



**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**  
C H A N N E L  
I S L A N D S

Senate Executive Committee  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, October 18, 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; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Greg Wood  
Staff Present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:34pm
  - a. Noted that Travis Hunt and Dan Wakelee will not be able to attend today;
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Agenda approved with no objections;
3. Approval of the Minutes from Sept. 27, 2016
  - a. Question on the Chair Report line, suggestion to add additional headers for “discussion” or markers for when it moves ahead to another topic; M. Adler offered to help with this as well; also, in Section 8(c), let’s strike “creative studies” here as it lacks context;
4. Continuing Business  
(none)
5. New Business
  - a. Add Policy (SAPP)
    - i. Introduced policy noting that it is an attempt to align policy with current practice; reminded that our job in Exec is to debate whether the policy is complete or not, it isn’t our job to debate the merits of the policy; observed that the revised policy reduces the number of signatures required;
    - ii. Discussion: observation that it seems limiting (referenced second sentence) that they’ll always go with the paper form, seems limiting if we ever go to an electronic version; ACTION – C. Wyels offered to relay this to SAPP in advance of the first meeting; question re- how many layers of review are they removing, seems like three layers during Week Four is dropping to one, is there still a reason for this; recalled that old policy used to have signature request series of dean, program chair and instructor; observed that this policy version has lightened the signature steps for a week, after that the chair is back in; recalled that Arts and Sciences program chairs were asked whether they felt chair signatures were necessary in week 4 but most did not feel it was needed;; comment that there could be a possible need for an additional signature where there are extenuating circumstances like internships, credential programs, field programs with field placements, etc. – but noted that the instructor can still

say no (and maybe should be instructed to say no for these at Week Four); observed that this is a policy that seems to be written with a 15-week schedule in mind, but it is not currently mentioned in the language; further recalled that chair signatures have been useful when we've had cases where students have wanted to add a course with a preferred instructor even though there were open spots elsewhere for the same class;

- iii. Discussed items to bring back to SAPP: 1) that the standards referenced are for 15-week semesters; 2) to address the rationale for leaving the paper form in; 3) to consider if there was a reason why chair signatures were thought to be important in the previous policy;
- iv. Discussion on whether it can go forward to Senate: only concern is to make sure that someone from the committee attends the Senate meeting; suggestion that since third paragraph says "after the third week of instruction" and "students may not add after the fourth week"... wouldn't it be more clear to just write "in the fourth week" and keep it at that; further suggestion that it would be really nice to preface each line with the particular week referred to; ACTION – C. Wyels offered to work with T. Itkonen and P. Murphy to see if we can work something out in advance of Senate;

b. Policy on Internships for Academic Credit (SAPP)

- i. Background on policy: there's a corresponding Executive Order (E.O.) for this; sometime between when this came out and 2013, SAPP drafted a policy to be in compliance with the E.O., then sent a policy to Senate in Spring of 2013, but it was voted down; SAPP came back with another version but it didn't make it out of committee; issues around faculty not having the purview to address many items; there were then subsequent meetings with many campus entities, the main issues being workload and liability;
- ii. Question: in Section B it all seems to rest on Procurement staff, are they set up for this – answer was that it is safe to assume this;
- iii. Discussion: aim is that we will have one policy on internships after it's all said and done, in cooperation with PPPC; observation that it appears to read that every faculty member will be making their own policy on internships, which may be problematic; suggestion that maybe we need a policy for academic credit for internships; referenced the use of the word "policy" in 1(a); further observed the phrase "documentation of the above items should be submitted by students," but this doesn't seem to fit, is this a burden that we want the students to carry; further observed that in Section 1 it mentions "supervising faculty members" are responsible for, but then (f) says submitted by the student; issues may arise from students submitting in the first place; further question on who is the "appropriate administrative office" – answer if this could be the Procurement office;

comment that perhaps the student is walking over the paperwork – follow up question of “why would they”; summarized the procedural logistics on student-initiated internships (sometimes after the fact requesting credit); suggestion that the agreement form may need to go in a different place; recommendation that we do have the capitalized learning agreement, referenced in (a), difference is in A(e), but this needs to be reconciled; suggestion that it sounds like we need to clarify what the office of Procurement is; question if we are talking about just formal internships or service learning opportunities; noted that this does say service learning; recalled that service objectives can be broken down by 100-level classes, versus gradual increases in responsibilities and hours for 400-level classes (referenced second sentence); noted that fortunately they are using the language of the E.O.; observed that Section B seems to be dealing with the site and not having to do with the student – answer was yes, that only Section A has to do with the student;

- iv. Discussion on whether it can go forward to Senate: observation that it sounds like there’s enough tweaking to hold onto this for now; recommendation that we ask for more information in the Background section of the policy, agreed that the more definitions and background the better; observed that it seems like a timeline should also be suggested, some of these steps may need months ahead of time in preparation, maybe “at least one semester in advance”; comment that instituting such a timeline may help mitigate future complaints; agreed that a clarification of the chronology would be helpful (reference to Section B and learning agreement); observed that nothing in the policy says the agreement has to be in place before the student attends;
- v. ACTION – C. Wyels summarized that she will provide comments to SAPP; policy will not go to Senate as a first reading item at this time.

