Senate Executive Committee
AGENDA
Tuesday, November 24, 2015
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Antonio Jiménez Jiménez; Jeanne Grier; Cindy Wyels; Jim Meriwether; Simone Aloisio; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Stephen Clarke; Jacob Jenkins; Travis Hunt; David Daniels. Guests: Phil Hampton; Geoff Buhl; Grace Robinson.

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:34pm

2. Approval of the Agenda

   a. P. Hampton may need to report for jury duty, let's move to agenda approval; agenda was approved with no objections.

3. Approval of the Minutes from November 3, 2015 (attached)
   a. Meeting minutes were approved with no objections.

4. Continuing Business
   a. SP 15-02 Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research
      i. Suggestion that "insure" be changed to "ensure"; committee agreed, text was changed with Track Changes feature enabled so that Academic Senate would note it;
      ii. ACTION: SP 15-02 will move forward to the Senate floor;
   b. SP 15-03 Academic Master Plan 16-17 (APC)
      i. Academic Planning Committee (APC) informed Jeanne that they will change the title of the Computer Engineering program for 2019 as the Mechatronics Engineering Degree; committee summarized that they submitted short form in 2006, now they're putting in the long form and in the meantime they wish to change the name; clarification that it's in Curriculum Committee, who plans to hold an open forum before next Senate meeting; summarized that they want to change it on the master plan before the long form is approved in Curriculum Committee; concern expressed that by a name change it could change the whole intent, and without much information to Senate Exec;
      ii. ACTION: SP 15-03 will move forward to the Senate floor;
5. New Business
   a. Committee on Centers and Institutes (CCI: Time Certain 2:30pm)
      i. Hank Lacayo Institute Review

1. P. Hampton: summarized review of each of the centers and only one did not provide a report, which was the Hank Lacayo institute; former director had left, Dr. Cordeiro is now overseeing this; observed that we don't have a way to enforce any consequences so, there is no action that we can take, appears like their program is continuing without a director, would be helpful to know how long this may be the case; question is if there is enough structure and support to maintain this, particularly when we have yet to receive this report more than a month after requested;
       2. CME submitted a charter document, Senate policy says that the advisory committee comes up with a name, then it goes to the Committee on Committees for eventual submission to the Senate; current Senate policy does not include a caveat to guide the process for the advisory committee for candidate selection; we have an interim director who would like the next director to step in as soon as possible;
       3. Exec summarized that part of the rub was that they had to put the recommendation to the Provost, but this places a difficult situation of potentially opposing the Senate; reply that if there is a push to revise the current policy to reflect this, CCI would be in favor; the charter is viewed as a strategic plan, but we have no policy right now on how the by-laws work with this, we'll be working on this;
       4. IGER review produced concerns from our standpoint; current indications are that grant funding would be extended after December, would become 100% stateside as of January 1st;
       5. ACTION: P. Hampton will contact N. Parmar and will also send along the recommendation on who they've nominated for CME;
   ii. RTP Committee Participation
       1. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was reviewing the practice of people being able to decline to serve on the RTP committee; The FAC felt this to be a program matter as it appeared to be one particular program that leaned toward this being a problem;
       2. Exec recalled that there was no policy regarding criteria for someone declining to serve; recollection that at other colleges there's a policy on i.e. serving three times and then automatically coming off; question to P. Hampton if it is possible to ask FAC to offer such guidance on RTP committee participation; P. Hampton that seems reasonable, highlighting the importance of serving on RTP; Exec added that we could also revisit the composition of the committees, currently not as balanced as it could be (e.g. heavy on arts & sciences, but what about library, for example), could be more of an open call where anyone could serve in this capacity

ACADEMIC
SENATE

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

California State
University

(right now only one person can do it in the library); other comments from Exec is to not change it from representative structure, though it could be something similar to what Senate does where a position is listed as "Open" after a service term expires; further suggestion to see if there are other parts of the policy that would need amending;

3. List of questions brainstormed by Exec re: things to consider when thinking about drafting policy for URTPC service: 1) who serves and who may "opt out"; 2) should there be any period of "not up for re-election after a given term of service"; 3) what to do about sabbaticals; 4) accountability? (on committee but doesn't read files / show up to meetings, etc.); 5) should we re-think representation; 6) should there be a number of terms limit; and 7) consider reviewing the composition of URTPC policy and wrapping these together.

