Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 7, 2015
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Nancy Deans, Stephen Clark, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Jim Meriwether, Jeanne Grier, Antonio Jíménez Jíménez, Cindy Wyels, Vanessa Bahena, Colleen Harris Keith (guest)
Staff present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:35pm
   a. Meeting introduction from J. Grier: Provost out of town on CSU business; statewide senators Aloisio and Yudelson also out (S. Aloisio at lobby day)

2. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Agenda was approved with no objections.

3. Approval of the Minutes from March 10, 2015 (attached)
   a. Minutes approved with no objections.

4. Continuing Business
   a. SR 14-01 Support of AS-3197-14 (Executive)
      i. No concerns, ok to add to Senate agenda
   b. SP 14-13 Biology Pest Control Adviser Certificate Program (APC)
      i. J. Grier: this has been requested for time certain at 2:45pm during Academic Senate meeting; this is a revised document submitted with track changes, asked Exec if this is the version to post – J. Meriwether preferred stylistically that strikethrough font and highlights be used instead of track changes (thus removing name of person editing)
   c. SP 14-14 Policy for On-Line Teaching and Learning (Exec)
      i. J. Grier suggested that committee first address changes, recalled that D. Downey had asked about modes of instruction (Sec. 2); J. Grier clarified that the corresponding Senate policy itself would need to be amended, rather than amending this document;
      ii. J. Grier recalled feedback from G. Hutchinson, suggesting that contractual language referring to chairs need not be included, but would like to see references to Article 12;
      iii. C. Harris Keith asked if we can change it to read "the intent of this policy is to protect faculty, etc."

ACADEMIC
SENATE

CHANNEL
ISLANDS

California State
University

iv. N. Deans noted that Article 12 has no bearing on this, i.e. if you don't have work for an instructor, then there is no entitlement; not in favor of the change;

v. J. Grier recalled "careful consideration" language;

vi. N. Deans noted that this language is not needed because chairs have to give careful consideration, but if you change mode of instruction to something that instructor can't or won't do, i.e. if you turn down work you turn down entitlements

vii. J. Meriwether suggested if the word "shall" could be changed to "should"

viii. J. Grier noted that the intent was to give programs control over this decision, i.e. if people are entitled to a course, they are entitled to units; if program puts a mode of instruction as "all online," it is the program's decision to do so;

ix. C. Wyels cited example, asking: e.g. what if I'm a lecturer and want to teach online, but don't have the qualification to teach online (which is a fixable issue); or, what if a disability prevents this mode of instruction, which would be protected under the ADA;

x. N. Deans noted the aim to put language in this to potentially remove a method of getting rid of a faculty member by changing modes of instruction; also asked for clarification as to the role of Senate Exec at this point – asked if this was a first reading already, isn't this then under the Academic Senate's purview; answer from A. Jiménez that it's a similar process to Biology Pest Control proposal, where Exec can propose changes that can then be sent to the origin committee;

xi. J. Meriwether suggested that if you change "shall" to "should" in the first bullet point, it opens more leeway;

xii. C. Wyels asked what are the pros and cons here of accepting and/or rejecting Provost feedback; answer regarding cons from J. Grier – if Provost feedback not incorporated, strong likelihood that the entire policy will not pass; N. Deans asked if this would give the Provost the ability to line-item veto; J. Grier clarified that she already has this ability; C. Harris Keith noted that she didn't have to say anything, could have just killed it – instead, she provided informed feedback as a member of the Senate Exec committee; J. Meriwether noted that he would prefer to find out this feedback at this stage, rather than later in the process and having it not be signed at year end;

xiii. A. Jiménez cited an example: e.g. what if a lecturer who has gone through training to teach online, and they are offered an online course, but then do not want to do it online; answer from J. Grier that this sounds like refusing work; A. Jiménez summarized that it could be an issue of one's willingness versus the program's needs; perhaps could tie in protections

with careful consideration language – cited residency and training as factors contributing to careful consideration;

xiv. C. Wyels cited an example: e.g. what if there is malicious intent with the offer in the first place; not sure if this protects a faculty member that has been teaching a face-to-face course that is moved online by program chair;

