CSU | ACADEMIC SENATE | CHANNEL ISLANDS
California State University

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, February 21, 2017
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Cindy Wyels, Sean Kelly, Stephen Stratton, Mary Adler, Dan Wakelee, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Jeanne Grier, John Yudelson, Simone Aloisio, Greg Wood, Blake Gillespie;
Staff present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Call to Order
   a. Meeting called to order at 2:31pm, welcomed back committee members; noted that our recent trend is that we seem to be having long Exec agendas and short Academic Senate agendas; should pick up significantly as we see more proposal activities in related committees;

2. Approval of the Agenda
   a. A few amendments to agenda: did not receive MA in Psychology materials, please cross out item 5(b) MA in Psychology – Long Form; also please add 8(h) U-Glen food swipe cards, and 8(i) Discussion of criteria for the presidential teaching award;

3. Approval of the Minutes from Jan. 31, 2017
   a. Meeting minutes from 1/31/17 were approved with no objections

4. Continuing Business (none)

5. New Business
   a. *Proposed revision: Policy on Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students
      i. Background: C. Wyels recalled bringing this to the group to be more in line with CBA;
      ii. Discussion: Need to include who distributes the electronic message, had been struck out; further clarified that it's sent out by Senate; discussion of minor grammatical edits;
      iii. Recommendations:
          1. clarify when the 10 day appeal period to the Professional Leave Committee begins and whether notification can be made via email;
          2. other minor numbering edits under policy text;
          3. in the background section, remove specific year references from the policy;

4. add preliminary language to indicate that this policy will stay in effect until the CBA is renegotiated without the "Exceptional Service" aspect;
        iv. ACTION: will proceed to the Academic Senate floor as coming from Exec for a first reading item.
    b. MA in Psychology – Long Form (?)
        i. Tabled, no long form received;

6. Chair Report
    a) Updates on committee activities
        i. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC): currently
            1. looking at policies for adjunct faculty which would allow people to come and be volunteers in classrooms, write grants, etc.;
            2. reviewing RTP policy: removed first year portfolio from CBA requirements, which is allowed; removing President's role other than full review in 3rd year and tenure years; FAC is asking to potentially have a resolution or policy that faculty use the online portal; although CI has a policy that charged FAC to find online portals, we do not have a policy that mandates that online replace the paper portfolio;
            3. Discussion – question if we have a bound contract and actually purchased software – answer was Yes; ACTION – Exec recommended that FAC put online usage in the RTP general policy;
        ii. Student Academic Policies and Procedures (SAPP): Had been asked by Exec to work on priority registration, perhaps via a white paper; SAPP wants to draft a policy—a tiered registration draft; SAPP decided not to pursue the honor code policy draft received; SAPP is also looking into the process of withdrawals, given implications surrounding the 2025 Graduation Initiative (2025 G.I.), with withdrawals in the fourth week instead of the third; reference to SP 13-10 http://senate.csuci.edu/policies/2013-2014/senate-policy-13-10.pdf
            1. Discussion – question on who is assigning that committee work, because it should come through Senate; there is a new academic renewal process as well--this is for students who have attended in the past, allows them to regain good standing (E.E.O. 1037 provides some circumstances where a campus may disregard two or three semesters of coursework for a set of circumstances);
    b) Provost Search – Senate Exec and faculty interactions during campus visits
        i. Clarifications: Faculty will receive invites that don't require responses; Faculty are asked to provide feedback after attending; Vitae will be first available on Thurs. Feb 23rd; 48 hours before each visit and 24 hours after; visit dates are Feb 27 & 28, Mar 1, 6 & 7;

ii. Discussion on content of Senate Exec sessions with candidates: suggestion to make this more conversational and less scripted; recommendation to ask related questions, e.g. what are your thoughts on shared governance?; this is a group that has a lot of leadership;