b. Policy on Golden Four General Education Courses (GE: Time Certain 3pm)

   i. G. Buhl summarized that E.O. 1100 updated a previous Executive Order on GE and transfer credit; this year is new with a A1,A2,A3 and B3, Chancellor's Office said that we need a minimum grade requirement of "C" in order to get the GE credit; the other aspect is to encourage that students take these courses in the first two years that they are here; this would add consistency with native students and transfer students, who come in already with this minimum grade requirement;

   ii. Exec summarized that it seems like there's a carrot there for students who go after this in their first two years, but concern is about science students, who don't front-load GE and instead front-load science classes; discussion of registration priorities if they follow this GE course structure and how this will be communicated to students; GE committee conversations with students indicate that registration priority is a big deal to them, but if they don't meet this recommendation, there is not a significant penalty; suggestion to not advise a writing requirement in their first year; summarized that right now under this policy a junior with 60 units might be subject to this penalty, but a junior with 61 units would not have this penalty, recommend that the treatment as having 59 units be more clear;

   iii. Exec clarified that it's basically the last paragraph that expresses the committee's encouragement to complete these units in the first two years; confirmed, but actually it's the will of two committees; Exec noted that more confusion might arise in the last paragraph in terms of keeping track of what courses have what grade minimum requirements; also, if we're encouraging students to take A2, they might not take other upper division GE;

ACADEMIC
SENATE

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

California State
University

iv. In order to satisfy the GWAR Graduate Writing Requirement, a student must take 9 units in UDIGE; but right now if they get a "D" it will count under the present E.O., but not under new E.O. 1100; with this minimum grade requirement, we could talk about harmonizing this for the differences in terms of what it means depending on what program / class; observation of a potential problem which may be when going to the index it cannot be referenced; G. Buhl suggested that we could add parenthetical A1, A2, A3, B3 definitions;

v. ACTION: this policy will move forward to Senate as a first reading item.

c. Representative Senate Draft (Structure Task Force)

    i. Introduced draft as having color coded items for Task II to consider; the idea is to see if this is ready as a proposal to be presented to the entire faculty, want to know if Senate Exec is ok for this to go out to faculty and ensuing brown bags in the Spring; based on this we would have to revise some by-laws; the red stuff would go in the by-laws and would go in later; comment that most of things in red aren't going to change much compared to what we already have; observation that we'll have to figure out how to end people's terms early, for example; question on the last page, things are showing up in italics all over the place, what does this mean; answer that these indicate overlaps; about that, maybe there's a primary and a secondary role, so we could give more definition on which committee one would normally go to; noted that committee wasn't going to delve deeply into the function of each, the top five sub-committees are more fluid; observation that for some people in the overlap it would be a heavy load in terms of committee responsibilities; noted that probably the biggest change in this model is that by being a senator you are also on a committee; further clarification that you don't have to be a senator to be on a committee; could be summarized as that if a budget is being allocated for this service, then the service should be provided or they get the money back; people will be asked to do a lot more;

    ii. Clarification that the chairs get elected first, and we would be removing select at-large; question on why then is there a special spot for a lecturer, can you be a lecturer and be an at-large member? Answer that if you're nominated, then yes; further discussion on Senate Exec membership; observation that having the chairs as part of Senate Exec may dilute it a bit, worried that some of the big decisions will be handled by a small group of people; comment that these issues would have been discussed in committee beforehand, so hopefully more of these decisions will be held in the committee, don't think it will concentrate the power but will rather redistribute it; summarized that in the same way we played an advisory role for GE, we would function the same way in the new model; noted that Senate Exec operates on more of a consensus rather than exact vote;

iii. This is not a really polished draft, needs some discussion, question if there is anything glaring that needs to be changed; the last bullet point may need to be modified, as we do not have different RTP criteria; answer that in fact we do; clarification that you don't have a different RTP policy, you have different PPC, not sure what's intended there; answer that it would be a review body; question to further clarify table – intent was to let representative areas elect their own representatives;