## 6. Chair Report

- a. C. Wyels recalled feedback from PPPC and dropping language referencing the Vice President of Academic Affairs, this language has now been changed to Provost; recalled that in the past the Provost seemed to be included as one of several vice presidents, and what the office was formerly called was Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs – affirmed that this person going forward is the Provost and that it is understood that they are second in command of the university undafterer the President; comment that the Provost also has oversight on Academic Affairs;
- b. Discussion: question if this is something in the future that we will have to change small sections of text from existing policies – answer was yes, and could be an ongoing process, but the items identified by PPPC have already been updated by D. Daniels;

- c. Noted that a series of steps have been initiated about a tuition increase; CSSA has to be consulted (California State Student Association); first step is presenting a case to them as to why we might need this; important leverage point is the 169M gap between what the trustees are asking for and what the state is willing to give;
  - d. Referenced that in PPPC there's a policy being vetted where students who have to drop an entire semester are provided an appeals process if initially denied the possibility of getting their fees back, asking SAPP to have a representative on PPPC in order to help provide focus on this policy;
  - e. Referenced what D. Wakelee updated us about re the disbanding of the task force for restructuring, and that is that we don't really know what is hitting yet with 2025 Graduation Initiative; observed that we have things that are happening at the Division of Academic Affairs and the Division of Student Affairs, and these are kind of silos that are doing some of the same things inefficiently; consideration that this may have been something that the task force could have done, but is now disbanded; summarized that it's a bit of a "stay tuned;"
  - f. Will meet with Interim AVP of Academic Planning on Monday to look at the policy for academic planning, in general the thinking is that this policy will take some time to improve in the long term, but in the meantime we're looking at some short-term solutions;
  - g. Discussion: question that when you say "2025" in Senate you might want to elaborate / clarify this; agreed, this does not refer to the CI 2025 sustainability initiative; suggestion that we can add "graduation initiative" to this; suggestion to put "support of graduate programs" on the table when meeting about academic planning;
7. Nichole Ipach – Advancement – faculty/Senate conversation: time certain, 3 pm
- a. C. Wyels recalled prior conversations with N. Ipach to come to Exec to best address what would be mutually beneficial for Advancement and faculty;
  - b. Discussion: N. Ipach stated basic question of how can we provide for more faculty involvement with Advancement; expressed desire to welcome any other ideas, perhaps to find efficiencies; summarized that in the day-to-day we tend to be behind the scenes, then we do the President's dinner and concert, so it follows that some of you know about Advancement's role and some don't; asked what are some of the perceptions about Advancement on campus; answer from Exec member who sat on the Foundation Board last year, who suggested a brief part on what we look like, i.e. don't think that faculty have a good sense of where we are or how we're doing; N. Ipach thought it to be interesting that folks come to Advancement with a specific money amount, but without a lot of details to be provided to donors; noted that when you work with Advancement you have to partner with Advancement; comment that there may be misperceptions in terms of how many easily obtainable donations there are; answer from Exec member in regards to perceptions about Advancement, would be great to hear more about



## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

what are the categories / constituents that you've had a lot of success with, then on the other side what are the categories that aren't as successful; other question re what is the difference in how Advancement raises money versus how RSP raises money, are they synergistic or do they conflict, suggestion that this might be a conversation that we break out divisionally and to get this info to the faculty via the deans – i.e. the deans have Advancement budgets; N. Ipach agreed that this is something that she can explain, also agreed that the process on how we do our “survey of the land” needs improvement; i.e. we need to understand who the players are; question re how faculty are interested in keeping track of our students once they graduate, and Advancement seems to be as well; N. Ipach commented that we would love to partner in keeping track of alumni, and that this is a perfect example; elaborated that we have a new tool that uses LinkedIn to help find alumni (called “AlumniFinder”); Exec consensus that more information about this tool would be welcomed; question re what happens when someone randomly contacts you saying “I'd like to make a gift,” adding that we should also have clarifications on what constitutes a “gift”; N. Ipach answered that if you mean recognitions, we have named group study rooms for \$25K; question if Advancement has a goal every year – answer from N. Ipach was that the general rule is to raise at least 10% of a given operating budget; for our campus this is an incredibly lofty goal, we are a relatively new campus without a large alumni base; would be about \$7 million given a total \$70 million operating budget; our fund-raising goal is not pure science, but is based on the need or priority; referenced two major reports that faculty may want to see more info on, 1) the Voluntary Support of Education report, which allows us to see the campus comparative to national standards, and takes into account actual gifts and irrevocable gifts (estate plans); then 2) we have our Philanthropic Productivity Report, and this compares how CI is doing with other campuses in the CSU system – this is the number they use collectively to celebrate how much the CSU is bringing in, used for advocacy and reporting to the legislature, and also to ensure that folks with revocable commitments are still recognized; the large percentage of the bequests are going to hit us in the next 5 years, very rare that these are ever revoked in reality; most of Advancement's job is doing the relationship building and recognition, part of our challenge is keeping this momentum going with the same number of staff; Exec member recalled a website where graphs were available to see where the money went; N. Ipach noted that most of the money we're raising is going into academic programs or to student scholarships, plus a little bit of money has gone to facilities (renovations to courtyards, etc.); question from Exec if more information / some numbers available on how much money is being spent in these different areas, then comparing this to the costs that Advancement incurs; N. Ipach answered that right now our endowment sits at about \$12.5 million, but you actually need more to generate enough revenue; a portion of the earnings is to pay to maintain the funds, plus you need a wealth advisor; we're actually spending