c) Report back from "Closing the Gap" conference
   i. Campus leadership invited to Student Success at SDSU; summarized that it was a good reminder on how many hats our faculty wear; reinforcement that our service load is outsized; fewer concrete bring-backs, but little tweaks we could do that will be shared with the 2025 G.I. group; trustees were present as well;
      1. Takeaways from conference attendees: reasons why students aren't graduating in four years, including financial, academic, and cultural factors; the most important factor was economic, i.e. students need to work, and if tuition goes up then they have to work more; topic of peer advising and how effective it's been, i.e. students are much more willing to talk to other people their own age;
      2. Discussion: question if there's any sort of way for students who perform well in a given class could be paid a stipend to do advising; we're already doing this in some centers; however, nice to utilize statewide funds instead of student fee committees;
      3. Overall: it made attendees glad to work at CI, because at other schools faculty are sometimes viewed as the enemy; realization that we're not "UC Light" and are proud to be doing something different at CSU;

d) Exec requests for which committees to hear from at Senate
   i. Recalled that this is an effort to tag people to come to Senate to present a report; further recalled that the IRA committee was one of these, asked if there were any others or anything else to add;
      1. Discussion – answer was to have additional budget information, would like to have Fiscal Policies Committee (FPC) report;

7. *Return Topic: See Wiki prior to meeting. Will project during meeting.
   For consideration: what does SE wish to take up and/or lead Senate through? How/ who?
   a) Tenure Density
      a. Discussion: recommended that we consider what we can move the needle on; would like to see the university set a goal on tenure density; number of tenure-track faculty per students as a general target, but this only works if administration is receptive to setting a goal;
   b) Statewide Senate issues
      a. Discussion: A resolution is going to come forward to look at alternate models of tenure, expected to come to the March ASCSU plenary; summarized that depending on how one defines tenure, there may be alternate ways to consider

how to increase tenure density; question re how our statewide senators are informing themselves on this topic; this topic raises good questions but will be controversial; statewide senators noted their reporting obligation to Senate; further discussion on representation of our campus body and how feedback is being solicited; suggestion to include progress in ASCSU newsletter as well;

c) Service Load: nature of expectations (differentiated, made explicit), structure of faculty, expectations for individuals/ programs/ entire faculty

    a. Discussion: plan could be to write a report and submit to Exec to prepare the incoming Provost; it could be a bigger conversation, i.e. what do we as an institution want to look like in our "teenage" years; question if we also want to add accountability measures, i.e. if a program isn't doing much service could this be used as a metric for faculty hires; we could have a recommended service limit, maybe broken down by hours per week; it also may be tied to faculty representation, If you have these conversations together we may need to look revisit Senate structure, recalled that last plan was good and would have reduced service loads; question on what our big picture is, would it be trying to get more senior people to participate; Senate officers noted that they were addressing this issue in the Fall, e.g. putting two spots in when four were requested, etc.; agreed that first needed a point from which to analyze it then we looked at the related questions, i.e. are juniors and/or faculty from historically underrepresented groups doing too much, are seniors doing too little; comment noted that other CSUs are paying stipends or release times for lecturers (65% of the total faculty) .. question is what does the campus wants to do and are we disregarding lecturers; response that each time we display the numbers on this, we acknowledge lecturer service; the service obligation falls to tenure-track faculty who are given 3 WTUs per semester for service;

d) Faculty representation: how to improve

    a. Topic included in 7(b)(a) above;

e) Diversifying the Profession

    a. Topic included in 7(b)(a) above;

f) Faculty Hiring – input into changing process

    a. Exec agreed that we can check this off the list, with thanks to S. Kelly for helping to lead this charge and for planned report back to Exec.

