

**Senate Executive Committee**  
Tuesday, October 16, 2012 2:30 p.m.  
Provost's Conference Room  
Meeting Minutes

**Members present:** Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, David Ashley, Nancy Deans, Therese Eyermann, Beth Hartung, Antonio Jiménez- Jiménez, Daniel Lee, Jim Meriwether, Dawn Neuman, Claudio Paiva.

**Approval of the Agenda**

2:33pm

**Approval of Minutes**

2:33pm

**Chair Report/Announcements**

Chair Meriwether announced that the faculty affairs subcommittee of ASCSU wants to highlight outstanding faculty more. They are reaching out to chairs of the Senate of each campus to see if/how we honor our faculty.

A. Jiménez mentioned that President Rush has asked for nominations for an award in innovations in teaching & learning that take place in a system larger than our campus.

Chair Meriwether will report back to the ASCSU that our Academic Senate itself has no formal awards systems in place.

**Business**

**First Reading Items**

1) Policy on Grade Point Average for Minors (SAPP)

Chair Meriwether gave context and mentioned that this is a new policy. D. Lee asked how much freedom programs will have with additional requirements they want to impose. There was discussion as to whether it is possible to make benchmarks higher. Chair Meriwether asked if requirements should be consistent across programs.

Discussion as to whether policy applied to overall GPA or grades in minor. Chair Meriwether remarked that the #2 policy on Grades clarified question about #1 on GPA – that programs may require a minimum grade of “C” in all courses applied to minor. In other words “overall GPA” means the average of all courses within the minor. B. Hartung remarked that this policy would bring minors into alignment with extant major policy of 2.0 GPA. A. Jiménez remarked that the office of Financial Aid also requires a minimum GPA.

There was a question as to what the CSU system requires overall, and if there is standard prose. B. Hartung researched BOT policies on state system website. Chair Meriwether will ask for clarification of language and confirm as to whether there is a systemwide policy for minors that would negate our need to have our own particular CSUCI policy.

2. Policy on Grades (Amendment of SP 01-38) (SAPP)

J. Meriwether described the origins of this policy as a request to define CR/NC. Wording derived from other CSU campuses was utilized for the letter grade definitions.

Discussion about what CR/NC means and whether minuses should be included. Also it was clarified how a course is designated CR/NC: the instructor must elect options on form when creating the course.

Additional discussion as to whether NC courses are included in GPA.

Committee expressed concerns that defining letter grades in writing might make things more subjective and thus unclear. D. Lee mentioned that syllabi are required to have expectations and grading policy written. He suggested perhaps we should stick to the issue of defining CR/NC proper and not letter grades additionally. B. Hartung questioned if a grade definition was an issue of policy, but rather an opportunity and responsibility for the instructor to put it on the syllabus. A. Jiménez remarked that a definition is important to have a general frame of reference in order to prevent unrealistic expectations of students.

M. Adler commented that wording of “basic” & “minimum” is confusing. Discussion as to what constitutes a passing grade, and how CR/NC is different from pass/fail basis, including grade computations. S.Aloisio clarified that CR/NC is not included/ computed in GPA in policy, but is included in transcript. He also said that courses repeated are subject to grade forgiveness policy- grade does show up on transcripts, but not computed in GPA.

JM will go back to SAPP and report on extended & animated discussion. Will ask for some clarification of language on various issues.

## **Second Reading Item**

### Resolution on Prop 30

J. Meriwether remarked that a few campuses have passed resolutions with the wording “supporting a vote of yes”. He showed an alternative example from San Jose State University that simply stated, “Be informed.” B. Hartung commented that this was not especially useful. D. Ashley remarked that wording of ASI needs to be changed to Student Government. J. Meriwether to follow up.

B. Hartung and A. Jiménez remarked that either endorsement or “support a vote of yes” would be okay. B. Hartung and S.Aloisio support a change of wording to “endorse Proposition 30” but would also be support the wording “support a vote of yes”. N. Deans and other members seconded changing the wording to “endorsement”.

D. Ashley also suggested adding the name of the CSSA (Cal State Student Association) to join the list of other institutions supportive of Prop 30 in the second to last paragraph. These matters will be brought to the Senate floor next week.

## **Continuing Business**

### 1. By-Laws

J. Meriwether sent comments to the task force. They met and have responded, and now what does Senate Exec think? Provost sent comments by email.

M. Adler asked as to what was the result of the survey on times to meet? J. Meriwether: strong support in survey for keeping meeting times as they are.

N. Deans had a question as to the number of units requirement, as applicable to part-time lecturers and Senator 1-year terms. She also asked if lecturers are eligible to run to be Senate Chair, Vice-Chair, or Secretary. J. Meriwether clarified that it seems to him that according to the language “Senate will elect a chair chosen from the membership” it means that lecturer Senators are also included. He will take these two issues back to the task force.

Discussion about quorum language issue- 2.1D. B. Hartung added that the reason to add language is to reduce quorum and make it easier to conduct Senate business. “Senators who are unable to attend for a semester or longer may opt to leave and must notify in writing in order to lower quorum.”

B. Hartung proposed another item or section in Article 8 about whether the expected responsibilities for ASCSU senators should be included.

A. Jiménez asked regarding Article 4.2 – If the expectation is that Senate meets at least once a month during academic year, what happens if there is a need to cancel? J. Meriwether responded that we have canceled in the past, and that procedure is that Senate Exec has to approve it.

M. Adler had a point about 4.9 Consent Calendar, that A, B, and C were out of order logically.

4.12.A – Chair Meriwether pointed out that the Task force went with “paper” as opposed to “secret” ballot wording. If electronic voting – secret would be the norm.

J. Meriwether noted that about half of the CIA’s items have been placed in the bylaws and will add the rest of them. He continued that CIA had discussion on Article 5.15 and would prefer to keep it to 5 faculty members- They will take out the President’s representative and put in Chief International Officer (Gary Berg) as well as ASIP Rep (Antonio) to be in the logical mix for International Affairs.

B. Hartung remarked that each Center has its own governing document from which the Standing Committee charges (5.14) are drawn; she suggested that this section could refer directly to the governing documents. J. Meriwether replied that governing documents were originally passed as Senate policies and that Center documents need to mirror Senate Bylaws.

M. Adler asked regarding bylaws as pertaining to the terms for those serving on Minigrant Review Committee. She pointed out that the bylaws reflect a two-year term “except where noted” (5.12) Recommended that bylaws need to reflect the Committee’s policy of 1 yr term. Bylaws also need to specify that committee members cannot apply for minigrants while on the committee.

J. Meriwether added that there will Town Halls regarding the bylaws –one on Tuesday, October 30<sup>th</sup>; and then a second one on 10/31. Give your suggestions to J. Meriwether.

## 2. GVAR policy implementation

Chair Meriwether referred to the Senate Exec email that discussed the desire of Curriculum Committee to have the GVAR policy be implemented at the start of the next academic year, and that unless Senate Exec objected that seemed wisest. Senate Exec concurred.

## **Other Business**

Provost Neuman commented on progress made towards evaluations of courses. There are three possible solutions as to which courses should be evaluated- President has to approve.

J. Meriwether mentioned that Faculty Affairs committee has already met on this issue. They were asked to consult with President about his view.

A. Jiménez asked if Academic Calendars on website could be published in advance- i.e for a few years going forward. Currently only up to next summer 2013 is published.

## **Adjourn**

3:55pm