



**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**  
C H A N N E L  
I S L A N D S

Senate Executive Committee  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, March 10, 2015  
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185  
2:30pm

**Attendees:** Nancy Deans, Stephen Clark, Genevieve Evans Taylor (no hyphen), Jim Meriwether, Jeanne Grier, Simone Aloisio, John Yudelson, Gayle Hutchinson, Antonio Jiménez Jiménez (accent over first 'e', no hyphen), Vanessa Bahena; Julia Balen (guest), Alison Perchuk (guest)  
**Staff present:** David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order
  - a. J. Grier called the meeting to order at 2:38pm.
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Agenda was approved with no objections.
3. Approval of the Minutes from February 17, 2015 (attached)
  - a. Meeting minutes from 2/17/15 approved with no objections.
4. Continuing Business
  - a. Arts Management Minor (Curriculum)
    - i. S. Aloisio: we were asked what the guidelines are for what constitutes a minor, A. Perchuk recalled Penn State example on these guidelines; examples cited included the question of whether or not students could use a math major to get a statistics minor;
    - ii. G. Hutchinson recalled issue at Chico where they had prefixes not fitting into PeopleSoft portal; S. Aloisio agreed that unfortunately it is an issue; J. Grier asked if it was as easy as inputting the four characters – answer from S. Aloisio: you need different prefixes for different disciplines;
    - iii. A. Jimenez suggested concrete definitions for minors in terms of existing definitions for emphases, options, etc.
    - iv. G. Hutchinson asked about available statistics on typical unit range, thought it to be between 18 and 21 units; J. Meriwether agreed that this is a typical range; G. Hutchinson observed that anything more than this is difficult for students; J. Grier observed that it might be a second BA in that case;
    - v. A. Jimenez recalled discussion about high unit minors and that we're not graduating many of these; S. Aloisio observed that it seems like not many are sticking around to finish their minors; G. Hutchinson asked if the high unit count contributes to this, adding that a minor notes a level of competency in a given discipline; A. Jimenez seeing a lot of minors from

different disciplines, but with current structure might give advantage to those with related major;

- vi. J. Meriwether noted terminology of concentrations, emphases and options – these are internal to a major; S. Aloisio noted that no uniformity exists between CSU campuses;
  - vii. J. Grier recalled SP 11-10;
  - viii. A. Jimenez observed an issue with cross-disciplinary minors, forcing students to take a larger number of courses so that they can cover the objectives of the minor; question may be that are we overusing this trend, when we could have more topic-specific courses; Curriculum Committee is going to consider this feedback in future meetings;
  - ix. J. Grier suggested that we may need to revisit / revise SP 11-10 as a result, asking if there would be a benefit of having a policy instead of guidelines; G. Evans-Taylor asked if there is a maximum unit guideline for minor – J. Grier answered not at this time, seems like it may be a policy issue.
- b. Policy on Assigned Time for Service to Students (Executive)
- i. J. Grier asked Exec to think about this and whether or not we need to amend this; S. Aloisio asked J. Grier about “instructional faculty” definition in Applicability section – J. Grier answered it’s all Unit 3, including coaches and counsellors; J. Yudelson asked if anyone had the provision number – answer from S. Aloisio 20-37; J. Yudelson looked this up to say “faculty employees” – J. Grier recalled background section of policy noting it as all Unit 3;
  - ii. S. Aloisio asked how would a librarian, counsellor or coach get assigned time; G. Hutchinson answered that it isn’t abundantly clear; N. Deans asked if coaches are “faculty employees” under Unit 3 – J. Yudelson answered Yes, looking up the definition for this;
  - iii. J. Balen offered the idea that assigned time could be weighted in favor of “instructors of color,” noting possible steps to balance this with any legal issues, wants more faculty attention put forth on this; S. Aloisio recalled contractual language that mentions “especially underserved groups”; J. Balen checked and did not think that we can put it into policy language, but asked if we can increase awareness in how we approach it in advising; G. Hutchinson noted that whenever you have an opportunity for these awards, it’s helpful to have unbiased rubrics in place first;
  - iv. J. Yudelson thought that this could not be based on knowledge about the faculty member, because in terms of mini-grants we aren’t allowed to know info about the faculty member; J. Grier and J. Balen answered that in most other cases one would need to have this knowledge;
  - v. S. Aloisio reiterated that this is for 9 units, we’ll need to go through the process a few times to iron out all of the steps, suggested to not over-engineer it at the start;

- vi. J. Grier recommended to J. Balen that she craft a statement and submit it ahead of the next Senate meeting to be announced;
  - vii. J. Yudelson suggested putting “faculty unit employee” as the amended portion of the Applicability section;
5. New Business
- a. Academic Freedom Resolution
    - i. J. Grier asked Senate Exec if we want to add CI to this resolution; S. Aloisio noted that campus-wide does not have a policy on Academic Freedom, locating outdated references that refer to professors as “he”; J. Grier commented that these are 1970s references; S. Aloisio agreed with the importance of cleaning this up, but also doesn’t think there’s an urgency at this time;
    - ii. G. Hutchinson asked when Senate put together Online Learning group, would this resolution also consider intellectual property rights in a similar way, is CSU moving toward a blanket template; J. Grier answered that it was her understanding that they’re talking about a separate intellectual property;
    - iii. J. Meriwether: this came up a few years ago when we were asked to endorse a statement on academic freedom, went through all campuses, then CO said didn’t like the version; N. Deans noted that it’s now a new CO and new CO staff, so results may be different this time;
    - iv. J. Yudelson recalled feedback from non-tenure-line faculty that they might not have enough of a voice – encouraged by a policy that would offer more job protections to this personnel type;
    - v. J. Meriwether noted that it would be helpful to include link to AS-3197-14 within resolution; J. Grier agreed and will be adding this link or provide original document.
  - b. 2018-19 Academic Calendar
    - i. J. Yudelson asked Exec if we have considered starting a week earlier and then closing for Thanksgiving week; J. Meriwether recalled a number of alternatives were posed, received prior feedback from previous CO that it wouldn’t get approved – this could now be revisited with new CO; J. Grier noted that CI currently has the minimum number of teaching days, while other campuses don’t and may have more flexibility; J. Yudelson asked G. Hutchinson what her experience was at Chico – answer was very positive across faculty, students and administrators;
    - ii. J. Grier asked Exec if we should send this back to implement some changes; not a rush on this since it’s 3 years out; J. Meriwether suggested that if it becomes a broader conversation, it should include student feedback as well; N. Deans recalled when starting a week earlier was previously suggested, a housing issue was brought up;