8. For discussion and/or decision making

  a) Request for tenure-track faculty hiring update, including demographics (once this year's hiring is complete. B. Hartung had volunteered to update Senate on this;

  b) Curriculum process: consider expedited process to remove prerequisites, as programs may wish to remove prerequisites, but the process is quite lengthy—can a new form be created for this purpose?;

    c) Response from Curriculum Committee (CC) co-chair: Any prerequisites currently present will now be enforced via Peoplesoft, CC is trying to move away from the large flow of minor changes to address program packages as a

whole; CC suggests to do a program review every five years and adjust prerequisites at that time;

d) Discussion: this is why we need school level curriculum committees, a university level committee shouldn't be addressing changes in learning objectives or prerequisites; lots of minor tasks associated with these changes have been routed to the Curriculum Committee, something that they're moving away from; recalled process discussions with Records to catch students who do not pass prereqs after they've enrolled for the next class; clarification that we're seeing two phenomena here, one is the enforcement of prerequisites, the other is the question if we should be allowed to infinitely tweak the prerequisites; Janet Rizzoli and Blake Buller have been quite proactive and helpful in assessing courses affected by these kinds of changes;

   a. ACTION: Exec suggested to take this discussion back to S. Frisch and/or the President's Council;

e) *SP09-07 revision request

   a. Call for any comments or objections to passing this along to the Space Advisory Committee (SAC); currently no timeline is present, so they're recommending one;

   b. Suggestion to pass this Faculty Affairs, with a note that it would be useful to have a policy that provides more guidance;

f) *AA.04.007 Policy on Coordination of Data Collection for Purposes of Institutional Research – what senate group should provide feedback/ suggestions?

   a. Background: the change would require anyone using university students, staff or faculty for research purposes to make a request to get onto the IRPE calendar; "beyond individual classroom work…";

   b. Discussion: Faculty already have to apply for IRB approval for any research project; this adds an additional layer of review and time to the process; email from M. Bourgeois read aloud, mentioning a need for survey policy, sampling frequency and sampling exhaustion; observed that IRB doesn't perform the scheduling, IRPE does it; question if IRPE has the capacity to handle this, say if 40 classes want survey data, among other non-curricular requests; some have had difficulty obtaining data from IR currently; question to clarify who is feeling "over-sampled"; policy would catch student research projects across more than one class as well as faculty collaborating across classes; needs to be reviewed; IRB suggested as the right group, and they're already the approval body; reminder to Exec that we're not reviewing the merits of the policy, but determining whether faculty need their eyes on it;

g) *Faculty Time Use Study?

   a. Background: Given that there is a national study going on currently, does CI want to participate?;

b. Discussion: Clarified that it's a university commitment that individuals could then opt in or out of; noted that we're currently asking faculty about what factors matter, this might provide us with more data; clarified that it does not cost CI anything; response, why say no to an opportunity to retrieve more data; suggestion that we could have an intro message to encourage responses; Exec agreed;

h) *Proposed changes to the Program Review Policy

a. Background: question at hand is who gets to look at this; summarized that a sub-group of the Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC) reviewed it; also that A. Wallace made some minor changes to this policy; now that it's back at Senate Exec, shall it be a consent item?;

b. Discussion: changes to the cross listing policy may require some additions to this Program Review Policy; members who have been through program reviews raised some questions about the process now, including the large number of people involved in the process, the difficulty of raising critiques in front of the program chair, and the absence in Part 5 of a way to address disagreements, i.e. what if the program wants to do 'x' and the dean says 'no'; on Page 4 there's a list of who is on the CIC; this committee membership needs updating—for example, there is no faculty rep for the LRC as listed;

c. Further discussion: hearing that this won't be a consent item based on current feedback, asked how do we proceed; answer was suggested that it go back to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (CIC); suggestion that we may want some input from administration on what they're looking for in reviews and what people want on campus from it; recalled that the intent of the CIC was to establish a group of faculty who aren't tied to a particular program; clarification that our only compulsion is to fulfill this requirement is not for WASC, because it is also a CSU requirement; recommendation that the policy should reflect the needs, be meaningful, and come from a set of criteria; CIC should consider whether this has something more than what the WASC and CO require; faculty have found the outside reviewers' comments to help programs recognize successes with limited resources and argue for additional resources needed;

d. ACTION: This will go back to A. Wallace and the Continuous Improvement Committee.