xv. J. Grier asked Exec if we want to incorporate friendly language now, or take it as is to Senate floor – suggested that it may be good to come up with a solution now;

xvi. J. Meriwether suggested to strikethrough "shall" with "should" in second bullet point, leave it marked like this when going to Senate floor;

xvii. A. Jiménez asked if we can remove first bullet point entirely, if it's the lecturer's decision to either accept or refuse work via an online class;

xviii. J. Grier asked Exec if we can go ahead and move this forward;

xix. J. Meriwether asked if we could add a narrative explaining this change, possibly taking to Provost before Academic Senate; N. Deans we could certainly add a reference to Article 12.7 / careful consideration; A. Jiménez recalled that it's already covered in the CBA, in examples where careful consideration is not made.

5. New Business
   a. Policy on Composition of MPP Searches (FAC)
      i. J. Grier summarized that she worked with Faculty Affairs and HR to come up with a unified policy;
      ii. A. Jiménez asked if summer sessions were covered in this – answer from C. Harris Keith that summer sessions were not covered in either version;
      iii. A. Jiménez felt that this was a great document until the last paragraph, asked why not use stronger language here, given that it's not up to HR to determine search guidelines;
      iv. C. Wyels asked if language can be added similar to "under most situations these things should move forward during the academic year"; J. Grier asked if it's possible to have this language ready ahead of next week's Senate meeting; answer from C. Harris Keith that she can circulate this to the committee and have it back by Thursday;
   b. Policy on Faculty Directors of Mission Centers (FAC)
      i. G. Evans Taylor asked if we want to have any language noting the partnership with Student Affairs;
      ii. A. Jiménez posed a question: CIA reviews courses for international travel, job of director to potentially say "no" to certain traveler; contractually, can a lecturer be in this position? Answer from C. Harris Keith – this came up in meetings, could have written language to exclude lecturers, but didn't want to do that, since Centers could accomplish this within their by-laws;

the intent is that this policy will eventually go away in favor of all Centers creating related by-laws;

c. Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (FAC)

    i. A. Jiménez asked about Section 1.F, in that do we need to be more specific if it's turned down; answer from C. Harris Keith – when a SET is implemented, it stands for another four-year cycle;

    ii. A. Jiménez asked if we have to have restrictions on number of questions; answer from C. Harris Keith – the aim is that with a limitation on number of questions would increase accuracy;

    iii. A. Jiménez expressed concern with international service learning courses, because these are so different, could there be a separate SET; answer from C. Harris Keith that she would consider these as friendly amendments;

    iv. J. Grier asked what about mission-based experiences getting additional questions within the SET; answer from C. Harris Keith that she received feedback about generalized data versus deep specific data; perhaps a need for different instruments for different courses;

    v. J. Meriwether noted that if there's nothing comparative, then you could have lots of different instruments corresponding to each program; C. Harris Keith recalled that there is a standardized set of questions system-wide – CI or other campuses could add instruments on top of this, potentially allowing professors to look at the last four years of their teaching;

    vi. J. Meriwether suggested to individualize instruments if we aren't going to include comparative data; C. Wyels suggested to look at Section C for normed data; N. Deans observed that it doesn't indicate the different type of courses (lab);

    vii. A. Jiménez observed that there could be lots of differences in data, due to first time teaching, other examples, etc.; answer from C. Harris Keith that this is in Section B; A. Jiménez asked if there is a way of approaching this as a way to help improve an instructor's teaching, rather than just an evaluation tool; C. Wyels added that she would need comparative data in order to be helped by this information, i.e. if I get all "3's" is that good or bad; S. Clark also not clear on how this would help to improve teaching;

    viii. C. Wyels observed correlations between lower grade scores and national studies that show corresponding lower evaluations;

    ix. J. Meriwether asked if definition of "simple majority" to be clarified;

    x. C. Wyels asked committee in terms of our role as Senate Exec, are the changes still minor enough to move this forward; G. Evans Taylor added that this seems to be more process oriented rather than policy, asked if this is what we should be reviewing; J. Meriwether added that if we say that it's not ready, then it's tabled until the next academic year; C. Harris Keith summarized that we look to Senate Exec to provide a wide voice and

