



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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 28, 2015
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Colleen Delaney, Jeanne Grier, John Yudelson, Jim Meriwether, Nancy Deans, Simone Aloisio, Cindy Wyels, Stephen Clark, Gayle Hutchinson, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Geoff Buhl (guest)

Staff Present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:34pm
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda was approved with no objections.
3. Approval of the Minutes from April 7, 2015 (attached)
 - a. Meeting minutes were approved with no objections.
4. Geoff Buhl-GE discussion re Executive Order (EO)
 - a. G. Buhl opened discussion in seeking wider input on policy coming to Exec in Fall as result of EO; hopeful to bend ear to other future policies from GE; EO 1100 from Chancellor's Office is newest order on GE transfers to community colleges, new edition for us requires minimum grade requirements for Golden Four (i.e. critical thinking; oral & written communication; math); talked to SAPP and GEC for thoughts on how to implement this; due to lots of (300+) GE classes on this campus, we get large number of students that are distraught about C-grades in GE class, which makes them sad re: not being able to graduate; students and instructors often do not know full ramifications for grades assigned; we have chosen a "C" as a minimum grade, asked Exec if this should be adopted across the board
 - b. S. Aloisio: this also came up in statewide senate, feels this may be a bad idea, may promote grade inflation (i.e. "C-minus is the new F"); the problem with instructors not knowing what classes they're teaching is a fixable one, versus modifying a senate policy; would prefer to be able to assign D and F because some of the grades double count;
 - c. J. Meriwether asked G. Buhl to clarify what is being asked of Exec; G. Buhl answered that recommendation is that policy should come from both SAPP and GE, but between these two committees there is no consistent opinion at this point; looking to Exec now for more opinions and maybe some guidance;

- d. J. Grier asked when is the effective date; G. Buhl answered AY16-17; J. Grier agreed with the idea of setting a “C” minimum across the board for all four, but would be against the grading restrictions;
- e. C. Delaney recalled that at UCLA you could switch from pass to no-pass at the end of semester;
- f. C. Wyels commented that she wasn’t positive if we had a syllabus policy at CI; G. Hutchinson recalled that we did, asked S. Clark what year – answer 2008; C. Wyels: sometime students earn a D, ramifications of C or above could be problematic, relates to a communication issue;
- g. G. Buhl: GEC trying to make sure that transfer and native policy have same standards; C across the board adoption may result in a new standard for native students; J. Meriwether forecasted that it may be a long education process in terms of relationship to Golden Four;
- h. J. Yudelson noted that grades are currently assigned without consideration of whether it will affect a student’s graduation or not; G. Buhl suspected that few people teaching know about the minimum grade requirement; J. Grier asked how are we communicating this to the students, recommended that this should be in the syllabus;
- i. C. Wyels if you check the minutes from 2007, says that the vote for a syllabus policy failed in Senate, while 2008 policy was signed by President;
- j. G. Buhl noted that currently students need 3 classes to satisfy GEAR – for roughly a decade, CI has had a policy on GE learning outcomes, observed that for transfer students they must satisfy the Golden Four requirements *before* time of transfer, whereas for native students there are no restrictions on when these courses need to be taken;
- k. J. Meriwether observed that so many GE courses don’t have meaningful writing requirements, could change it to 1 that satisfies GEAR; further suggested to get a policy written that could then spark the debate, would force people to have a conversation; J. Grier commented that how you package it matters too, if you’re talking about a “freight ship of policies”;
- l. G. Hutchinson recalled finishing GE review, noting that if you’re going to rethink GE direction, maybe revising the policy first; G. Buhl noted that there are priorities here, wants to hold onto GE learning outcomes no matter what the future structure of GE committee is;
- m. J. Yudelson asked if there is a list somewhere of the classes we teach that reference which ones relate to the Golden Four; G. Buhl answered that you can find this online, but it’s basically 197 lower division, 149 unique upper division GE classes – summarized that for every TT faculty we have about 1.5 GE classes;
- n. J. Grier asked G. Buhl if he has enough to go forward / take back to GEC; G. Buhl observed that students don’t know what the GEAR is, they see the course in the CAR and think they’re fine, then find out late in the year, causing pain to students – feels this is not a communication issue, but a structure issue; S. Aloisio

feels that it was a policy mistake that leads to structure issue, could improve communication as well;

- o. J. Meriwether noted that you can fulfill a GVAR with a D-; C. Delaney observed there could be other confusion caused in the CAR, asked if we can program another heading; J. Grier recalled that if teaching a UDIGE, it needs to have a strong writing element;
- p. J. Yudelson suggested that if there is a way to parcel out what courses are in the Golden Four, let's get this list to the program chairs;
- q. J. Grier clarified that it's the upper division classes that have the writing elements; S. Aloisio sees the writing element less important than getting a policy to communicate to faculty, and the need to earn C's or better is more important, to relate to the E.O.

