multicultural approach; questioned if these courses could be added in once they exist; Chicano/a studies also not present;
      - iii. Observed that B. Bleicher was seeking who would be able to offer such courses – checked with multiple faculty members to see whom may be closer to the logistics of putting a course on-line; Noted that B. Bleicher did his due diligence in striving for multicultural courses to be added to the program but experienced faculty concerns due to their online nature; it was decided not to apply the ethnic studies report to this curriculum as it was released considerably later than this curriculum;
      - iv. Observed that two-thirds of the listed courses are not yet online; according to the Online Policy, programs would need to vote on those; recalled that B. Bleicher has said that electives could be transitioned to online later;
      - v. Possible suggestion could be to have a “to be created” section; Observation that in many program proposals it's common to have

- electives still to be developed; call to Exec to consider if feedback should be submitted to B. Bleicher and have him revise before going to Academic Senate, or if it's Ok to send as a first reading; general agreement that these are points that could be discussed on the Senate floor;
- vi. Further noted that a sticking point last time was the statement that all work is to be performed on an overload basis; Exec member(s) recalled that this is one of the reasons the answer was "no" when asked by B. Bleicher – if this could be addressed perhaps there would be more faculty buy-in; Noted places in the document that seek to address this concern;
  - vii. Noted that J. Leafstedt is no longer faculty among other faculty names that need updating;
  - viii. Question on what is Senate voting on, the WASC substantive change or the program proposal; answer with understanding is that it's for the course proposal; clarification that Senate would then be voting on whether the Chancellor's Office can seek WASC approval for this; noted that we will also need to be aware of the associated costs – Senate may not presently have all the information they need to make this determination, but we will need to move toward having this ability; further discussion on pending approved proposals that have yet to be implemented;
  - ix. Question if we are to hold this one up while we take the necessary steps – if so it could result in a curriculum moratorium; answer that we may not want to hold this up, noting that it's great the work that S. Frisch is doing to help retrieve the information, but is a large undertaking and is a huge decision; question if we could send this to Senate with a corresponding note that we're not talking about resources; answer with observation that we should be mindful that the CO will only allow this to sit for three years, whereas in the past they would keep it longer;
  - x. Recommended that it goes to Senate as a first reading item; noted that it may be helpful to ask B. Bleicher to introduce the curriculum by explaining a rationale for why this needs to be online, as these would not be state-side students; observed that this might address our students more than we realize, we would likely still be drawing from Ventura County;
  - xi. ACTION: noted follow-up messages to B. Bleicher, but that this will go forward as a first reading item in Senate;
- b. Program By-Laws: interpretation arbiter (no attachments)
- i. Question before Exec is in reference to the arbiter – the Dean is responsible for approving the bylaws, but recommending that Faculty Affairs address this question; we could also authorize the Dean to make the decision with a possible vote, e.g. you have a program, somebody needs to make decisions on preferred course of action; long-term items could be given to Faculty Affairs, short-term items could be given to the

Dean to make these initial decisions; we could also draw up an appeal process;

- ii. Questions discussed include whether the appeal option be kind of automatic if a given person wasn't given his/her way in the decision? Noted that most bylaws have two-thirds majority to change the bylaws; Question on why go to the Dean in the first place – answer was for efficiency's sake, but also that one can obstruct a program, especially if everything went to a vote; observed that in the policy it shows that these items are approved by the Dean anyway;
  - iii. Comment that whatever we do, we need to make clear that it's interpreting vs. changing the bylaws; seeing this as really a faculty governance issue – observing that the Dean and Provost are making sure programs are following the rules, but that they don't need to tell them what to do; recalled that Dean's approval is what has held up School of Ed bylaws, they were unable to vote;
  - iv. Request to clarify what would cause it being kicked up to a Dean; Exec cited examples where one person does not agree with a given interpretation; comment that not sure why this wouldn't be a program discussion at the first level; further noted that Exec is attempting to figure out the more efficient way of coming to an agreement; suggestion that temporary solution is that the interpretation of bylaws goes to the Provost, since this would be interpreted across the university, might not be a school or program decision – temporary solution would be that the Provost or designee could be involved in cases of impasse, plus we could send to Faculty Affairs for feedback and long-term solution.
- c. Honorary Degree Process
- i. G. Evans Taylor introduced process, one with a high degree of confidentiality, and further echoed by Chancellor's Office; today is the first day that we start the process, at Senate we'd like faculty input and would like to collect names by next Friday (16<sup>th</sup>); from there will provide information on the nominations; in the future if you want this process to just go to Senate officers, we can do that for next year, but this year it will go to the entire Senate Exec Committee;
  - ii. Question on number 4, mentions three candidates, is this a set target number – answer was that it usually is asked that a strong list of candidates is built, which is commonly more like three and not ten; Exec further discussed past honorees; comment about sticking to the clause about the “high moral standard” criteria, since we want to avoid granting an honorary degree and then having to revoke it later; Exec agreed;
  - iii. C. Wyels called for Exec to consider if we need to make any changes to the process; comment that we wouldn't mind it if it were kept to officers,

but given that confidentiality has been maintained in the past, including the entire Exec committee provides a wider perspective;