iv. The other part that may be contentious in this is the lecturer part, question if any changes on this – answer that it's the role that lecturers play both in representation and in voting – if this body has a consensus on this, task force II is happy to engage it; noted that as tenure-track faculty we have expectations via RTP for committee service, but this model would limit this service opportunity; clarification that this would apply just to Senate committees; comment that there are still tiers associated that could be cause for concern; task force could see this as a possible concern, but not sure how to fix it at this time; further concern from Exec in that no lecturer will run for any of these seats because by default you will be on more than one committee, or at least would diminish the lecturer voice as a result; comment that by saving spots for lecturers it would help with this issue; question if no one goes for the lecturer positions, what would happen to the open spots; answer that they would stay un-filled;

v. Discussion of our timeline; having open meetings in the Spring, wanted to make sure that this committee is ok with going forward with this as a model, even if an individual vote might be against it; may be helpful if we had some projections on the numbers, including the faculty to senator ratio; this might get tricky with the number of lecturers as well.

d. CI Capital Campaign (Advancement: 4pm Time Certain)

i. G. Robinson asked for opinions on best way on our silent approach to the CI Capital Campaign; asking for ideas on how to talk to colleagues about this, important to support CI's philanthropy, but might seem incongruent to give back to the university where we work; asking to raise $10M for the Foundation;

ii. Aware of the potential strike vote, Exec asked to overview basics; suggestion to share what the pillars of the CI Capital Campaign are; question on how long we're intending this to be in the silent phase; answer was no set time limit on this; example of something to avoid was let's say a chair of a program to give to his or her own program, then take a tax-deductible trip using these funds;

iii. Suggestion that each program have a spot in a drop-down menu in order to allow people to easily make a program-specific gift; another suggestion to maybe have something to help spur a competitive spirit, something that compared CSUs in terms of endowments; or some comparison that would

ACADEMIC
SENATE

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

California State
University

say "we're more likely to see that $1M gift if we see 75% participation," for example; Senate Exec wants to see that our gift is being used strategically and not just fattening one division's wallet; further comments that faculty members want to see the Foundation's priorities need to be aligned; G. Robinson answered by recalling the five pillars that were specifically chosen for this campaign; further recalled a survey was performed by a firm to achieve broad information gathering on this; Advancement wants to offer participation to the faculty in a method that feels good;

iv. Question comes back to what's the best way to reach faculty; other question is if there's a way to salvage the thought that some may be done with giving when seeing and or disagreeing with the direction of some of the pillars; answer that if you want faculty participation, it is always better to make them feel like they're part of the process, concern that we weren't part of building this from a grass-roots perspective, and now we're being asked to pull the sled; members of Exec were interviewed when this survey took place, but today don't have any idea of where the input went, and would like some clarity on what the process was to select the pillars; also what about transparency, i.e. after you give what happens to the money – how can we ensure appropriation; general past experience when asking questions from Advancement is that this feedback was not greeted with an open ear, in terms of what the five criteria are – today is the first time learning that we can be more specific to giving, such as to a specific program; G. Robinson agreed that this could be addressed; suggestion that one opportunity is in the language as an invitation to participate, the other is that this database is separate from other types of giving; questions on the CI Capital Campaign versus the Annual Fund; answer was that the Annual Fund is the regular solicitation that goes out every year, and if nothing specific is noted, then it goes back to the university mission priorities;

v. Question on how it would look for peer-to-peer conversation; observation that there are power relationships no matter how we look at it, so this might be problematic if the request to give comes from a source of power; suggestion of what if something came out from the Senate and Advancement together; noted that it does come back to this being a one-time campaign versus the annual fund; suggestion on how about increased publicity on the impact of the gifts; suggestion on how about circulating your annual report to a wider audience; question on what the processing fee is, say if you donate $10, how much for processing comes out of it; G. Robinson answered that it's a very small percentage, right now is 2%, so would be .20 cents for that $10;

e. Academic Calendar Continuing Discussion

ACADEMIC
SENATE

CHANNEL
ISLANDS

California State
University

    i. Reception of this draft was mixed; observation that faculty may not enjoy potentially grading up until Dec. 24th; suggestion would be that if you want a Fall break that you put it in October;

    ii. Senate Exec recommended that why don't we come back to this at our first meeting in the Spring, please send chair comments or be sure to save them for the first meeting of the Spring;

6. Chair Report
  a. Chair called for any other feedback or announcements;
  b. Acknowledgement of the recent passing of the CSULB student during the terrorist attacks in France; announcement that at 7pm there is a ceremony tonight in Aliso Hall; Senate Exec gave thanks for the considerate announcement;

7. Other Business
  a. None, meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.