- iii. J. Grier offered to talk to Faculty Affairs on how to incorporate this feedback; S. Aloisio noted that after our Structure Task Force, he is losing faith in the effectiveness of Brown Bag discussions; J. Meriwether suggested that a small (3-person) task force could be pulled together, maybe someone from Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Senate Exec and a student... could include a Qualtrics survey as well; V. Bahena volunteered as the student representative; Exec suggested others as C. Derrico, D. Wakelee – J. Yudelson volunteered from Senate Exec; J. Grier offered to consult with D. Veal, and also offered to attend kick-off meeting(s); G. Hutchinson noted that D. Veal could have ex-officio status;
- c. Biology Pest Control Adviser Certificate Program (APC)
  - i. S. Clark asked since they have to pass exam to get the state license, is CI doing anyone a favor of merely granting a certificate to say that they've taken the course load; A. Jimenez observed that CI courses can help them pass the exam;
  - ii. S. Clark noted that our certificate has the exact same title as the state licensure version; J. Grier commented that it's similar to teaching credential, where you get the credential at conclusion of courses, but must pass the exam to provide classroom instruction; J. Yudelson noted SHRM examples similar to this; J. Grier observed that you can either have your degree, or you have 2 years experience plus the 42 units – this is just to be able to take the test, field itself does not require a B.A.; N. Deans noted that successfully passing the exam gets you a license; A. Jimenez liked that you receive a license instead of a minor;
  - iii. J. Grier observed prerequisite of already being enrolled in the biology program; A. Jimenez noted that the extra classes are provided through Extended-U – for our bio majors they would meet the prerequisite, but if you are a member of the community, you can take the course through OpenU, get the certificate and pass the exam;
  - iv. J. Meriwether suggested that R. Alarcon could be 1) contacted in advance, 2) provided the documentation, and 3) encouraged to attend next Senate meeting.
- d. Policy for On-Line Teaching and Learning (Exec)
  - i. J. Grier: the question is how to roll this out, a complex document, not every section has items that can be voted on, have to be careful to not supersede other documents if modes of instruction are modified;
  - ii. G. Hutchinson: in the Course section, the word “impacted” was used, would you consider an alternate word choice here;
  - iii. A. Jimenez asked if a vote here would supersede program by-laws; N. Deans answered yes, the intent was to supersede program by-laws to allow more voice for temporary faculty (with at least 24 WTUs); J. Grier said that we have some programs that don't allow any lecturers to vote, this

would supersede that; J. Meriwether asked what the weighting percentage might be; J. Grier would consider including weighting guidelines; J. Yudelson asked if program votes to change modality, then would a lecturer lose entitlement... could be forced to teach something that they may not be qualified for, could then lose entitlement;

- iv. G. Hutchinson asked if a program will be able to control their modality – end of day it's about student need, access; may be implications that we're not seeing, issue of control of curriculum; J. Grier recalled the intent of packaging all options together, put onus on program chair to keep curriculum control; J. Meriwether noted that there is already an external reviewer present, citing WASC example, who could say "no"; G. Hutchinson noted that if a program decides it is going online, instructors should adapt;
- v. S. Aloisio cautioned that this may get dicey; J. Yudelson asked what about the question of if someone is potentially displaced, will they be provided training so that they won't be displaced; also, if faculty is willing to adapt to modality, how will their reviews be impacted; G. Hutchinson answered that this has to be taken into consideration;
- vi. J. Meriwether observed that in Faculty Assessment section, says that "rubric will be available on website," but suggested if it could be included as an appendix in addition to this, because websites change; G. Hutchinson recalled that you see a lot more info in Blackboard versus face-to-face;
- vii. A. Jimenez asked if an example of where a tenure track faculty might not want to teach an online course, would their job be in jeopardy; G. Hutchinson would have to examine this; A. Jimenez used the example if right now if I'm a lecturer and say "no," then I have the policy to back me up, but if I'm a tenure track faculty member, I don't have a policy to back me up; J. Meriwether noted that this could also go the other way too, where a program decides to go only face-to-face and an instructor who is already teaching course online says "no";
- viii. N. Deans said spirit of the guidelines was to provide job protection if faculty members do not follow program decisions; J. Yudelson recalls trend that as we continue to grow, we'll be adding more part-time lecturers, program could decide work load for these individuals, asked if we will have the resources for the additional training requirements that this may lead to; G. Hutchinson suggested that more references to applicable CBA may be appropriate to include here; J. Yudelson citing example about "careful consideration," may result in conflicting approaches between micro and macro (e.g. where job security wouldn't be guaranteed if lecturer example were to not follow program recommendation);



## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

- ix. J. Grier will add appendix that J. Meriwether mentioned, along with careful consideration section, then will submit to Senate floor.
6. Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm – (remaining agenda items tabled for next meeting due to time constraints)