- d. Center for Multicultural Engagement bylaws
  - i. Noted that these proposed changes to bylaws should go to the impacted centers; recalled that they called it a charter, wasn't really bylaws; noted co-director arrangement in CME, recalled that it became problematic that this document that didn't go through Faculty Affairs, i.e. separate budgets were floating around; recalled that CME charter was interpreted as a strategic planning document and not bylaws; Exec member(s) recalled being in these meetings, intent was that since J. Balen was going on sabbatical, it was an attempt to cover the directorship while on this leave;
  - ii. C. Wyels called for recommendations on where to go from here; observed that CME does not currently have bylaws, recommendation could be to create such bylaws; referenced Senate policy on choosing directors; recommendation that if we ask one center for bylaws, we should ask all the centers to do it; comment in favor of empowering the Committee on Centers & Institutes in this fashion; forwarded P. Hampton email to Exec Chair with more background; observed that they've been doing annual reports, but not much action on this post-report;
  - iii. ACTION: C. Wyels agreed to make the Committee on Centers & Institutes aware of these concerns and also with CME, plus we will keep this moving forward with bylaws from all centers;
- e. CSU Ethnic Studies Report
  - i. Summarized that Chancellor's Office (CO) says "please engage in robust discussion" about this; recalled in statewide meetings that this came from multiple campuses, lots of feedback that went back to faculty, however we are a system of 14K faculty, so perhaps a small percentage of faculty have actually seen this; summarized that these are suggestions to faculty on building curriculum;
  - ii. Recommendation based on this is that this may go to Curriculum Committee; noted to also make a recommendation to GE committee to make ethnic studies part of General Education requirements; further recommendation that we should send some context with this, i.e. we're not saying that this is an Executive Order from the CO that charges programs with this – programs can make their evaluations on their own budget and curriculum; agreed that GE is a good choice for involvement, along with Curriculum Committee;
  - iii. Recalled that the CO communication was clear that we have a year to discuss this, plus it may be a window into programs on other campuses that have yet to address the need for ethnic studies; observed that the report says that this in no way should affect existing programs from addressing diversity in hiring; further observed that only one campus listed

on the report as having a minor, but we do have an Asian Studies minor on our campus; comment that it could be that we weren't required to submit this information on minor programs;

- iv. C. Wyels called for personnel recommendations to ensure that this report is followed up with; comment that seems like this is geared for AVP of Academic Planning and Undergraduate Resources, given the impacts on campus-wide curriculum; noted that Provost office would be happy to send it to the Division, let them know where to direct comments – to S. Frisch, to GE, or to Curriculum Committee; general agreement to send to both GE and Curriculum Committee, follow up inquiry on why we can't require this as a campus, i.e. institute some kind of campus requirement instead of waiting for the CO to require it; agreed; further suggestion that maybe program chairs could also be involved;
- v. Further discussion on how to document "robust discussions";
- vi. ACTION: Exec agreed that S. Frisch would be a good point person for this;

## 7. Chair Report

- a. C. Wyels noted that folks will be hearing about 2025 symposium, in that the Chancellor's Office initiative highlights renewed efforts to raise graduation rates, both in four-year and two-year-transfer rates; question from Exec if there is a group that will be tackling this – answered Yes that a group is forming;
- b. Slides were then displayed regarding service opportunities; Senate officers asked to help determine the highest priorities on what is needed; moved to Qualtrics survey draft portal, in order to help faculty be more strategic in determining their needs;
- c. Suggestion if it might be good to add when respective committees meet – answer that an attachment would be included with the email announcement;
- d. Feedback on Qualtrics question text, not exactly sure what "interested" means versus the other column labels, would also like to see more of a gradation; agreed that something like a gradation of "if I have to" / "sure I'll do it" / "I really want this / pick me" would work well;
- e. ACTION: C. Wyels will work with D. Daniels to revise the Qualtrics text; C. Wyels asked Exec if everyone was good with leaving the appointing process with the officers; Exec agreed that this is most efficient;
- f. Question from Exec on why the faculty on the search committee are selected by the President, why aren't there faculty on the search committee selected by faculty; answer that SP 14-15 specifies the membership and allows one faculty member; follow-up comment that having one faculty member elected to the committee may satisfy the policy, but the thought for the intent in shared governance is that faculty get to pick the faculty member; maybe next time we want this to be different;



## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

8. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration
  - a. Requests for time to share information with faculty; question if these folks could be requested to each have a written document that could be provided, or if we would we be willing to make that a prerequisite; noted that these groups may be assuming that all faculty are at the Senate meetings;
  - b. Suggestion that these folks are able to go into the FitStudio to make a video, which may be the best vehicle for the announcement-related content; from this video we could then decide to bring this person in because we do see it as important; folks could attend the corresponding Senate meeting and bring more substantive questions at that time;
    - i. Agenda items (b. i-vii) through (c.) are tabled for consideration outside of Exec meeting by Senate Chair, in interest of time and in keeping with time sensitive discussion on the selection of the faculty member to the Provost search committee;
  - c. Selection of the Senate Exec designated faculty member to the Provost Search Committee;
9. Other Business
  - a. No discussion, meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.