



Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 30, 2014
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Present: Jeanne Grier, Colleen Delaney, Antonio Jimenez, Robert Hopius, Alex Yopez, John Yudelson, Stephen Clark, Cindy Wyels, Pamela Abbot-Mouchou, Dave Chakraborty, Genevieve Evans-Taylor, Simone Aloisio, Beth Hartung, Nancy Deans, Phil Hampton, Greg Wood, Colleen Harris-Keith, Jim Meriwether

1. Meeting Called to Order – 2:30pm
2. Approval of the Agenda – approved as is
3. Approval of the Minutes from September 9, 2014 (attached) – approved as submitted

Introduced new at-large Senator Colleen Harris-Keith

4. Special Guest: Dave Chakraborty, AVP of Facility Services
On SRI, communication between Facilities Services (FS) and faculty came up between Jeanne and Dave. She introduced him to the meeting to discuss some of the items that came up. Dave introduced Facilities Services and their function on campus. One such issue is noise, and Dave wants to know how to minimize such issues. Dave introduced Pamela and his student assistant Robert because they will be taking notes on any comments/inputs from the group. Dave then went over a PowerPoint (attached). 30-35 projects going at any given time. Asked the group what FS could do better. Simone asked, with Dave leaving, who is going to be in charge? Dave said he does not know right now, but there are other people in his area who will follow what is currently in place. Dave wants to know what improvements in addition to what FS is currently providing as far as communication. Colleen also mentioned that communication is better, but the Physical Master Plan Committee last year did not meet, and no one communicated about scheduling meetings with her before the meeting dates were set. Also, as an archaeologist, she was not consulted about digging on campus, so FS is not taking advantage of the resources available in faculty. Dave said he will make sure than any digging, even tree planting, is communicated to all who should be informed. He further stated that the Physical Master Plan Committee did not meet last year due to lack of need, but he will discuss Colleen's concerns with John Gormley. Jim Meriwether asked for clarification on the Space Committee. Dave said they meet quarterly or more often as needed. Jim continued by asking why the Space Committee doesn't have faculty representation, when they are meeting frequently, and the Physical Master Plan

Committee, with faculty representation, isn't meeting, so there is a disconnect. Jim's concern is that information is being distributed to the campus community, but it doesn't appear that there is any committee meeting about it and communicating that information. Jim specified the planned student housing as an example. Dave clarified that the Student Housing contractor was selected in May 2014. In June, FS sent out a project notification. Sept. wavelength was supposed to provide an update. Dave talked about Housing in the CI 2025 presentation. The Space Planning Committee met several times about the project, with representation by Dan Wakelee and Gayle Hutchinson, but that information was not communicated out to the campus. FS needs to know what is too much information and what is not enough, and Dave needs that input in order to know what to send out. Simone pointed out that divisional representation and faculty are not necessarily the same thing and the issue might be divisional communication. Dave specified that the Physical Master Plan Committee determines what buildings are going in and the Space Committee decides how the buildings are being utilized. Cindy explained that the role for faculty is to be involved in the decision-making process, not just being notified. Faculty should be part of the process. Pamela stated that, in August, the President reviewed all the committees on campus and disbursed those to the divisional level. By the end of the year, the charters of these committees will be reviewed, and faculty will most definitely be involved in the Master Planning Committee. The Space Committee will fall under the MPC. Dave asked for clarification on Dan Wakelee as being "faculty." Jeanne clarified that he is not a faculty representative. John asked if FS has software that can track projects at any point in their timeline and could that information be made available. Dave said that software is available and being utilized. Dave said there is a list of projects in Design and Construction phase that is shared with Dan Wakelee. Dave said there are currently not resources available to make project timelines available online. FS will answer any questions if asked. John pointed out that Dave's suggestion for the current situation only works if you know what questions to ask. Dave said he will pass it along so that it is addressed even after he leaves. Cindy pointed out that the project notifications that are sent out are very helpful. Dave summarized that the decision-making capacity the faculty are requesting is not a FS issue, but he will take the comments about communication back to FS and try to implement them to improve the information sent out. Jeanne and Pamela will continue to work on the committees.

5. Continuing Business (Time Certain 3:10pm with Phil Hampton, co-chair FAC)
Jeanne asked if FAC is supportive of the two policies. Phil said there was not full representation at the last FAC meeting, but there was no indication that the policies were ready to move forward as they are.
 - a. SP 14-01 Student Opinion of Teaching Survey (FAC)
 - b. SP 14-02 Policy on Mode of Instruction (FAC)
FAC discussion was about a Senate vote for yes or no without input from FAC or a motion to refer back to committee. Phil indicated that the concern with the policy is that it is the instrument instead of a policy about an instrument.

