



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 11, 2014
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendance: Simone Aloisio, Frank Barajas, Nancy Deans, Jeanne Grier, Jim Meriwether, Nitika Parmar, Sara Sanders, Cindy Wyels.

Members absent: Mary Adler, Lillian Castaneda, Stephen Clark, Gayle Hutchinson

I. Chair Welcome/ Meeting Called to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:36pm. Chair Grier welcomed new member Sara Sanders who will be replacing Vanessa Bahena on Senate and Senate Exec for this semester. S. Sanders introduced herself as the Vice President of Student Government and noted that she is getting acquainted to position and is excited to serve on this body. Every member introduced themselves.

II. Approval of the Agenda

J. Meriwether asked to add a section entitled "Academic Senate and Strategic Planning". Section added under "New Business" before discussion item on Committees. Agenda approved as amended.

III. Approval of the Minutes from February 18, 2014

Approved.

IV. Continuing Business

SP 13-09 CODEL Long Form—Joint Doctorate in Education Leadership
No discussion. Item will come before upcoming Senate.

V. Discussion Items

- Discussion: Common Proposed Policy Process Update (Aloisio/Wyels)

S. Aloisio began by noting that this proposed process will be presented briefly before the President's Policy and Planning Council (PPPC) on Monday 3/17.

Brief discussion of concerns associated with proposed common numbering system. Another digit will be added to Senate numbering system- for example, SP 12-012. Pertinent policies will be cross-listed as Senate and Administrative Policies. Items up for review will come back to Senate for review. Concerns over control will be alleviated by President still signing all policies. All policies will go through a proposed clearinghouse of Senate Officers (Vice Chair, Chair, and Secretary) and 3 designees from the PPPC in order to decide what are Senate and/or PPPC policies, and to determine what policies have possible faculty implications. Chair mentioned

some policies will be coming up for review. Discussion of whether this process plan needs to be presented to Senate.

Discussion that Senate/Senate Exec may see more policies coming through, such as policies involving workload, which will be directed through clearinghouse and may be directed to Senate Exec. Discussion that the PPC and Senate process will need to be streamlined and dovetailed together. PPC process is to currently review policies every three years; moving forward, the unified policy system looks to revisit policies every five years. N. Parmar asked who will decide what is a Senate Policy moving forward and gave example of IRB Policies. Chair recommends that in any cases where there is lack of certainty, the clearinghouse should bring items to Senate Exec.

Discussion that these changes are procedural and thus do not need to go to Senate for approval. However, J. Meriwether commented that renewing policies every five years may be time-consuming for all involved. S. Aloisio suggested soft-launching the process by sending some policies back to Committees for review next semester/year even without a formal process already in place. C. Wyels noted that SAPP has already started doing so.

Item will not go to Senate for approval, but Chair will mention the new process in her report.

- Discussion: Effective Dates and Catalog Rights

Analysis of challenges and opportunities having an electronic catalog. Policies passed in Spring 2014 should have an effective date of Fall 2015, due to catalog rights. Discussion: Are “press dates” still valid for an electronic-only catalog? Should catalog be updated mid-year? Discussion of need to figure out mechanism for communication as well as cut-off deadline date(s) in Spring. S. Aloisio speaks to catalog rights as only pertaining to curriculum and what classes students need to graduate and mentioned Title V.

J. Meriwether spoke on the previous policy passed on GWAR ([SP 11-07](#)) where no effective date was specified. Discussion of problems and possibility of policies being effective immediately. J. Meriwether gave background on prior timelines, noting tighter timeline that now that many courses are online, and suggested possibly policies could go into effect the day the President signs.

Discussion of need for students to be informed in a timely manner about changes and updates to Senate Policy.

Students do have [catalog rights](#) to graduate with regulations in effect when they enrolled (with some exceptions); timely information is still important in that they could choose updated regulations in effect at the time they are graduating. Discussion about who are decision-makers about catalog items, and how to keep lines of communication flowing. We should get an update of PDF. N. Parmar asked as to when online catalog is available for students to review. S. Aloisio confirmed that we still need graduation dates. Chair will talk to Dan Wakelee and report back on this area.

[CI Catalog Definition of Catalog Rights](#)

V. New Business

- Policy on Withdrawal (SAPP)

C. Wyels gave background on Policy. This is the third version of the policy with a specified intent to clarify “serious and compelling reasons” for which a student can withdraw from classes after three weeks (“late withdrawal”). Policy was rewritten to reflect the widely varying term lengths on the CI campus. C. Wyels noted that one line will be added to reference the 12 week term. Respective offices will be responsible for making start and end dates of terms available.

Chair read email from B. Monsma with opinion on whether chairs need to sign class withdrawal forms. Chair clarified discussion between class and term withdrawal forms. C. Wyels spoke to this issue. Discussion of Records routing forms for student who have extreme need. Discussion of need for backup/documentation of medical withdrawal for students. C. Wyels explained that policy clarifies what is already there and that having documentation enables clearer decision making for chairs. F. Barajas asked about how a withdrawal impacts the institution resources versus late registration. C. Wyels and S. Aloisio mentioned that late withdrawal means there are seats lost in classes.

C. Wyels mentioned merits of proposal. J. Meriwether commented that the deadline is late to drop one course. J. Meriwether suggested “serious or compelling” and “serious and compelling” in two different places in document should be match up, and “should versus must” language should be clarified regarding whether or not documentation is required.