more foundation money than our peers to cover our costs, but as a donor you're not going to like that; the challenge is trying to walk the fine line to do what the campus is asking us to do and simultaneously what the donors expect us to do; question re what about the gifts for the new buildings and how they are subsequently named; N. Ipach answered that when something is named it doesn't mean that it covered the cost, e.g. the library received a \$5 million gift for a building that cost \$60 million to build; right now we have a prospective donor that may want to get a building, but we also have to consider program limitations, i.e. we can't then send programs that are insufficiently funded, we must ask how are they going to occupy a new building to make it work; this does involve the campus to make choices, but donors don't want to wait, when the opportunity is there we'll need to act on that; another challenge is what do you do with a donor who wants to give \$10M but that's not enough to build the particular building; also a lot of the programs have large gifts, such as nursing or engineering; question if that \$10M could run classes; N. Ipach answered that 3% of interest earned would be spent on supporting classes, so 3% on interest from a \$10M grant wouldn't get you too far; recalled that when folks read about money for an endowed professor or chair, it's not used to cover the cost of the position, it's used to cover their research; when you're Harvard, Stanford, Yale, it might come much easier; Exec member recalled that class sections were opened because of this; N. Ipach answered yes, recalled that you can, e.g. a UNIV 498 class was started on this;

- c. C. Wyels asked Exec what can we ask N. Ipach to provide by Thursday so we can use it at Senate; suggestion that this could be the two main reports and the website; added suggestion that if you had an org chart, would help to know who they are, what their responsibilities are; N. Ipach offered that you probably want to see how we're doing comparative to other CSUs; suggestion for a short snapshot using last year's dashboard;

#### 8. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration

- a. Visit and report from the ASCSU Chair
  - i. C. Wyels noted that C. Miller will be here; question about how much time should be given – answered about 10 minutes;
- b. Dan intends to flesh out what we currently know about the 2025 Graduation Initiative and how that may shape some efforts this year
  - i. No further discussion on this topic;
- c. IRPE request to present
  - i. Institutional Research Program Evaluation; C. Wyels recalled meeting with M. Bourgeois re what they are doing to demonstrate graphics by graduates in their majors, pick a major and look at those same metrics; also student readiness, again pick a major then drill down by



demographics and by major; he should be presenting on 1) retention/graduation by demographics, majors, etc., 2) student readiness upon matriculation by demographics and majors, and 3) student performance while at CI (probation, GPA, Etc.) by demographics, majors, etc.; similarly, Exec could ask M. Bourgeois 1) “what can we ask for in terms of data and analysis?” 2) “please provide a status update re data warehouse: timeline, contents, functions?” and 3) “how does CI use data to enhance student success?”; observed that this presentation could be somewhat lengthy; question re since this will be closely tied to the graduation initiative report from D. Wakelee, what should the timing be in terms of the order of presentations – answer that D. Wakelee’s should come first ahead of M. Bourgeois’;

- d. Advancement
  - i. Question about how much time for this; suggestion that we have the first reading item from SAPP first, then time for Advancement, 20-25 minutes;
- e. Fiscal Policies?
  - i. Request made to Fiscal Policies Committee (FPC) to make a more formal report than they have currently been doing; a heads-up that they’re inclined to turn their recommendations into a senate resolution;

9. Other Business

- a. Exec member commented that the conversation with N. Ipach made her think about if we had an alumni office; answer was yes, that N. Ipach oversees this; further comment that if we can successfully track our alumni, there’s lots of possibilities; comment if there things we can do to keep in touch, rather than keeping this knowledge tied to programs; added comment “and what can we gain access to”; noted that they’ve got this new tool, do they want to show how it is used; question if AlumniFinder is a tool that can be accessed in the alumni office, or would we need to make a request to Advancement for it;
- b. Meeting adjourned at 4:02pm;