



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

Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 21, 2014
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Present: Colleen Delaney, Alex Yepez, Colleen Harris-Keith, John Yudelson, Gayle Hutchinson, Stephen Clark, Jeanne Grier, Stephen Filling, Cindy Wyels, Genevieve Evans-Taylor, Jim Meriwether, Simone Aloisio, Nancy Deans, Antonio Jimenez-Jimenez

1. Meeting Called to Order – 2:30pm
2. Approval of the Agenda
Jim asked to add an item under New Business: RTP (answer given at last Senate regarding the university RTP committee). No objections.
3. Approval of the Minutes from September 30, 2014 (attached)
Approved as amended via email.
4. Special Guest: Dr. Stephen Filling, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
 - a. Originally from Stanislaus campus, trying to figure out how to communicate better. Focus on system issues instead of campus issues, but system issues have serious impacts on the campuses. Trying to explore ways to share information more effectively with Academic Senates. Three main concerns:
 - i. Search for new executive vice chancellor of academic and student affairs – chancellor white decided to combine the position into one. S. Filling is on the search committee and seeks input on what it takes for the person to be successful.
 - ii. State of general education. BOT last spring changed title V so programs are required to be a minimum and maximum of 120 units. One of the ways programs are trying to meet this demand is to double-count major requirements as GE.
 - iii. How do people get on committees? How does the President get faculty on new committees and task forces? Academic Senate guidelines are supposed to dictate this. Some campuses struggle with this.
 - b. Chair asked if there was a priority for these items. Committee item might be the easiest to address. Last year, decentralized from Office of President to VPs. Past practice was a call would go out for volunteers from Senate Chair. New practice this year being implemented, staying along the same lines, pretty successfully. Some task forces have people specifically appointed ex officio due to their roles. Yudelson stated that CI is remarkable in reaching out to lecturers. With very few exceptions (RTP) lecturers are invited to participate and are represented on a

variety of committees. Aloisio spoke to the search for the VP position and said he'd prefer someone academic who understands the CSU. Filling asked for clarification. Aloisio said 23 campuses, the type of students (first generation, commuters), and that the tenure track faculty create curriculum and research for students, and there is a trend system wide that tenure track faculty hires are not being funded. Over half of the CI budget goes to non-academic areas. Wyels brought up the issues of not having faculty volunteers for committees due to the low tenure density and lecturers being prevented from filling those positions. Filling asked if the 8% growth is going away. Aloisio clarified that the growth is students, not faculty. Filling asked how the campus copes with additional students. Aloisio said put more in classrooms. Chair stated that there is a need for a short term and long term plan regarding orientations, events, classrooms, faculty, etc. Chair asked if CI had any programs over 120, and Aloisio clarified that it isn't an issue on CI because the campus is new and this was considered from the beginning. Delaney pointed out that there is a concern about the kind of GE courses students are being told to take. Filling stated some BOT members have made comments about there not being a point to GE courses or putting them all online. There is a push to shrink GE because it is being perceived as irrelevant and costly. Aloisio mentioned that he has heard talk about restructuring GE. Chair pointed out that there has been ongoing talk at CI about revising GE. Aloisio brought up that community colleges are talking about offering 4 year degrees. Filling mentioned that 19 will be offering a pilot project that do not offer degrees "similar to CSU degrees." Faculty from different programs need to review them for similarities. Community College accreditation covers 4-year degrees (does not require WASC accreditation). Filling said it's being spoken of as a pilot, but doesn't expect it will go away. Aloisio asked if they have to consult with CSU before offering degrees. Filling said they have to consult with the CO before programs go live. Aloisio pointed out that Academic Senate should advise on the process. Filling said the CSU campus in the service area should be included in the process. Filling reiterated the need for improved communication. Email thoughts to him on that topic. Wyels asked about the timeline for the VP search. Filling said search committee is meeting this week, interviews scheduled Nov. 3rd. CO wants candidate identified by end of year, announced in January.

5. Continuing Business

- a. SP 14-03 Math Stats Minor (Curriculum)
 - i. Chair has not received any updates from this group. Brown bag meeting scheduled this week, so expecting many comments. Meriwether asked if the proposal was good to go or has to go through a two-step process. Wyels clarified minors are a one-step process. Chair mentioned that there is still the need to clarify where minors are in the internal master plan.