N. Parmar asked if point number 5 includes term withdrawal? Chair pointed out “typically” as was noted in the policy. N. Parmar also asked on number 6C – How can a student enroll without even getting permission number? Chair pointed out there are prerequisites and occasionally, operator errors. Item will move forward as SP 13-10. J. Meriwether commented that in the past, items only received policy numbers as soon as they get approved for first reading.

- Report from Committees on Centers and Institutes (Parmar)

N. Parmar gave an update on this committee, which she is currently chairing with Chris Cogan. Committee is getting back on track and is now reviewing all policies coming their way. Centers have submitted reports; however, Institutes have proved a little more challenging. Discussion of oversight. According to policy ([SP 09-01](#)), Centers and Institutes can be discontinued if they fail to provide reports. Chair suggested giving Centers and Institute a framework for response. Discussion of deadlines.

Committee will approach Centers and Institutes for reports and missing information, with policy information and a deadline. Discussion on how best to present this information to the Senate. J. Meriwether noted that reports have traditionally been verbal reports; however, they can be written (from committees). Chair suggests waiting for complete information from all Centers and Institutes.

- Discussion: Academic Senate and Strategic Planning (Meriwether)

Discussion of roles of Senate. J. Meriwether read 1.5.b. from [Senate Constitution](#) defining faculty as “primary source of recommendations to the campus president on strategic planning for the University”. There has been much feedback from faculty who would like more involvement in Strategic Planning process, especially in areas of creating target for growth, future growth rate and associated space needs. Topics discussed included growth rate, public-private partnership, new programs, tenure-track hiring, support staff, other budget/ resource issues, and appropriate venues for communication.

Mention of former UPAC (University Planning and Administrative Council), which was ultimately replaced by PPPC. F. Barajas mentioned that other universities have a greater percentage of their overall budget go to programs. Discussion of role of Fiscal Policies Committee and prior lack of significant and timely consultation with that body in strategic planning. Discussion of concerns among faculty. Discussion of possible future approach. S. Aloisio suggested asking the Provost for another regular update on budget and strategic plan. Chair pointed out the need to define “participation by faculty” and “full participation by Senate”.

Discussion of how to define and measure Senate participation in consultation. J. Meriwether suggested perhaps the Senate Chair could sit on Cabinet, as is the case on some other CSU campuses. Mention also that this could be a Senate resolution. S. Aloisio noted that a Statewide resolution is coming up regarding faculty shared governance, on the heels of a [recent resolution passed by CSU Pomona](#).

Discussion of selection of Strategic Planning Committee members as elected representatives including Chair of Senate, Faculty Affairs Committee, and Fiscal Policies. Discussion of possible action items for Senate Chair to take to regular meeting with President Rush. Discussion of last year’s previous report by Fiscal Policies. N. Deans noted that expanding campuses can be a workload and mileage issue. Discussion of undergraduate versus Extended Ed courses. Strategic Planning will go on Senate Exec agenda as a discussion item for next meeting.

VI. Chair Report

Chair has received updates from advisory committees, noting that some committees have never met. Chair will have more of a report next time when time may be available. Regarding programs going to WASC, the chair has received a response from Bill Cordeiro and will also be receiving one from the Provost. One possible idea is to create a task force on online learning issues and to help conceptualize policy on the very large and new issues. Chair Grier mentioned prior Taskforce on Online Learning noted that Faculty Affairs is still working on a policy on online learning. S. Aloisio commented that many of these issues came up at the Program Chairs meeting last week, noting also that chairs have been tasked to come together and look at this question.

Discussion of issues related to online teaching and Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Discussion of measures of quality instruction, such as evaluation. The question was asked, How can educators have a peer evaluation if a course is fully online? It was pointed out that the new curriculum form specifies who decides if course is online or not.

Chair presented a mock up for an On-Line Learning Taskforce. Language about notification. C. Wyels / J. Grier suggests policy should be amended to include “online and blended” language. J. Meriwether suggested perhaps leaving off paragraph 3 as it is more of a resource than a policy question. Jeanne will bring back to next Senate Exec taking into considerations and feedback of Senate Exec.

S. Aloisio said that existing committees could possibly address related issues, such as Curriculum or Faculty Affairs type. C. Wyels agree that these are pedagogical issues, but having a specific task force with a comprehensive overview to external and other forces could be beneficial. Noted concerns about WASC. J. Meriwether suggested making task force smaller and more cohesive.

Adjourn
--4:37pm

Appendix I

Proposed Taskforce for On-line Learning Issues at CSU Channel Islands

Charge: The taskforce for on-line learning issues is charged with identifying policy issues pertaining to on-line learning and propose recommended policies for senate consideration.

Currently identified policies issues include 1) who decides a course or course section will be offered on-line (faculty, chair, administrator); 2) the curriculum process for the transition of brick and mortar programs to on-line formats; 3) the curriculum process for changing modes of instruction of an approved face to face course; and 4) quality assurance measures for evaluating on-line courses and programs.

This taskforce is also charged with identifying necessary technical support for the development and on-going offering of distance learning instruction including: on-going faculty development, staffing, library resources and physical facility and infrastructure needs.

Reporting: This taskforce will report to the Academic Senate

Members: Senate Technology Advisory Committee, Representatives from Curriculum Committee, Representatives from Faculty Affairs, Representative from Academic Information and Technology, Representative from Extended Education, and the Director of the Teaching and Learning Innovation.