



**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**

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

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, September 9, 2014  
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185  
2:30pm – 4:30pm

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

A. Meeting Called to Order  
2:30pm

B. Approval of the Agenda  
Approved without objection

C. Approval of the Minutes from April 24, 2014 (attached)  
Approved without objection

Introductions – Call coming out for one, at-large senate exec member

Discussed purpose of Senate Exec as not reviewing merits of policies before moving to Senate floor, but whether they are in a form ready to be debated. Will continue this year in this vein.

D. Continuing Business

1. SP 13-11 Student Opinion of Teaching Survey (FAC)

John brought up a concern that it doesn't look like a policy. Jeanne agreed that is it problematic. However, previous policy is similar, so there is precedent for putting it into policy. Antonio stated that, as written, it doesn't fit all instruction modes. For non-traditional courses, it would not be as effective as it is intended to be. Simone stated that Antonio can bring up these concerns on the Senate floor. Sara asked if FAC had met since the last reading. Jeanne said that most of the members are new, so they haven't been able to meet since then. They are waiting to meet once new members have been identified. Sara asked if the suggestions from the last Senate meeting had been considered. Jeanne stated that they probably had not, since the committee hasn't met since then. Jim had a concern about the language of the policy not stating that the proposed document is an instrument, not the policy itself. Simone asked for clarification that the policy would not be implemented this academic year even if it was passed. Jeanne said Faculty Affairs would have to advise, but she didn't think that it would go into effect immediately. Stephen brought up a concern that the addendum is taken from another university, with a specific problem with the word "suggestion"

being part of a policy. Jeanne will take these comments and share them with the newly formed FAC. Antonio asked what the options are at the next Senate meeting. Jeanne said it can be amended and then voted up or down. Antonio asked if it can be referred back to the FAC and then come back to Senate as a first-reading item. Jeanne said she thought the process would be to vote it down and then ask for it to come back as a new policy but will look into options. This will move forward to Senate as a second reading item.

2. SP 13-12 Policy on Mode of Instruction (FAC)

Meant to be a stopgap measure to address some of the issues related to how courses are identified. Proposed elements of the task force's policy recommendations were discussed in passing. Jim clarified that the policy was not a stopgap measure, but was focused to address an issue on campus. By the time this policy came to Senate, the technology workforce was already in place. John brought up a question regarding blended versus online and if there was documentation that differentiates between the two. Jeanne stated that, according to current policy, online is 75%, blended is up to 50%, and standard is up to 30%. John brought up potential implications in terms of the CBA regarding "the department decides," but programs have bylaws that determine voting, and there may be pressure on faculty who aren't allowed to vote at the program level being forced to teach a course in a mode they aren't comfortable with. How would entitlements be affected by a program assigning courses with specific instruction modes that faculty aren't able to teach (not subject matter, but instruction mode). Jim brought up that section B addresses this, but Cindy pointed out that B doesn't clarify enough in the language about prior modes of instruction. Gayle brought up that this is a question about who has the decision-making power: the program or the faculty. Antonio brought up the instruction mode in relation to the curriculum committee application. Jeanne said that is not part of the application currently. Jeanne summarized that this policy is in the same position as the previous. It will move to Senate for the second reading vote. Simone asked if Jeanne can send the comments to the FAC. Jeanne said she would. Simone brought up the timing issue (synchronous/asynchronous) as not being addressed in the current policy.

E. New Business/Discussion

1. Filling senate committee positions

There was recently a second round of elections. Committees continue to have openings. Colleen reported that 9 positions were filled. Greg Wood accepted Senate Parliamentarian position. Antonio asked if new faculty ran for any of the positions. Jeanne said there were some, but not too many. Some positions require tenure, so they wouldn't be eligible. Jeanne said a suggestion is to have the committees ask for volunteers and then let the Committee on Committees and Senate Exec know. This would be an informal process. The Senate Exec position