Greg confirmed that both options are allowed. Phil further stated that there is a third option to postpone indefinitely. Cindy asked if there is a way for the Senate to express its will as a body about the policy. Greg clarified that Senate will have to make a motion for one of the three options. Simone asked, if it's referred back to committee, will it come back to Senate as a first reading. Phil said it's not part of Robert's Rules, but Greg thought it would come back as a first reading.

As far as the mode of instruction policy, Phil said the FAC has made more progress with that and, his concern is if the task force product will come before FAC or not. Collaboration would be optimal. Jeanne said the task force product would be given out for discussion to faculty in general before it comes to Senate Exec. Nancy brought up the concern about Spring course assignments and, if the current policy is passed, it would affect Spring courses. The task force product would not be ready in time to affect the Spring courses. Jeanne pointed out that the policy would have an effective date, and this is not a catalog issue. Simone commented that he doesn't think there are any proponents in Senate for either policy currently. He suggested referring them both back to committee. If people disagree, there can be a discussion on the Senate floor. Cindy brought up a concern that, by sending the policies to Senate with a vote to go back to committee influences the Senate vote. Senate Exec should refer them back to committee if that is the consensus. Phil's concern about referring back to committee doesn't affect the policy on mode of instruction if the task force will be sending out information to faculty. Greg stated that Senate Exec can decide not to put these on the agenda again. Phil suggested doing that for the policy on student evaluations because there have been no changes made. FAC has recommended it be referred back to committee because of this. Antonio recommended putting both back on the agenda in order to provide one more opportunity for discussion. Jim brought up the concern that Senate Exec would remove an item that has already gone through first reading in Senate. Jeanne asked for a vote on SP 14-01 to be put on the agenda or for Senate Exec to refer to committee. Policy will be put on the Senate agenda as a second reading item. Phil asked for the opportunity to address this in Senate. Jeanne said the same will apply to the second policy. Antonio asked about the effectiveness of the policy. Jeanne said it will go into effect the day the President signs it.

6. New Business/Discussion

a. Math Stats Minor

- i. Jeanne introduced the topic and asked for questions. She contacted curriculum because initial proposal had a 2013 date asking to be put on the Academic Master Plan (internal).
 - ii. Jim asked if minors have a short form and a long form. Jeanne said she wasn't sure, but that she believes they do. Antonio said he wasn't sure either, but he thought only the short form was required. Jim pointed out that it would be worth everyone knowing, going forward. Cindy found the information on the Academic Planning webpage, there is no short or long form, just the minor proposal form. Beth brought up that she doesn't think there is a way to remove a minor from the Academic Master Plan. Jeanne stated it could be voted down the next time the Master Plan comes to Senate.
 - iii. Comments – Antonio had a question about the statistics courses being electives because the required courses are pretty advanced, and this minor is being proposed to being valuable to a wide variety of students. Cindy clarified that the courses do not have to be taken in the order listed. Jim asked for clarification about the number of electives versus the total. Cindy agreed.
 - iv. Will move forward to Senate for first reading
- b. Student Success Fee Task Force
- i. Jeanne received an email from Steven Filling, the statewide academic Chair for the CSU, requesting that our campus take a look at the information and gauge if we would be in favor of participating in the future. Alex asked if this was the \$4 fee. Simone said no. Antonio asked for clarification. Jeanne explained that CSU campuses can levy a student success fee from \$35-\$780 dollars. CI does not have this fee on our campus, only 12 CSUs do. There is currently a moratorium on this fee. (see PowerPoint from Jeanne's email). Simone explained that the fee is used for a variety of reasons such as hiring tenure/track faculty and student research. It is a divisive issue amongst faculty. CSU scheduled two brown bags on the topic, one in the north and one at CSUN to talk about student success fees. It is a category 2 fee (mandatory). Antonio asked if there are restrictions on how the fees can be spent. Jeanne said there are. Simone said, compared to IRA, these fees are more open. Different campuses use it different ways. John pointed out that he doesn't think it should be called a student success fee, but a student "excess" fee. There is nothing to correlate the money with "success." It's a way for administration to pull more money out of students with few restrictions on how it's spent. Colleen brought up that, as far as the student side, fees are not tax-deductible the way tuition is. Her concern is that this is a problematic way for schools to raise tuition without raising tuition. Genevieve stated that the group doesn't have the right information or the right people around the

table to make a decision about this. She pointed out that the 12 campuses that have the fees instated are benefitting in a way that we are not. Beth mentioned that all she knows about them is what she's read in the press. What are the other campuses doing with the money, and how do they tie it back to student success. Antonio brought up that he didn't know this fee existed until this meeting, so it's a good thing to put the word out and see what people have to say. Alex agreed and said it would be good to send out information when we have more and answers to potential questions. As a student who currently struggles to pay the current tuition, he wouldn't want to see this fee imposed. Also, how would the fee amount be determined? Simone said, in response to Steven Filling, our campus doesn't currently have the fee and doesn't have enough information about it to form an opinion. Alex said, if the students know what the fees are being used for, they would be more comfortable with it, if the campus decides to move forward with the fee.

