<div align="center">

Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 5th, 2013
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

</div>

Attendance: Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Frank Barajas, Vanessa Bahena, Lillian Castaneda, Stephen Clark, Nancy Deans, Colleen Delaney, Jeanne Grier, Beth Hartung, Gayle Hutchinson, Cindy Wyels

Guests Present: Matthew Cook, Bill Cordeiro, Alison Perchuk, Marcus Wurtz

I. Meeting Called to Order
2:33pm

II. Approval of the Agenda.
Motion to approve; seconded.

III. Approval of the Minutes from October 15, 2013
Minutes approved without dissent.

IV. Curriculum Committee and the Academic Master Plan
- M. Cook: background of holding off on updates to Academic Master Plan (AMP) last spring, pending arrival of new provost. Academic Planning Committee (APC) have since met w/ Provost Hutchinson to discuss AMP and process.
- APC would like to consider changing process. There's no reason or policy on submitting a new master plan unless there have been changes. They're not proposing changes (other than potentially moving some dates around).
- B. Cordeiro: Chancellor's Office (CO) requires the campus send an AMP to the CO and Board of Trustees (BoT) once a year. Must show proposed degrees and possible implementation dates. Date becomes irrelevant once BoT votes – provost and president may move implementation dates. Have taken AMP through Academic Senate every year – always raises "heat." Senate doesn't have a say on implementation dates. Gayle and Allison have good idea: let's take off the dates.
- Another possible change to process: In past, virtually all short forms have been approved. APC would like to change process so that short form contains more information for making that initial decision.
- Main message: AMP is done. Only new thing under consideration is MA in Psychology, that wouldn't be done in time for Fall submission to Senate. So let's not submit to Senate.
- S. Aloisio: Why is what Senate has voted on so different from what is submitted to CO?
- B. Cordeiro: Evolution. Letter from president to CO just has name of degree and date. AMP was developed in early years to keep track of more information/ planning.
- M. Cook: Goal of AMP was to give structure to school that was growing. Money wasn't a concern. AMP a casualty of economic collapse. Dates became problematic. Want to eliminate dates and enrollment figures and concentrate on academic rigor of programs.

- S. Aloisio: Still want to understand… President sends letter with degrees and proposed implementation dates. We (Senate) should take that list and vote on that. Senate weigh-in still matters.
- B. Cordeiro: CO already has what we'd vote on this year.
- G. Hutchinson: If program is on AMP, it's already been approved through other means (short form, long form). So voting on AMP is voting on programs (degrees) twice. Seems that – on this campus – once the short form is approved, the program has that endorsement… Long form is then rubber-stamped. Let's reexamine process. Also, current process takes two years from initiation through final approvals – might be too long for some good ideas. Consider making more entry points to process. (B. Cordeiro: In fact, actual length of process is three years.)
- G. Hutchinson: Still have issues. E.g., Health Sciences has been on AMP for some years, with planned launch for F'14. CO has already put it on CSU Mentor; not clear we'll be ready. Yet parents can see program, ask us about it…
- J. Grier: Relevant question is about ceasing to bring AMP to Senate.
- S. Aloisio: Senate should vote on AMP before the next time it's submitted (e.g., next year, should it change.)
- Question of transparency – people can see and know what's going on, maybe via an internal document.
- Next issue: Comments on the draft sent – new version omits dates and enrollment targets. Dates gave some sort of implied priority. Question within APC regarding how to advise provost regarding priorities; how to register faculty views and thoughts.
- Idea for grouping: AMP should be useful to programs for internal planning. So group degrees in terms of rough time blocks for when they might be implemented. Give relative order by groups.
- Current version raises lots of questions: why have so many gotten only through short form process? Possibly no sense of urgency as short form approval (currently) gets program on AMP.
- Voting on short forms ignores context (missing detail required for long forms; even then, not looking at resources requirements in university context).
- Proposal: just make current AMP a report item. Or consider using that 2:00 community hour pre-Senate, then lead into report.