5. Continuing Business

- a. SP 14-15 Policy on Composition of MPP Searches (FAC)
 - i. J. Meriwether commented that there was a lack of awareness; G. Hutchinson noted that there are certain HR guidelines that we must adhere to when posting positions, could there be an announcement to better heighten awareness – will mention this in Cabinet to start this process;
- b. SP 14-16 Policy on Faculty Directors of Mission Centers (FAC)
- c. SP 14-17 Policy on Unit Load Limitation (SAPP)
- d. SP 14-18 Policy on Centers and Institutes (CCI)
- e. SP 14-19 Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (FAC)
 - i. J. Grier asked Exec if procedurally this should be SP 14-01 and replace the original one that got sent back to committee; no objections from Exec;
 - ii. G. Hutchinson: just finished RTP reviews, noted percentage of students completing these evaluations very low; S. Clark recalled that in the classes within his program our instructors mark out the last 30 minutes and tell students to bring a device to perform the survey using class time;
 - iii. G. Hutchinson asked if we can do something stronger than “encourage”; N. Deans recalled that in the old days we got a much higher response rate by using paper evaluations; J. Grier recalled that at SDSU they hold student grades until the evaluations are complete;
 - iv. J. Meriwether recalled that this conversation has happened before, i.e. there's the instrument and then the delivery of the instrument, which are two different things; ultimately, let's improve the situation of having 40 students in the class but only 9 students actually complete the evaluations;
 - v. J. Grier suggested what about trying a media campaign, i.e. videos, global messages, ways of getting out the message to help students feel more comfortable and explain the importance of these evaluations; further

observed that all campuses going to online evals are having these issues (except for those holding student grades)

- vi. J. Meriwether asked if are we then proposing to go back to paper; G. Hutchinson commented that we are not; S. Aloisio felt that the only way to do it is to use classroom time, disagreeing with the approach where the faculty member holds the burden of getting the response rate up; G. Hutchinson noted that when she looks at the RTP process, it's to get constructive feedback – maybe there's something we can work on together to incentivize this to get better feedback;
- vii. N. Deans felt that at 20-25 questions for each class that students take, may be too many, asked if we can look at shortening this to potentially increase response rate;
- viii. J. Grier located more data on this, summarized that there is about a 30% drop in response rate from AY07-08 (~75%) to AY14-15 (~45%);
- ix. J. Yudelson suggested that for whatever process involves a mobile device, let's make sure everyone has equal access for those that don't have smart phones;
- f. SR 14-02 TT Hiring Resolution (Exec)
 - i. G. Hutchinson looked ahead to Friday where she will have more information, expected to have good news on being able to hire more than 4 TT faculty for next year;
- g. SP 14-20 MA in Psychology (Curriculum)
 - i. J. Grier on behalf of A. Jiménez (read his email): would like to hear from Provost or B. Cordeiro with a clear explanation of what passing this program in Senate next week would mean in terms of implementation and resources; recalled hearing argument a couple of times that due to their high number of FTEs, the psychology program has the money to start this program; disagreed with this argument, observing that we start using this rationale at CI, this will undoubtedly create a division in programs between “haves” and “have nots,” i.e. bigger programs will have green light to expand, while smaller programs will never be able to develop; in a system like ours, there will be divisions that are more profitable than others, but this should not mean that those profits should go back to them; if we do, we won't be able to support smaller or new programs that will need some seed-money to expand;
 - ii. G. Hutchinson clarified that she wasn't sure why V. Adams said he had the support of Provost; clarified that when meeting with psychology that she asked what resources were necessary; they then demonstrated a shift in teaching schedules with existing staff, rather than additional tenure lines; J. Grier expressed concern that in revised document they no longer need tenure lines;