6. New Business

a. Global Premodern Studies Minor – Curriculum

- i. Clark mentioned on page 4, there is a 15 unit minor (small end, compared to rest of campus), and no more than 6 within the major. The question is, is this different enough from the major to count as a true minor? Delaney read it as classes in the major that don't count for the major. Clark looked up the list of other minors, and the average units for a minor is in the 20s. Jimenez-Jimenez agreed, and one of the courses can be research-based. Also, this was proposed by only one person, so who was involved in the consultation? Chair said she contacted the Chair of History. Meriwether stated the process was very collaborative. The issue about the number of units for the major never came up. Says this is worth further discussion. Delaney pointed out Sociology is also 15. Anthro is going to lower the units for their minor as well. Meriwether said you can't double-count a class for a major and a minor. The intention is that you can do two additional courses that don't count for the major, but are housed in the major. Clark questioned the rationale for the number of units in the minor. Delaney and Wyels both spoke to the number of units being substantive. Jimenez-Jimenez pointed out that they can take other courses that are not necessarily premodern, and there needs to be enough courses within the subject to count for the minor. Chair asked if these concerns are enough to send the proposal back to Curriculum or if it can be discussed on the Senate floor. Delaney pointed out that the name of the minor was changed. Meriwether said it was Ancient and Medieval Studies, which was a Eurocentric way of creating a minor. Jimenez-Jimenez said the issue may be rebranding the minor so it covers the intentions of the subject matter. Aloisio said it looks like the courses are repeatable, and it doesn't read like it's an additional 15 units, but 9. Meriwether asked if there is language about that. If not, there needs to be. Agrees to not move forward until there is clarity on that matter. Chair will take issues back to Curriculum.

b. Policy on Disqualification (revised) – SAPP

- i. Wyels asked for clarification on "overall GPA." Does this mean GPA in all units attempted for the current program? She also brought up a wording issue regarding "no later than three weeks," does this mean within the first three weeks of the semester following the disqualification? Meriwether asked for clarification on the 12 attempted units, are those all at CI. Clark mentioned that he thought CI wasn't taking second baccalaureate students any more. Yudelson asked about, under policy, where it says academic disqualification "any preceding semester." Is it "one strike?" Wyels, said yes, plus overall GPA. This is the current policy. Chair will ask committee

for further clarification. With clarifications, should this move forward as a first reading item? No dissent.

c. Discussion: FDAC Memo 10.13.14

- i. Chair referenced FDAC memo as well as letter referenced in the memo that offered recommendations from the committee in spring 2014. Letter suggested CI move forward with something indigenous, rather than faculty development expert. Committee stated they are not experts themselves. Wanted to take a year to invite experts. Task force is looking at restructuring committees and Senate. Need to start strategizing on priorities, needs, wants. Can forward this to the task force. Hutchinson stated that faculty development is very important, and the FDAC should meet with B. Hartung, review the letter, and she would love to work with the committee or have Hartung work with the committee. Faculty Development Director position went away, lost funding for that position, so the FDAC is a good way to go about working out these issues. Aloisio brought up the potential for reaching out to newly hired faculty and untenured faculty. Harris-Keith mentioned that there is a group in Blackboard for this and setting up workshops. Deans brought up that one of the concerns of FDAC was that they were approached with housing the mentoring program and didn't think it was the appropriate committee to house that program. Jimenez-Jimenez asked if this committee used to review the mini-grants. Deans clarified that there is a mini-grant committee now. Deans said the FDAC met with Hartung their first meeting. Committee was told there was no money, so the concern is putting time and effort into developing something when there are no funds. Hutchinson agreed and said money will be tight for a while. She is committed to look for money, because AA is committed to faculty development. Committee should meet again with either the Provost or B. Hartung. Chair said one of the main issues is that the charge of FDAC rests heavily on having a Director of Faculty Development and, without that person, the advisory body has no one to advise. Deans said the committee is looking for direction from Senate on what the expectations are for the committee. Meriwether agrees that there is a misalignment between what exists and what is being asked. Last revision of bylaws recommended doing away with FDAC. However, that implied taking away faculty development, so recommendation was amended on the Senate Floor as well as rewriting the charge of the committee. This should be revisited. Stated it is not a matter of more funding, but there are things happening on campus that do not fall into the current structure because FDAC is not advising anyone. There are faculty development programs on campus that were not presented to FDAC. However, there is no communication between those programs and FDAC. Harris-Keith asked if