V. Continuing Business
Second Reading items – consider them information in Senate Exec. Proposals & Resolutions will need to be amended on the floor during the second reading.
   a. SR on Defining Student Research—minor changes
   b. SAPP Policy on Academic Probation—minor changes
   c. SAPP Policy on Unit Load limitations—no changes

V. New Business
   a. Policy from SAPP: Add Policy (revision of SP 03-05)
      - Clarification: No change regarding instructor option to provide a permission number (instructor is not obligated to do so).
      - Send to Senate.

b. Policy from: SAPP: Academic Internships: The proposed policy is to be accompanied by CI's Internship Placement Agreement (attached; incorporated as an appendix by reference), Executive Order 1064 (for reference), and a Sample Internship Agreement Addendum (for reference/ example).
   - Discussion of language regarding site visits; language changes suggested.
   - Discussion of liability – see Internship Agreement to clarify that employees of university not liable.
   - Provost: University has concern to protect university, employee, student, and site from liability. People can still bring a civil lawsuit. If all the agreements are in place and processes followed, university should still defend employee.
   - Main objection during S'13 was workload. Conversations with D. Wakelee determined that site assessment needs to be a faculty responsibility.
   - C. Wyels will make changes suggested re site visit wording and send back to Chair Grier to send to Senate.

L. Castaneda entered the meeting at this point.

VI. Chair Report
   a. Online Concurrent Enrollment
      - Differences in language: WASC says a major is online if 50% or more of the coursework is online. An online major would a need separate accreditation review. CI has policy giving definitions for online, blended, and (not online) courses.
      - New CA law dictates that the Board of Trustees (BoT) create definitions that will apply to all CSUs (these will supersede ours).
      - OCE (Online Concurrent Enrollment) – CI may offer courses; any CSU students could enroll.
      - CI is operating w/o policies regarding this sort of thing. Issues include teaching assignments (past lack of consultation, question as to who makes these decisions) – what are curriculum issues/ what aren't?
      - Should have a committee looking at this – which one?
      - Who teaches these? Where can they teach from? What sort of involvement?
      - Faculty Affairs (who teaches, who decides?) and Curriculum (guidance regarding courses)
      - Questions re marketing, publishing in catalog, lack of clarity (to students) regarding what it is that they've signed up for.
      - V. Bahenna: CSU student gov't drafting white paper regarding online education.
      - Need discussion re whether chairs can dictate how a particular course is offered.
      - Mention of "drift" from older course proposals (e.g., that indicated they'd be 3 hours lecture/ week) to blended or online courses. Issue for Curriculum Committee.
      - Question as to how faculty determine how they'll deliver a course (online or some variant). Seems to be individual by individual and within programs.
      - Cal State Online and OCE courses must be entirely online.
   b. Duplicative Policies

- J. Grier met recently with Melissa Remotti; reviewed duplicative policies (administrative and senate). Issue: would like to remove duplicative policies (especially those in conflict).
- Going forward: how do we decide which policies fall within administrative purview and which within Senate's? Some really pertain to both groups.
- Admin policies reviewed every three years. Senate – not so much!
- History (B. Hartung): 3 – 4 years ago there a number of policies (Student Affairs, Admin, Senate) in conflict. Melissa worked to resolve and eliminate conflicts.
- Suggestion: Policies that have faculty implications need to go to Senate. Get passed there, then go to President's Council… if changed there, need to come back to Senate.
- Another suggestion: Have Senate committees review old policies! (This isn't regularly done.)

VII. Other Business
a. For Senate agenda: Dan wants time certain to talk about OCE.

b. M. Adler requested a preliminary report on hiring.
- Provost Hutchinson: No offers made yet; info being collected from DSCs. Next step: Determine consensus candidates (those the president, provost, and DSC all support); move forward on those. Then get more info (from AVPs and program chairs and DSC chairs) on the candidates for which there's some differences of opinion. Goal: get it all done way before Thanksgiving. Insights to process welcome! Impressed with both groups of candidates; please convey to colleagues that they did a great job vetting.
- Discussion regarding messages received about viability of particular candidates while DSCs are in process of deliberating. Perceptions of DSCs they're being told no; Provost intent was to communicate and provide heads-up so as to elicit more information from DSCs when necessary.
- Request that DSCs put forward their rank orders with their justifications.