- iii. C. Wyels felt that in written form it doesn't pass the resource test; G. Hutchinson answered that she doesn't think that resources questions are answered often enough, especially within academic planning; asked if we can expand the justification process for how many majors are expected over time, identify what we need in terms of a cost-justification; summarized that we're asking Senate to help determine whether this is a good idea or not, i.e. should faculty committees be approving proposals based on academic planning and a demonstration of need, then a separate process of resource identification; agreed that even after the proposal gets approved, the resource questions don't go away (faculty can retire, etc.); asked if you make it into the AMP cue, does that denote the order that resources will be received?
- iv. J. Yudelson observed that current technique exists where we can just increase our class size to put resources somewhere else; J. Grier noted this is part of our academic planning process that is broken;
- v. S. Aloisio felt that the question on whether we are voting on academics or resources is what people are seeking a definitive answer from the Provost about; G. Hutchinson observed that the AMP is a curious beast, for example Kinesiology is nowhere on the radar – the killer is that this information is published to students, when the reality doesn't match; S. Aloisio noted that a Master's program takes a lot of resources, not confident that this MA won't need more resources that are printed on paper;
- vi. J. Meriwether noted that at first they expressed a need for one or two more TT faculty to get this going, but now don't need it – this raises a question of what A. Jiménez is speaking to – take English for example, didn't have the ability to breakup their courses to make the resources available to make a masters; raises questions of what our priorities are at CI; what about Extended Ed programs buying out stateside faculty to teach in niche programs; felt it false to say that they're self-supporting if they're being paid stateside; G. Hutchinson recognized need for students going through Extended-Ed; J. Meriwether observed that it has ramifications stateside;
- vii. C. Delaney observed on proposal that two different tracks are mentioned, but doesn't list which courses apply to which tracks;
- viii. S. Aloisio noted that people are asking if inclusion on AMP is in order of resources received, or if not what is the order – i.e. will this mean that MA in Psych will be fast-tracked to be available, or will it be added to the list; G. Hutchinson agreed that resources will always be a factor, recalled that English would've had to cannibalize their resources;

6. New Business

a. Policy on Moratorium

- i. J. Grier on behalf of A. Jiménez (via email) – frustrating to see lots of programs coming from Curriculum Committee without consideration of resources and definitions (e.g., what’s a minor for us?, should we develop all these graduate programs that only affect a handful of students?, is it time to create a "New Programs Committee" like we had in the past to put forward new, unrepresented majors for CI? What does it mean when we pass a program in Senate in terms of implementation and resources?);
- ii. C. Wyels commented that a moratorium is drastic, but that it may be necessary; J. Grier agreed that it is fuel that makes the conversation happen; G. Hutchinson forecasted that the only challenge to this may be from GEC;
- iii. J. Meriwether cited an example – for a faculty member just hired who wants to teach a new course, wants them to be able to teach the new course
- iv. G. Hutchinson asked if this could be an agreement without a policy; J. Grier answered that it could be a resolution; G. Hutchinson forecasted that it may open it up a lot of petitions for exceptions; S. Clark suggested that maybe if we put the moratorium for no new programs, but not “all operating business”; J. Meriwether agreed;
- v. G. Hutchinson assembled a task force to fix the academic planning issues, they’re on a rigorous timeline; S. Aloisio asked to clarify “broader faculty involvement”; G. Hutchinson answered in terms of broader involvement with community – the question is when does the whole faculty shape a program and when does a program get to shape a program; J. Grier suggested that operationally we could look at how “faculty” is defined;
- vi. C. Wyels recalled that we have had many proposals come through Curriculum Committee that haven’t had broad consideration (cited MA in English); recommended that Exec not put this on the agenda for full Senate;
- vii. S. Aloisio noted that the President asked for funding from the legislature for an engineering program; felt that the President isn’t going to sign this as a policy, should be a resolution; but, not sure we need this resolution, as Curriculum Committee is asking for Senate blessing to not put forward new programs next year;
- viii. J. Grier asked Exec for decision on this as far as moving it forward to full Senate; Executive Committee voted No, will not move to Senate;
- ix. J. Grier suggested that these issues could be presented to new Curriculum Committee; S. Aloisio agreed and would support giving feedback to Curriculum Committee;
- x. C. Wyels recommended we get community feedback, something to the effect of “these are our industry needs and we need academic programs to

support it”; J. Meriwether would like to see actual binding commitment from the “community” rather than just a pledge.

- b. Request for report at 5/5/15 senate: CI 2025
 - i. J. Grier commented that we will say “No, we don’t have time”; asked by Y. Trinidad to put a call out for a university committee to help implement CI 2025; J. Grier suggested that there needs to be some sort of monetary compensation if faculty are to come in off-contract during the summer; S. Aloisio recommended that if they want faculty buy in, why not do it in Fall; J. Grier answered that their timelines do not allow to wait until Fall;
 - ii. J. Grier read statement from Y. Trinidad on importance of next steps for CI 2025; C. Wyels recommended that parameters are identified, and that they are put in writing, along with an understanding of who the audience is; G. Evans Taylor recalled that the expression for the need for faculty involvement was sincere;
 - iii. J. Meriwether a call for interest could go out via email; J. Grier offered to also make an announcement at Senate, place it in the newsletter;
- 7. Chair Report
 - a. J. Grier recalled that we noted that SP 14-02 went back to committee, asked operationally how this will be ultimately reflected; C. Wyels answered as “expired,” Exec agreed.
- 8. Meeting adjourned 4:51pm