it is possible to identify expertise on campus and have those people work on faculty development as they have been? Aloisio said maybe the committee can work with Hartung to identify areas on campus where faculty development is a goal. Otherwise, if the committee thinks they do not have a charge, they should adjourn for the year. Meriwether asked if there is going to be one entity that is going to steer faculty development forward. There are mini-grants, writing retreat, blended learning, ISLAS, etc. that don't align with the charge of the committee. Hutchinson said she would like to see faculty development centralized in the division. Yudelson asked if there was an FDAC director at one time who had 6 units of reassign time to do the administrative work. Wyels said it was a full-time position. Chair said it was Carol Holder in the beginning, but Phil Hampton also had that role at one point. Yudelson asked if reassign time would be a solution until resources free up. Hutchinson said it should be looked at. She wants FDAC to meet with Hartung again. Chair said looking at a revised charge should also be considered. Hutchinson will talk with Hartung. FDAC will let Hutchinson and Hartung know the next meeting information.

- d. Hiring Report Categories
 - i. Question raised by Greg Wood during Senate two meetings ago resulted in a report from Ana Pavin. This report did not offer the information at the level of detail Senate preferred. Aloisio specified at the last Senate meeting the categories that should be shown and the net gain/loss in each of those categories as well as the FTEs. Chair went back to Pavin for more information. Hutchinson said she will work with Chair on getting the information. Deans said chart did not have lecturers on it at all. Chair said Pavin did not have access to that level of information through the new budget process. Hutchinson said position management has changed, so she will work with the Chair to get the information via FTEs. Total from year to year is what Aloisio is requesting.
- e. SAPP question: amending advisory statements in policies
 - i. Christina Smith sent this to the Chair: I have a strange SAPP related question. There is a policy that students must take classes to get reinstated. They almost always have to be taken via Open University. Can an advisory statement be added without changing the policy? Aloisio asked why they don't want it to be approved by Senate. Chair said she wants to see what they are proposing before answering. Wyels said the policy stated student GPA at CI has to increase, but they can't take classes except through Open University. Agreed that any document changes must come to senate.
- f. RTP answer at last Senate

- i. Question was: What policy/rule/procedure/decision-making guides how faculty may be or are removed from the election ballots? Answer from Hartung didn't specify an answer. Meriwether asked if FAC can look into that. Chair asked what outcome is wanted from the FAC? Wyels said a CSU campus has a policy that once you serve 3 times, you are off for life. Meriwether said his prior campus said there was no way to decline, but once you had served twice, you could remove yourself. Not sure if it should be a policy. FAC should explore ways to level the playing field. Aloisio asked if the RTP policy required members of the URTPC to be full professors or associate professors. Meriwether stated that it used to be any tenured, but was changed due to the limited number of full professors available to evaluate associate professors at the time. Chair will send this to FAC.