will go out via the Committee on Committees as an elected position. Jim said he has no problem with volunteers, but there should be a formal announcement when someone is added to a committee. He also asked, if there is a run-off, and the first person steps down, would the second person then take their place. Colleen said there was precedent. Cindy brought up that, depending on the nomination, some people may not feel the need to nominate another person. Having an election might bring more people out of the woodwork. Stephen brought up that some new people may have been overwhelmed with workload and did not have time, but now may be interested. Antonio brought up that this is a good way to meet new people. Jeanne said 4 new faculty were elected. Antonio brought up the concern that older faculty may keep running because they are comfortable and familiar in the position, and new faculty might be discouraged from running because the incumbent is so well-known. Antonio further stated that, even in elections, there needs to be room for new faculty, even if they are unknown/less well known. Jeanne summarized that the volunteer process will move forward. Open positions will be one-year for volunteers. John volunteered for the mini-grant position.

2. Report from Statewide Senators

Simone and John went to Long Beach last week. Sara gave the report as the CSSA representative. Big topic was graduation initiative. October 14, 4 people from each campus will be going to the CO to talk about the phase 2 graduation initiative. Consulting firm will be there to increase 6-year graduation rate for CSU, which is currently 54%. Phase 1, raised from 54 to 56%. Chancellor wants to raise it to either 60 or 64%. CI is 51%. As a system, 4-year is 17%. Consultants are going to talk to campus leadership and give advice to each campus on ways to increase the graduate rate. Simone brought up the point that Senate should advise the campus leadership before they go to the meeting. This is by 2025, so the freshman class of 2019. There are also additional efforts/funds to close the achievement gap between underrepresented groups and traditional students. Report from Dean of Extended Education about CSU Online and CourseMatch. Simone pointed out the most important thing he and John do is interact with people at the CO, but there are no students and hardly any faculty. Most of these staff have never worked at a university before, so liaising is the most important thing they do. Let Simone or John know if you hear “the CO is making us do this.” Miscommunication at the end of last semester about SB1440. Articulation officer brought up issue with two options in the Chemistry major. A phone call to the CO clarified that there only has to be “an option” within the major, not all options. This is just one example, so if you hear “the CO is making us do this,” let Simone or John know. Genevieve pointed out that some of the institutional effectiveness report numbers differ from those reported at the CO. She also asked for clarification on freshmen and transfer. Simone said freshman, and 51% was what was reported. John also mentioned that Chancellor White, who makes a

point to talk to them at the meeting, is very approachable and non-confrontational. If there is something we as a campus care about and want to tell him, he wants to know and will be open to it.

3. Update on Global Studies and Ed.D.

Gayle reported that Gary Kinsey has pushed the Ed.D. start date out to Fall 2016. Campus WASC review in March 2015. Antonio asked if the WASC review was specific to the Ed.D. Gayle said yes, it is required. A question was asked about the status of the program in Fresno's senate queue. The provost said she would follow up. Global Studies, CO in process of reviewing. Comments from June 2014 suggested resubmitting with the 2013 template, as it was submitted with the 2009 template. Andrea Grove, Scott Frisch, and Karen Carey will be working to revise the documents. Jim brought up a concern that the policy passed in April 2013, signed by the President and doesn't understand the 2009 reference. Concern about the AVP of Academic Planning not informing the Senate about changes in forms during this process. Why was a policy passed in 2013 not submitted until 2014, and why was the letter from the Provost not requested for a year? How can other projects move forward while these items are delayed, submitted with errors, etc. Simone brought up a point of clarification that there is a co-chair of the academic planning committee. Jim stated that there is an administrator in charge of academic planning. Simone said the co-chair should be copied so the faculty are in the loop through the process. Jim said the faculty member is not the co-chair of academic planning, only the committee. Gayle will look into it. First, accountability, second, communication, and third, responsibility. Gayle will follow up. Antonio wanted to mention, as a faculty member involved in the process, it is very frustrating that it sat for a year only to find out the form was wrong. Gayle brought up the concern with approvals taking longer than necessary. Jeanne mentioned moving discussions between Senate and Academic Affairs forward on academic planning. Jeanne will note an addendum that she met with the Curriculum Committee concerning some issues that came up about lost documentation and other matters where programs aren't informed when items are sent to the Curriculum Committee that maybe should have a wider vetting. Jeanne will have this proposal on the next agenda as an item for discussion.