- c. Presentation request for Senate: CI 2025
 - i. Jeanne was asked by Caroline Doll if an update can be made at Senate. Jeanne asked if the group thought it would be worth showing at Senate. Jim asked how long the presentation would be. Jeanne said 15-20 minutes. Jeanne will have them prepare a 10-minute presentation with 10 minutes for questions.
- d. Intent to Raise Questions: Barajas' question
 - i. (sent via email) Jeanne also forwarded this to the Provost. Simone suggested sending it to Fiscal Policies Committee or Faculty Affairs as a point for discussion. Colleen D. said it is of concern that each program has to request travel funding every year when it was always a part of the budget in previous years. Cindy pointed out that this is a smaller part of the bigger issue related to budgetary priorities. Simone, again, pointed out that the Fiscal Policies Committee would be the place to send this question. Cindy's concern is that the policy has made recommendations and not made headway, so going through the regular motions has not been particularly effective. Antonio pointed out that, if the Senate Exec pursues this, Senate Exec would be advocating for a single faculty member's particular cause, and that is not the role of Senate Exec. Jim agreed with Antonio and pointed out that the Fiscal Policies Committee has continually put forward \$1200 per faculty member for travel. Frank's question increases the amount. Jim brought up that there was money allocated from the President's Office to the Provost's Office, and that might be a potential source, but that it's not Senate Exec's place to answer. Cindy stated that the Fiscal Policies Committee is the group to address Frank's question to. Jeanne said the committee has not been very active lately, so does Senate Exec want to send this to them. Jeanne asked

if the Provost should be put back on the agenda to give her Budget 101 presentation. Beth clarified that the presentation is going to be given elsewhere, as well, but the Provost can address any Senate questions during the next meeting. Beth pointed out that the Fiscal Policies Committee is a consultative group to the Provost. Jeanne said she will work up a draft to send to the group for feedback before it goes to committee. Simone pointed out that the real question may be that the funds used to be there, so where did they go? And this group may be the body to address that, perhaps with the Provost.

7. Chair Report

- a. Invited input about publishing the faculty list on campus committees. Name, purpose, faculty membership. Will go to VPs if group is in agreement. Cindy asked if the list could have all member names. Jeanne said she doesn't have that information.
- b. Senate committees are all listed on the website not as an attached document.
- c. Call for task force for senate structure did go out. 8 volunteers so far, mostly from math and science. Recommendation day for volunteer call ends tomorrow. Colleen D., Cindy, and Jeanne sent out the call. Jim asked for clarification about who the task force makes their recommendation to. Jeanne said it would be to Senate Exec. If a policy came out of this, it would mean by-laws revisions, etc. as they would come to the Senate floor. Jim asked if the volunteers are aware of what is being asked of them. Jeanne said the charge that went out did specify that.
- d. Enrollment Growth presentation at last Senate did not generate any questions. Jeanne wanted to point out that the main focus of his presentation as new students and transfer students (undergraduate). New students split as undergraduate and graduate students. New student growth did include graduate students at a constant growth rate of 4%. If more graduate programs come online, this growth rate will need to be reconsidered.
- e. Jeanne is meeting with the President tomorrow (October 1) and invited input from the group to take forward. Antonio said the issue with putting a lot of effort into passing Masters program, but the biggest increase being undergraduate students, and new undergraduate programs are being delayed, when that is the campus' largest demographic. Simone wants to know what the President's plan is for tenure/track faculty growth to go along with the campus FTES increase. Colleen brought up that the infrastructure strain with such a fast growth can be overlooked, so keeping it front and center in front of administration to prevent problems. Nancy brought up that there is no real clear plan about the online education program for our campus. Jim pointed out, in the President's talk at Senate, it was 18% when he was hired. Nancy wants to know what that means and has that changed.

8. Other Business

- a. John asked if it would be appropriate for Senate Exec or Senate to put forth a resolution about Gayle's mother's passing. Beth pointed out that resolutions have generally been when someone left, so doing this individually would be better.

9. Adjourn – 4:24pm