



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 28, 2014
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Members present: Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Vanessa Bahena, Frank Barajas, Steven Clark, Nancy Deans, Therese Eyermann, Jim Meriwether, Nitika Parmar, Cindy Wyels.

Members Absent: Lillian Castaneda

Guests Present: Gary Kinsey, Timothy Rummel, Kaia Tollefson

I. Meeting Called to Order
2:34pm

II. Approval of the Agenda
Approved.

III. Approval of the Minutes from November 26, 2013 (attached)

J. Meriwether made a correction so that minutes on page two read "whether chair of Senate sits on Cabinet on other campuses". J. Meriwether also corrected an error regarding estimate of new students for Spring.

IV. Chair Report

Chair Grier welcomed back Jim Meriwether back from sabbatical and welcomed Nitika Parmar to her first Senate Exec meeting. Chair clarified that Senate Exec charge is to debate whether policies are ready to go to Senate; not to rework documents.

Chair gave background regarding recent hate crimes and student hazing at San Jose State University and Arizona State University. A student-led task force called "Don't Hate, Elevate" is currently in the process of being created at Channel Islands in order to bring diversity issues to the forefront. CSSA (California State Student Assn.) has passed a resolution and Student Government will be drafting a resolution for our campus. V. Bahena spoke to CSSA's desire that any possible resolution will reflect the mission of the campus and Student Government's desire to increase campus support. An open call for volunteers will be coming out for those who would like to work on a campus resolution.

Chair asked if an announcement should be made at Senate, and whether this task force work should be opened to Senate or to a Center or Committee that has diversity as part of its charge? Discussion. J. Meriwether suggested a combination of having a core group while keeping the



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

task force open to volunteers. There was mention of the President's committee on diversity. V. Bahena mentioned potential events including a sit-in and poetry slam to raise awareness of situation. Please email Chair Grier with suggestions for events.

Chair mentioned organizational chart of Senate and asked Committee for feedback, adding that some committees such as the Search Coordinating Committee and Administrator Review Committee are not on the chart given that they are not in bylaws. Chair mentioned role of Advisory committees and the fact that not all of them have convened yet. V. Bahena asked about charge of Committees and whether all of them are necessary. M. Adler asked about the Academic Master Plan; J. Grier commented that the chart was created in accordance with the bylaws and that the Academic Planning Committee is not listed in the bylaws.

Provost Hutchinson noted that some folks do double duty on more than one Committee and briefly noted how Senates on other campuses are set up and whether it might be possible to consolidate some Committees. C. Wyels noted that we would need a comprehensive list of Committees (in addition to those in bylaws). Chair asked for review for glaring omissions from Senate org chart. S. Aloisio noted that some ad hoc committees were left off the chart, and that would be a bylaws issue. T. Eyermann mentioned Parliamentarian should be added to org chart; Chair Grier pointed out that is an appointed position. J. Meriwether mentioned that bylaws committee last year did try to winnow down positions as well as advisory committees; however, he added that Senate voted specifically against eliminating advisory committees but that a fundamental restructuring could be a different matter. Chair Grier countered that new data about actual workload may now be available. V. Bahena asked about Student Representative position. Was there a traditional reason to have a designee/appointee rather than have Student Government President. J. Meriwether noted that it was important to have an elected Student representative to represent students rather than an appointee.

Chair updated everyone that she has put in a request for Senate budget for 2014-2015 budget which includes: an increase in reassigned time for Senate Exec Officers (3 WTU per semester) besides the Chair; an increase in staff time allotment; and an increase in summer and winter break stipends (no winter break stipend currently) for various Senate folks. The Campus Senate Chairs lists sent out a spreadsheet of data from other Senates regarding assigned time for Exec Officers or Senate Committee Chairs. N. Deans asked if Grier asked for assigned time for standing Committee chairs and the Chair replied no, because no time was available to consult over the break to determine which committees should receive the assigned time.

Next, the Chair reported that an email call for faculty volunteers has gone out for the new Athletics Planning Committee that has transitioned from CI Athletics Research Task Force. V. Bahena asked who is on Committee. Chair Grier replied that Don Rodriguez is currently on and that we currently have seven volunteers. Senate Officers including S. Clark and C. Wyels will select from that pool.



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Finally, Chair Grier had a question about the report from Statewide senators. Simone will be absent on the day; will anyone give his report? Chair will give a condensed version of Simone's report. Asked, what is best way to report this information to faculty? Should a report at Senate be given as well as an email out to the faculty, such as an item in the newsletter? N. Deans suggested posting a link in Academic Senate Community or if something is urgent, the statewide senators could send out a "highlights email".

S. Aloisio asked question regarding President Rush's statement at the Spring Faculty Meeting regarding our campus power plant's carbon tax application. How did we do that? Is that for perpetuity? Is that solely for power that we generate and use, or for power that we sell back to the grid? Are we selling power back to grid? And are we going to spend any of that savings on renewable energy? It was noted that AB32's effective date is until 2050 and that AB32 was passed at time of purchase. T. Eyermann spoke up to say that she believes it is a one-year deferral and referred Simone to Celina Zacarias and Dr. Rush. Mary Adler asked if this is a question for the Senate Intent to Raise Questions but S. Aloisio stated he preferred the question be raised in Executive.

V. Time Certain – 3:15pm

- Ed.D. Joint Doctoral Proposal with CSU Fresno- Long Form

M. Adler asked for an update about what happened with this policy last year. J. Grier clarified that the Short Form in Educational Leadership ([SP 12-15](#)) was passed through Senate last year, and this current long form and attachments have come from Curriculum. V. Bahena said students are asking about the meaning of tenure. Provost Hutchinson invited her to come speak to her.