i) Purpose/ Nature of *Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQs)*: adapt for efficacy?

a. Background: sometimes we receive a number of questions and some don't seem meritorious of Senate business; recently a question / answer exchange was recognized not to be helpful; others do highlight how we can improve institutionally; observation that it may have outlived its effectiveness, perhaps due to our growing size; may be premature to ditch it, may want to see some reforms first;

b. Discussion: faculty should feel that they can ask questions with the backing of all faculty where they don't feel retaliation; it's important to hear all of the questions and all of their answers; we could take questions before the agenda is set instead; agreed that by asking it in Senate, it brings with it a form of accountability; it's a rhetorical move for when the faculty member feels that not enough movement is happening, although this brings with it an occasional question that is less useful; Senate Chair recalled that solely emailed questions are not as manageable in this form, plus there is value in raising it publicly; noted that communication is one of our issues that we're working on to improve internal communication; suggestion that a blurb could be written that highlights some important areas in our bylaws; it seems to work by having ItRQs at the end of the agenda to be more efficient with our Senate business.

9. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration (nothing unusual here)
   a. Background on the presidential faculty teaching award, noting that we do have regular faculty on campus who teach graduate students; we also have psychologists and faculty who don't teach;
   b. Discussion: more than half of the School of Education faculty aren't eligible to apply due to the predominant criteria for undergraduate teaching; comment that we're using this award to send people other places, i.e. the Carnegie Mellon award; suggestion to have other service or research awards; observed that the CSU is founded on teacher preparation, and to not have any SoE faculty on this is a concern; question on who manages this award – reply was B. Hartung; question on who sets the criteria, i.e. if we change the criteria then who would we send it to; comment added that the announcement comes from the President's Office; Exec recalled receiving information that 95% of our students are undergrads and that's where the focus is; Exec member(s) reviewed the criteria at Carnegie, found 25% of Carnegie's impact comes from undergraduate teaching; question on how many teaching awards do we give out; maybe we just have one campus-wide award to recognize what we all do, as Carnegie will see 100,000 other applicants where CI representation is not assured; the Student Research Advisory Committee was going to move toward an award for research; on many campuses there have been at least 3 major awards annually;
   c. Suggestions toward a recommendation: if there was a recommendation about a collection of awards, then that would be helpful; requests to expand the category were sent via email; question if Exec wants to take this on, or whether we want to look to FAC; a year or two ago there were other people tasked with this same intent but did not go anywhere; one approach would be to present general recommendations for three awards, with requests for a process and a set of criteria, give FDAC one and give out the others, then when the criteria come back to Exec we can harmonize them into a single policy to put forward; question on how this award is funded – answer that it's funded from the President; suggestion

that our criteria would not preclude some awards to go forward to the Carnegie award;

    d.   ACTION: C. Wyels offered to craft a recommendation;

10. Other Business

    a.   Regarding a swipe for a meal plan, if a student doesn't use their full swipe, that our campus just keeps it, whereas on other campuses it has been donated; suggestion is that what if we take the surplus swipes and give them to students in need; we could then put these cards at the food pantry, the idea being to take this unused money and to put it to good use; recommendation that it would be good to see student government do something about this along with faculty support;

    b.   ACTION: C. Wyels will forward this to Travis Hunt, and will also let him know that he has faculty support; will look to him to provide feedback to us at our next meeting; will copy Michelle Noyes on the email; question on why the surplus swipes don't just go back to a student's account; this question will be forwarded as well;

    c.   Summarized that the upcoming Senate meeting will be filled with interesting reports and lively discussions, but won't have much in the way of continuing or new business; noted that a report has since been received from IGER, with thanks to D. Wakelee for his assistance in this endeavor;

    d.   ACTION: Centers & Institutes will report on this at the next Senate;

*Please review an associated document or website prior to the meeting.