



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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 12, 2016
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Gayle Hutchinson, Jeanne Grier, Cindy Wyels, Michelle Dean, Jim Meriwether, Sean Kelly, Simone Aloisio, Stephen Clark, Greg Wood, Colleen Delaney
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 March 15, 2016 (attached)
 - a. Meeting minutes were approved, along with an amendment that will be forthcoming in today's Senate Exec agenda regarding perpetual calendar in the minutes;
4. Continuing Business
 - a. SP 15-08 Policy on Double Counting (Curriculum)
 - i. Noted that there were no changes coming from Curriculum Committee;
 - ii. ACTION: we will see this on the Senate Agenda as a second reading item;
 - b. SR 15-03 Resolution on Affordable Learning Initiative (Exec)
 - i. ACTION: we will see this on the Senate Agenda as a second reading item;
 - c. SP 15-09 Policy on Second Baccalaureate Degree (SAPP)
 - i. Revisions came to include Executive Order language in Purpose section; they also cleaned up the document at the end regarding references to the Nursing program;
 - ii. ACTION: we will see this on the Senate Agenda as a second reading item;
 - d. SP 15-10 Policy on Reinstatement (SAPP)
 - i. Observation that in the highlighted text, students seeking reinstatement for the summer or fall semester, and yet we don't have a summer semester; clarification that there is a graduate program that has three quarters going through the summer; suggestion that we may want to have this language in there to capture summer reinstatements where applicable;
 - ii. NOTE: Please do a find and replace for "CSUCI" to change to "CI";
 - iii. ACTION: we will see this on the Senate Agenda as a second reading item;
 - e. SP 15-11 Policy on Evaluation of Temporary Counselor Faculty (FAC)
 - i. ACTION: we will see this on the Senate Agenda as a second reading item;
5. New Business

- a. Noted that Curriculum Committee was asked for a priority list of items; there was concern that we won't have enough time for thoughtful deliberation on all of this; Curriculum Committee suggested an order via email, going for the easier ones first; question as to whether, if we decide to go in a priority order, would we have a sense of what would be most important?;
 - i. Observation that both Mechatronics and Liberal Studies are the more pressing; noted that an argument could be made in favor of the majors, since they have to get on the AMP, whereas minors don't need to; feedback added that they'll still need to get approved into the catalog; further noted that the catalog deadline has passed;
 - ii. Question if then these programs would not be available in the Fall; answer not sure, but we can check with D. Wakelee to get more info;
 - iii. Comment that the Mechatronics does have the priority, but noted that Liberal Studies is still under CI faculty control even though offered through Extended University to a specific population of students not currently enrolled;
 - iv. Suggestion that if these are on the agenda, then they become second reading items even if we don't discuss them; so, if we're out of time at the meeting, someone can move to have them as second reading items; confirmed that this is allowed; also, if people deemed it necessary, we could have an emergency session of Senate, it's an option; observation that this is a the debatable item on the floor, if someone makes this motion then there's discussion to follow; suggestion to look at some of these now;
- b. Resolution of Appreciation Discussion (Exec)
 - i. Noted that President Rush will be attending the next Academic Senate meeting; this resolution is a draft, we can take edits on this until next Thursday; suggestion to present it to Dr. Rush in the form of a scroll, T. Emmons will help with the graphics and layout; tried to mix thoughtful and funny elements as well; second to last sentence may need some edits, as President Rush did not tell us to write this; clarification of the timeline that we need it by this Thursday;
 - ii. ACTION: Noted that we didn't want to put it on the agenda, so as to keep it as a surprise, instead wanted someone to amend the agenda from the floor; suggestion of the order to first recommend to amend the agenda after the minutes, then to go to the document;
- c. Resolution in Support of the Academic Senate Chair as a Member of the President's Cabinet (Exec)
 - i. Noted that this is really directed toward our new President Beck; suggestion of edits to the sentence containing "San Diego State to Humboldt," because this isn't really accurate since it sounds like everyone is doing it, reality is that it's more uncommon; committee agreed to strike this Whereas;