K. Tollefson, G. Kinsey, and T. Rummel entered the meeting at this point. Chair opened floor to questions and comments. J. Meriwether brought up points about extent of faculty costs including the current number of tenured faculty in the SOE and that the nine faculty teach only 15 sections this spring, yet no new faculty are requested or planned for this program. He asked, what is hiring extent that campus needs for program to be viable? The response was that hiring for tenure-track Ed.D. has been difficult to fill due to unique position of bringing in an experienced school administrator who has the advanced degree and qualifies for a tenure-line position. J. Meriwether asked a follow-up question about whether it could be distinguished lecturer position? Discussion continued regarding reassigned time, buyout, and workload of current educational faculty. G. Kinsey mentioned that it is a joint program that is not just School of Education faculty, and that CSU Fresno has hired five new faculty with revenue from program; and mentioned the need for our campus to be competitive in our region.

Discussion of whether there will be monetary benefits to programs who are not involved directly. Provost asked for clarification on actual revenue and actual costs for future years, such as salaries and benefits associated with receiving help from Fresno? G. Kinsey answered that CSU Fresno is funding all of those costs. G. Kinsey also clarified that "Operating Costs" is our



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

campus's portion of the operational costs and that "indirect costs" are allocations that will be made to participating units.

Discussion of whether net losses are borne by CI in first year and following years, and whether loan is forgivable. It was stated that Fresno gets their money back in second year; and splits revenue going forward. However, this fact was contested by some members present, and it was next stated that the profit arrangement between campuses is still to be determined. C. Wyels asked about enrollment expectations, and G. Kinsey responded that each campus has roughly 12 spots to fill in each cohort; a much larger interest (186 surveyed so far) has been indicated across the region, but that local consumers would be prioritized.

Provost Hutchinson asked about whether it would be possible to increase cohort size in the future, such as with concurrent cohorts; C. Wyels asked if the pool of interest will dry up. G. Kinsey replied yes, is confident that we will meet cohort size on an annual basis, and that it is important for cohort size to stay small. J. Meriwether asked if it is possible that Senators could see MOU prior to voting. G. Kinsey mentioned that timelines are short because WASC approval is also needed. Provost asked if there could be a good faith general draft MOU; G. Kinsey and K. Tollefson will work on this but time is of the essence and Fresno will move forward without CI's participation if we don't approve it soon.

F. Barajas mentioned that prior Provost had deferred a decision on the short form, and concerns about financial aspects were thus brought to our new Provost. G. Hutchinson voiced that she had spoken about the short form with D. Neuman, adding that real scrutiny comes with the Long Form, and noted that information about program affordability and cross-institution financial arrangements is also important. N. Parmar asked what percentage of courses in CI's School of Education are currently online, and asked regarding whether current faculty development opportunities are sufficient. It was pointed out that only courses, not whole programs are online; also that Project VISTA and Jill Leafstedt can provide training. There will also be opportunity for CI faculty to shadow Fresno faculty. This is mandatory for WASC accreditation.

M. Adler added that it would be helpful to reconsider amount of faculty that will be needed from education and all programs. Item will move forward to Senate if a draft MOU and data on faculty needed are provided in time for distribution to Senate Exec on 2/18. Chair noted that the due date for Senate Exec materials is Thursday prior (2/13). K. Tollefson pointed out concerns about necessary level of detail and noted that if there is any delay due to lack of the information requested, that it is possible that this opportunity could pass by CI. S. Aloisio added that having an overhead agreement would also be helpful but not necessary. G. Kinsey mentioned WASC timeline for summer.

VI. Continuing Business

- SP 13-06 Policy on Academic Dishonesty (Revision of SP 02-01 from SAPP)

Item will move forward to Senate.

VII. New Business

- MA in Psychology Short Form

There were concerns about the costs of this program. However, item will move forward to Senate. V. Bahena commented that psychology majors are looking forward to this degree.

- Minor in Philosophy – Short Form

J. Meriwether gave background and noted that this form came to Senate Exec in a similar form last year. There had been questions, and the item was sent back to Curriculum; however, only minor adjustments were made and not every aspect was addressed. Chair Grier added that she did meet with one of the Curriculum chairs. Major concerns expressed by the group were: why are courses appropriate for Philosophy minor/major? What was rationale for a particular course to be included? What is unifying arch of Philosophy in this discipline?

It was pointed out that some of the listed courses are from older course catalogs. J. Meriwether pointed out that he would like to see a more clearly articulated vision of major and by extension, the minor. N. Parmar and Chair Grier would like to know if the major and minor are still going to be housed in Sociology.

S. Clark spoke to a similar minor (Global Studies) that required a “grab bag” of courses and pointed out that adding more minors increases need for tenure track faculty. C. Wyels asked if there is a question on Long Form that addresses higher-level questions such as rationale and vision. There is a rationale and overview section ([CSU Long Form](#), section 3a) N. Parmar mentioned the noted small number (4) of students in first year, and S. Clark pointed out that there is no brand new curriculum. S. Clark asked about whether there is a standard for number of students for a new major or minor? C. Wyels do we have procedures for eliminating programs and faculty involvement. (Point of Information: [SP 05-01](#))

General agreement that course numbers and cross-listing of courses should be verified prior to Thursday 2/13, as well as where minor will be housed, and number of faculty (and possibly students) participating. Chair will send this item back to Curriculum. If items are cleaned up, it will move forward to Senate.

- Revised Academic Field trip guidelines will be discussed at next Senate Exec.

VIII. Adjourn

4:27pm.