7. Chair Report

- a. Support Coordinator will be starting November 4th to do Senate and IRA support – Dave Daniels. Chair thanked Jessyka Dalton profusely for her extended time and tremendous job at taking minutes at the meetings. Unanimous applause!
- b. Foundation proposals have been submitted. Need one or two more people from senate exec to review by the end of this week. Aloisio asked for the number. Chair said 27. Clarified only those who haven't submitted are eligible to review. Asked co-chairs from Fiscal Policies to recommend faculty from their committee, they both agreed to help review. Each proposal will be reviewed by at least 2 people. Accessible on Google Drive with rubric. Meeting Thursday to discuss. Yudelson volunteered. Group meeting at 1pm on Thursday.
- c. Academic Planning Committee met for the first time today. B. Gillespie sent a draft to put before Senate. Chair asked how to proceed. Will send to committee by email. This needs to be approved by December. APC willing to bring to Senate as an amendment to the agenda. Jimenez-Jimenez asked for clarification on how APC sent this information to the Chair. Chair said the APC met today and sent their draft to her at 2:11pm. Took off Art MFA and added the Psychology MA. Gillespie did not have the usual template. Aloisio asked if the reason the AMP has to be submitted by the end of the year is because the President has to send it to the CO (new majors and their proposed dates). The internal master plan is something separate. Chair concurred. Aloisio said it is ready for first reading as-is. Jimenez-Jimenez asked for clarification. Academic Master Plan is a list of majors the President has to submit to the BOT/CO by a certain date. The Academic Planning Document has minors, credentials, extended university, FTES, etc. That is an internal planning document, utilized by the campus, and there is no due date. Hutchinson clarified it was a planning document to help AA decide how to grow. The actual Academic Master Plan is a list of degrees with implementation dates that has a due date. Proposed dates match what was on the long forms. The

implementation dates is part of a different discussion. Hutchinson said it becomes problematic when the CO posts this information and prospective students see it and wonder why it isn't at the campus. Still working with the CO to make sure the list is accurate. Jimenez-Jimenez asked why 10 of the proposed degrees are graduate programs and only 5 are undergraduate with 8% growth projected for undergraduate students in the upcoming years. CI cannot put all this effort into a master plan that doesn't address the need for undergraduate programs that represent more areas than the current list. Meriwether said if the list is presented to Senate as just a list of programs that are going to the CO as information, there is a lost opportunity to discuss the issues Jimenez-Jimenez is bringing up. Meriwether wants the internal document to be presented for discussion. Hutchinson said the problem with the document was the confusion about FTES. Aloisio said if Senate doesn't vote on the list, the President is going to send a letter to the CO that hasn't been voted on by faculty. Wants to put it up as a first item reading on the Senate floor. Wyels said there are faculty who weren't around when these degrees were put on the list, so they will have questions about it. Chair summarized that the list was received late, in a format the committee isn't used to, but the information needs to be presented to Senate, and the conversation needs to continue about the CI planning behind it. Meriwether expressed the concern that the information is being presented late, in the wrong format, and the committee is asked to "just go with it." Chair said faculty can change what is on the document and conversations between the APC and the programs have been happening. They are not complete. Meriwether expressed concern about the campus not being ready yet to discuss this document. Yudelson asked for clarification about the degrees that have stars next to them going through Extended University and why? Chair said that was the intention at the time of the proposal. Hutchinson said it would be good to collect these questions and present them to the APC. The document has no context. Gillespie will be attending Senate to speak to the document. Meriwether said part of the restructuring, where APC is housed should be looked at as well. Hutchinson agreed and said, if you consider restructuring Senate, having APC under it would allow more of a faculty voice in the matter. Jimenez-Jimenez said we need to think of beyond what we have at CI. There needs to be more effort at the strategic level to look at the needs of the students and build the programs that are best for the students. Hutchinson spoke in agreement with Aloisio's proposal to send the document to Senate for first reading, but also continue the internal discussion about strategic planning for AA and how to prioritize. Jimenez-Jimenez asked what happens if Senate doesn't pass the document. Aloisio said the President still has to send a letter with the plan to the CO. If faculty don't comment on it at all, the President will probably send last year's plan to the CO. Jimenez-Jimenez said he would prefer it not pass so the President's letter shows that the faculty don't approve of the document. Delaney said the items were approved when they were put on the list. Denying at this point

would prevent the MA in Psychology from being on the CO's list. Clark asked if the APC could present the information earlier. Hutchinson asked if it could be presented in the Spring. Chair said one of the co-chairs of APC was informed of the deadlines earlier in the semester. Meriwether asked if it could be presented in a way that the document is a placeholder. Aloisio asked if the Chair could send out the document from last year.

- d. Information item: Liberal Studies degree completion program through Extended University is before the curriculum committee. Online program expecting to do its work through overload of faculty's normal contract work. Curriculum committee has questions about that. Chair said this will come to Senate Exec and Senate before being implemented.

8. Other Business

9. Adjourn – 4:26 motioned by Delaney