informed feedback such as this, especially when feedback is not coming in sufficient quantity at brown bags;

d. Policy on Centers and Institutes (CCI)
   i. J. Meriwether asked if there is any shorthand on what has changed; C. Harris Keith asked what was this prompted by – answer from J. Grier that it was prompted by an Exec Order that came out last year, which brings discontinuance into more clarity;
   ii. A. Jiménez summarized his attendance at the brown bag on this, which mentioned that Centers have additional reporting responsibilities;

e. Policy on Unit Load Limitation (SAPP)
   i. J. Grier noted that the highlighted parts of this document is the shorthand on what changed; main changes are to mark number of units (14 units);
   ii. J. Grier asked for more definitions per question from A. Jiménez; J. Meriwether answered that nothing in prior policy says you can't take a 4 unit class – this seems like we're adding units from previous version, but there's a reason for a unit limitation; C. Wyels asked if there has been a large number of requests to exceed previous unit limitation; C. Harris Keith added by asking what the success rate of approval has been;

f. TT Hiring Resolution (Exec)
   i. C. Wyels supportive of hiring more TT faculy, noted that there are good things we need MPPs to do, would like to remove the tie in / restriction for percentages of MPPs; A. Jiménez answered that we had resources, but we decided to hire more MPPs instead of TT faculty; J. Meriwether observed that this is a resolution, not a policy, i.e. non-binding; C. Wyels suggested that we continue to get big grants, but let's also make sure we have the administrators to support them;
   ii. C. Wyels cited example: e.g. if a donor says I want to endow 4 tenure track positions, I'd rather it not count against this; J. Meriwether supportive of creating a hiring plan for tenure track positions, then asked if it is better to extract MPP references; J. Grier suggested that it may be better to ask for what we want rather than putting us against another group on campus;
   iii. J. Grier asked Exec if MPP language is taken out, how many would oppose (minority opposed on initial vote); more details will be written down by J. Grier and circulated to Senate Exec; ex-officio could be voting or non-voting, noted that our by-laws are silent on this; J. Meriwether observed that during the drafting stage the names are included, but after approval the names drop off; J. Grier will email S. Aloisio first on this;

g. MA in Psychology (Curr)
   i. C. Harris Keith asked given significant costs of this, do we just approve the curricular side of this and let administration work out the resources; S. Clark observed that lecturer faculty would need to be hired to teach

ACADEMIC
SENATE

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

California State
University

graduate courses, then later says lecturers would be hired to teach undergraduate courses, seems a little confusing;
ii. J. Grier asked Exec if this is ready to move forward to Senate;
iii. J. Meriwether asked if things are now being stopped due to lack of resources, and this is asking for resources, what does this mean; C. Wyels answered that AMP process may be broken, working on proposal to shore up these processes in Academic Planning and Curriculum Committee; would like more careful guidelines to review curriculum, e.g. minor proposals; C. Harris Keith added that even though we know of others that have been approved, others can leapfrog due to more resource allocation;
iv. A. Jiménez asked if we have ever not approved in Senate Exec; J. Grier answered no; A. Jiménez added that this might be part of the problem; J. Grier has asked Provost for money to devote personnel / staff time; J. Meriwether observed that there may be a resource question / issue here, which may not be tied to course enrollment size; C. Wyels asked if we can do a strategic ordering in terms of what order things are presented to Academic Senate; J. Grier answered Yes; further discussion between J. Grier / J. Meriwether / C. Wyels to decide this order.

6. Chair Report
   a. J. Grier reported that she was emailed by CurrComm chair that GPS Minor was not signed by AVP, and will not be implemented, due to resources not yet allocated; options could be to add to AMP to then await dates when resources are assigned;
   b. J. Grier reported that Exec has been asked to recommend a faculty member for a campus climate task force; creating a campus climate survey is first charge for task force; just to clarify, this type of climate is meant to examine how everyone gets along, etc.; S. Clark suggested forwarding to Psychology and Sociology, since they examine human behavior, as well as social group interactions.

7. Meeting adjourned at 5:04pm