- ii. Suggestion to keep the “be it” statements; noted that capitalization is not necessary;
 - iii. ACTION: we will see it as a first meeting item on the Senate agenda;
- d. Perpetual Calendar (Exec)
 - i. Noted that task force wanted the perpetual calendar and the fall break to come together; document includes calendar options;
 - ii. Observation that some of the qualitative comments discussed at the previous meeting were not reflected in the minutes; buried in the background are all of these other implications of a fall break; finding that neither the minutes, nor the document seems to reflect some of the comments reflected in the qualitative comments;
 - iii. Recollection that these points were discussed at the task force level; however, let the minutes be amended to add “there were some concerns over the qualitative comments received from survey feedback”;
 - iv. Clarification of the number of grading days, noting that as far as policy goes, we have more than the minimum; suggestion that we should put the names of the task force on the policy; also, the third paragraph in the Background section should really go into the Purpose section; because, it’s not really just a perpetual calendar; cited hypothetical example of what if someone wants to amend the perpetual calendar but doesn’t want a fall break – answer that this option was circulated along with the survey, so we’ll be prepared;
 - v. ACTION: we will see it as a first meeting item on the Senate agenda;
- e. Resolution on E-portfolios (FAC)
 - i. Question on why do we need a Senate Resolution on this; answer was that Faculty Affairs wants a resolution to show faculty support, in light of the massive workload that this process entails;
 - ii. Observation that it reads like it’s more of a policy than a resolution – it’s directing Faculty Affairs to implement; noted that this was drafted by FAC; further noted that a resolution is not binding; suggestion that we could ask them if this should be a policy; i.e. so instead of “charge” to implement, could be phrased as “work towards it” as more akin to resolution language; further suggestion how about “encourage”; full phrase could be “encourage Faculty Affairs to work with Faculty Affairs Committee to work toward implementation”;
 - iii. ACTION: J. Grier will inform them of the changes, will be a first reading item on the Senate agenda;
- f. RTP Policy Revision (FAC)
 - i. Clarification asked on what do they mean in section 3.g, i.e. shouldn’t that person serve – right now it’s saying that you can opt out, even if you have yet to serve, should be that you have to serve at least once; observation that this is a good thing for the floor to discuss in order to clarify;

agreement on removing the formatting edits to track changes; suggestion if there should be added language about opt-out clauses for CFA officers; agreement that this could be a comment added on the floor;

- ii. ACTION: will be a first reading item on the Senate agenda;
- g. Astronomy minor (Curriculum)
 - i. Noted that all the math is here under the 200 sequence; noted that we have a policy on the agenda that removes limits on double counting; comment added that our prerequisites are very low comparative to other universities, so without some amount of double counting we would be unable to run this program;
 - ii. ACTION: We will see this as a first reading item on the Senate agenda;
- h. Art history minor (Curriculum)
 - i. Recalled that this has come to Senate before, was sent back, is now back here at Exec; observation that this minor cannot exist if we approve the other policy on double-counting; Exec chair will inform the proposers of the program; further observed that if you amend it on the floor, then you're changing the curriculum; noted that if this were to occur that there would still be time to go back through Curriculum Committee to make amendments;
 - ii. ACTION: We will see this as a first reading item on the Senate agenda;
- i. Mechatronics major (Curriculum)
 - i. Announced that Mechatronics is having a Brown Bag this Thursday;
 - ii. Question if this is going to start out as an impacted program; observation that with cohorts of 24 it would be impacted; added that it came out that there were only 24 bench seats, as such there could only be 24 students, so then because of the bench seats it becomes an impacted program; noted that this may be a question to be raised at the Brown Bag; we could alert M. Soltys that our questions are coming; comment that maybe there's other things they're thinking about here, but naively it seems that they could run multiple sections of this; question if they have enough labs – answer that these questions should be posed to M. Soltys; observation that in section #9 it wasn't clear about the chart, as to if we are hiring two faculty in the first year, and three in the second year, or is the second year just adding one additional hire; comment that resource allocations are unclear due to this; question if we know that we'll get approval for 133 units, because they'll have to ask for CO exemptions on this, as similar programs have to cap at 120 units; conversations recalled with M. Soltys and C. Mallon that they are aware of this and that there may be justification for increasing this unit cap;
 - iii. Noted that at a provost council meeting, gave final list of 18 recommended new hires to the deans, which included CompSci first year request; question that since this discipline is a mix of computer science and

- mechanical engineering, wouldn't you want to hire two faculty here, one from each discipline; recommendation to check with M. Soltys on this;
- iv. Recollection that it used to be common for those individuals making new proposals to come to Senate Exec, especially when you have something big like this; clarification that faculty colleagues have been working on Mechatronics for the last three years, it's not just because of the influx of funds in support of this; recollection of the \$500K in state support and how it asked for both faculty and equipment resources; comment in defense of M. Soltys, in that he has given us the opportunity to inform us about this, e.g. Brown Bags, a 30-minute session before Senate; further comment neither for nor against it, but an aim to anticipate questions that may come up in Senate; comment that the current process doesn't effectively address the resource issues we commonly face; agreement that there are resource issues here that haven't been addressed; rejoinder that this is an implementation issue, not a curricular issue;
 - v. Question of who would say no – answer was Provost or Provost successor; comment that what we're hearing is if we've got questions, ask the people pushing the program; summarization of the history behind this program submission, from long form to Senate consideration;
 - vi. Question so if someone said we have a program, is there a dollars and sense will that this program will be; i.e. a body like strategic resources could make a decision, rather than add the end of the discussion we say that we have resource issues; reply was that we also need to ask ourselves at what point do faculty then make decisions;
 - vii. Noted that if there's the opportunity to layer in some of the section #9 stuff, would be beneficial in all of the discussions at all levels; whether this comes prior to first reading or takes more time than a few days, but would be ideal if it could be sent in advance of first reading; noted that the Senate materials will go out this Thursday; comment in favor of asking M. Soltys if this is the total number of faculty or incremental; may not be realistic that we'll be able to get an answer by Thursday on the operating costs; comment that this example may amplify some of our problems with identified broken processes; general statement going back to major points that this is an expensive program;
 - viii. ACTION: we'll see this moving forward as a first reading item on the Senate agenda;
 - j. Liberal Studies online program (Curriculum)
 - i. Noted that this went through the WASC process, will be offered through CalStateOnline;
 - ii. Question whether this is going to be a degree program based entirely on the concept of overload; comment added that let's look into this; question on how this works, if we'll take the person out of the stateside program

and hire an adjunct to replace them, and the Extended Univ pays for the adjunct; reply was that student fees are expected to contribute revenue; Exec recalled a list of eligible faculty, but the document doesn't note that these folks have agreed to actually do it; question if it was it up to 125% or are they being bought out;

