Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Tuesday, February 19th, 2013
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30 p.m.

Attendance: Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, David Ashley, Frank Barajas, Nancy Deans, Therese Eyermann, Jeanne Grier, Elizabeth Hartung, Antonio Jiménez- Jiménez, James Meriwether, Dawn Neuman, Claudio Paiva.

I. Meeting Called to Order/ Chair Welcome
2:35pm

II. Approval of the Agenda
Approved.

III. Approval of Minutes from January 29th, 2013
Approved.

IV. Chair Report/Announcements
Chair of Assembly Committee on Higher Education & Assemblyperson Das Williams would like to meet with faculty and students on March 26th. General agreement that there should be no formal presentation to Senate. C. Paiva says Mr. Williams' visit should be a separate meeting from Senate. N. Deans requested confirmation that meeting not conflict with CFA mixer.

V. Business

A. Second Reading Items

1. SP 12-07 Policy on Grades (amendment to SP 01-38)
No changes since this item came through Senate. M. Adler concurred with the amendment; expressed that currently one can pass with a grade of D, and mentioned that is relatively rare in other CSU institutions. B. Hartung clarified that faculty are able to use fractionated grading. Discussion of cutoff points for fractionated grading. There was mention of an Email from a faculty member that noted the required minimum grade of C in a Freshman Composition class. Discussion of desire for consistency of requirements within majors, general education requirements, prerequisites, graduation, and credentials- or at least one easy-to-find location where one could find all this information. S. Aloisio mentioned ASCSU "Golden Four" WASC requirements. Item will move forward to Senate.

2. SP 12-08 Policy for Listing of Online Course Offerings
Chair advised of a change that was made since the policy was last sent out. Every incidence of the word "meeting" has now been changed to "session". No other changes involved.

3. SP 12-09 Minor in Freedom & Justice Studies

Discussion of necessary provisions for appropriate funding of this specific minor, and new programs in general. Discussion of whether the short and long forms are an implied promise to offer programs. A. Jiménez-Jiménez commented that the proposing program may be different than the eventual home of the new major or minor. M. Adler asked if the new proposed courses have gone through Curriculum? General surmising among the Committee that the answer was no. Another member asked what happens if courses are elective only and enrollments are low, and noted that possibly they could be included as General Education requirements. B. Hartung commented that the listed courses of this minor fulfill requirements of Philosophy minor as well. Chair will talk to Scott Frisch and the Curriculum Committee. Item will move forward to Senate.

4. SP 12-10 Lecturer Evaluation Policy (Revision of SP 09-06)
N. Deans gave background, commenting that this policy was updated with language in order to comply with new CBA; three-year contract lecturers have to be evaluated in their third year. "Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory" ratings language was also included. Discussion. Comment on frequency of mandated student evaluations. Chair clarified that this is a separate item from the lecturer evaluation policy, and that it is currently under review by the Faculty Affairs Committee. N. Deans further elaborated that portfolio language has not changed: a portfolio required for full-time lecturers; and is optional for part-time lecturers.

B. First Reading Items
1. Proposal to Initiate a Minor in Philosophy (Curriculum)
Discussion of who is proposer, versus support for program- including faculty resources and composition of faculty. B. Hartung noted that two of Sociology's most impacted courses are listed. C. Paiva asked if minor and campus in general will be relying on lecturers more. Discussion of need to balance out new programs with hiring tenure-track faculty. Provost Neuman mentioned that this question points to the campus-wide issue of prioritizing growing existing programs or adding new ones. S. Aloisio and J. Grier commented that the question of resources and timing of implementation is separate; the short and long forms ask "is this program academically sound and a good fit for the campus. Discussion regarding the need for a venue for discussion of resources.

Fiscal Policies will present their Fiscal Policies memo at a special report at Senate. General consensus that there should be more broad discussion across campus about adding new programs, including more elements & information for making informed decisions as well as more faculty and student voice and transparency going forward as to which academic programs are brought on.

M. Adler spoke to the general precedent of seeding majors with minors prior to setting up the major (the Philosophy Major is for 2016 on the Academic Master Plan).

2. Post-Tenure Review Policy (revised) (FAC)
Chair gave background on policy and commented that this version clarifies what is expected of person undergoing PTR, and the process of creating the PTR committee. C. Paiva noted that resources are limited, and that the committee should be cognizant of creating more work for people. General clarification that there is a lack of disciplinary consequences of negative reviews. Chair added that review is required by CBA every 5 years. General agreement that this policy is

fine. General Clarification that this policy updates the policy already in place. Item will move forward to senate.

D. Other Business
<u>Learning Outcomes</u>
Chair distributed a list of learning outcomes and mentioned that Amy Wallace is endeavoring to sort through learning outcomes for WASC & assessment. Discussion about what is Senate's requested role. One member noted that the campus WASC/Assessment office of Institutional Research will become Institutional Effectiveness. S. Aloisio mentioned that consultants have been coming on campus to assess institutional learning. Chair talk to Amy Wallace and get additional clarity about desired Senate Role.

VI. Adjourn
4:01pm