4. Enrollment and growth expectations

Jim brought up the chart shown by Ginger Reyes at the Arts & Sciences meeting about the 13-8-8-8 growth rate. 2200 new students for Fall 2014, yields more students at an 8% growth rate in Fall 2015 – 2368 new students. Percentage is less, but compounding. Gayle said she will invite Hung and Ginger to Senate or set up a Town Hall about the subject. John brought up that this ties back to Curriculum Committee that, unilaterally, individual class sizes have been increased. Student growth brings up the issue of how individual program chairs

will address the course proposal course size and enrollment creep in classroom workload and changes in pedagogy. Jeanne brought up that, on the curriculum form, it is a benchmark. There is no current policy about course caps. Simone asked if a 15-minute presentation can be scheduled for Senate about enrollment growth. Antonio agreed, but also wants it discussed outside of Senate. A university-wide meeting should be set up to address how it addresses people outside the program areas. Gayle mentioned she is holding a division meeting called “Budget 101.” She can include this information/subject in the meeting. Jeanne will schedule with Hung and Ginger for Senate to do an overview and go into detail at the division meeting. Antonio brought up the need to have long-term planning and not just look forward to the next year. Jim pointed out that the CI 2025 growth point was set prior to the recession, so will the 5-year stall be taken into account. Gayle said this might be a question to ask the President. Jim referred the matter back to John’s point about course caps and enrollment benchmarks, maybe a better policy needs to be in place about enrollment.

5. Faculty Meeting follow-up and next steps – Jeanne reported the first faculty meeting of the semester went really well. She wanted to know if there were any thoughts from the group about further discussion. She will follow up with a Task Force on Senate Structure and discuss this in the Chair Report.

#### F. Chair Report

Jeanne met with the President and he is planning on going forward with reconstituting UPAC to bring more faculty into decision making and planning. Communication between faculty meetings is of concern. Senate Exec appoints faculty to positions, and there is little to no information coming back from those committees. Simone brought up a concern about UPAC being headed up by a faculty member appointed by the President. Gayle brought up her preference for CSU Chico’s organization of a university-wide senate with two subcommittees that handle all policy on campus. Her concern is that UPAC is another group that will be determining policy instead of clarifying a distinct faculty body that directs policy. Simone also stated his concern at a third body involved in policy. Jeanne mentioned a new template for policy that will be posted on the Senate website. Simone asked if UPAC would replace the President’s planning committee. There was no clarification on that point. Jim mentioned his desire to see a committee that will achieve productive discussion in a way he hasn’t seen happen yet, but was discussed at the last Senate Exec meeting in Spring 2014. Jeanne asked for volunteers from Senate Exec for a subgroup to look into the direction: UPAC or Strategic Resource Planning Committee (subcommittee of PPPC). Jeanne mentioned that she has been collecting information from other CSU Senates about their structures. Simone volunteered for the subgroup to look at need for UPAC and restructuring. Jeanne said she will be involved. Jim volunteered as well. Cindy asked if UPAC would replace the Strategic Resource Planning Committee. Gayle clarified that, through discussion, the subgroup would be to



## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

improve Strategic Planning. Jeanne said there would be two groups, one to improve Strategic Planning and one to look at Senate structure. Colleen and Cindy said they would help Jeanne write a call for volunteers to look at Senate structure. Antonio mentioned that, several years ago, changing structure was an item that a lot of work was spent on that got trashed because no one was ready to change the structure at the time. Cindy clarified that the call would be to see if it is something everyone is willing to consider at this time. Jeanne said she would ask Blake Gillespie for that information, as he worked on it at the time, to acknowledge the work that was already done. Steven Filling is the statewide senate chair and will be present on October 21<sup>st</sup> at the Senate meeting.

Trustee Larry Norton will be on campus Wednesday, October 29<sup>th</sup> 11:15-11:45am.

Jeanne will send out an invite to Senate Exec members. No agenda.

Jeanne will be working on the Senate newsletter in the pdf format.

G. Other Business – Cindy brought up the idea of Committee chairs giving a 2-sentence update for inclusion in the newsletter.

H. Adjourn

4:31pm