- iii. Noted there's nobody on the Curriculum Committee who's ever been a program chair; further noted that it's a very junior committee and that's one of our issues right now; concerns voiced about the sacrifice in service load for their paid overload work, i.e. service work isn't paid, so concern that overload work would take away from this service and community engagement; question on what is the timeline; answer recalled that they're planning on implementation in Summer 2017;
- iv. Observation that in the narrative on page 16 it says \$400 cost for students, but in the budget file it says \$550 on page 17;
- v. Comment that the idea of this program is sound because it meets a need, but, we're going to have a B.A. of Liberal Arts with different curriculum online as compared to what we have on the ground; this idea has been expressed to B. Bleicher, but without resolution currently; comment that this difference in online curricula versus on the ground curricula shouldn't be permitted; observation that in the WASC introduction it says that this is an existing program, just with a new modality; suggestion that a solution could be "Concentrated Studies," basically you can make your own major; comment that one would argue that there's a difference between a course and a program; question that if because the program changed a name, would it have to go all the way to the CO as a result;
- vi. Comment that an invitation to go to someone from Curriculum Committee to attend the next Senate Exec meeting; comment that because we can't do service learning online, some courses may be out; noted that it's academic planning that's supposed to be addressing resource questions; comment that no one wants to say "no" on campus; rejoinder that in fact we can say "no" at Senate; concern that a degree program is built entirely on the concept of overload, at what point do we say that this is not the optimal way to go about doing degree programs; comment that this may not be ready, but ok with further discussion on the topic; recollection of an email from B. Bleicher noting a \$4000 level of support, with a follow-up question if they received a grant for that;
- vii. No committee consensus on moving this forward;
- k. Creative writing minor (Curriculum)
 - i. Recollection that you can't have a minor in your major; noted that this is a request for a 15-unit minor;
 - ii. ACTION: we'll move this forward as a first reading item on the Senate agenda;

1. Healthcare interpretation certificate (Curriculum)
 - i. Question if is this state-side or Extended Univ; answer was stateside; question if a member of the community take this course; answer was Yes;
 - ii. ACTION: we will move this forward on the Senate agenda;
6. Chair Report
 - a. New Policy on Sponsored Projects Administration was APPROVED by PPPC (Jason Miller presented). Clearinghouse suggested Senate review (possibly, as 'consent' item).
 - i. J. Grier asked for thoughts if they should be consent items or if they should come to Senate at all; agreement that they should both come to Senate; J. Grier summarized that we have two options, we can have it as a consent item, where we can have it on the agenda and by approval it becomes Senate policy, or it could move as a first reading item; question to ask clarification if this conflicts with any other policy on intellectual property; answer was No;
 - ii. J. Grier noted that this will move to Senate as a consent item
 - b. Policy on Pre-Approval of Institutional Grants Proposal AA.01.004 had its first reading (Jason Miller presented). Clearinghouse suggested Senate review. PPPC is hoping for second reading in PPPC May 3.
 - i. J. Grier noted that this is up for second reading in PPPC; in our Senate could go as a consent item or a first reading item; question if we had a sense of what the changes were; answer was that memory serves that PI's have to have written approval, where Cabinet are the department retaining ultimate accountability;
 - ii. ACTION: J. Grier will ask J. Miller for the track changes version; will go as a consent item in Senate;
7. Other Business
 - a. J. Grier recalled the email received from J. Luna's student group; wrote back to the student that the deadline for new policies has passed, but recommended contacting / pursuing Project VISTA and Children at CI;
 - b. Exec noted that there's interest, but we don't have the means; this may need more study, we'd need to discuss the impact on learning in the classroom, as well as safety issues (e.g. classes that have labs); recollection of the presentation for mandatory reporters of child abuse, there were issues that faculty weren't included in this previous discussion; summarized that we're all good people, but if we were to do this, it may put us down a new path of legal liability;
 - c. Suggestion to have them contact K. Tollefson; J. Grier agreed to set up the students with K. Tollefson;
 - d. Exec suggestion that it may be more appropriate for a white paper on this rather than a pursuit of Senate policy; committee agreement;

- e. Question seeking clarity if not everything is covered on the upcoming Senate agenda, what happens to the remainder; J. Grier answered that she is happy to make a statement about our process during her chair statement, asking for a deliberative process;

Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm