



California State  
University

## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Senate Executive Committee  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, March 14, 2017  
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185  
2:30pm

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

1. Meeting Call to Order
  - a. Meeting called to order at 2:35pm;
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. C. Wyels noted additional items to discuss; agenda with amendments approved with no objections;
3. Approval of the Minutes from Feb. 21, 2017
  - a. Meeting minutes from 2/21/17 approved with no objections;
4. Continuing Business
  - a. \*Proposed revision: Policy on Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students (one word revision made following Senate)
    - i. Background: Summarized that one change was made and has been tracked;
    - ii. ACTION: This will move forward to Senate as second reading item;
5. New Business
  - a. \*Proposed Academic Renewal Policy (SAPP)
    - i. Background: CI is allowed but not required to have a policy on academic renewal; given that students have been using the retroactive withdrawal to serve this purpose, this policy is more appropriate when these applicable circumstances may apply;
    - ii. Discussion: Question on how this differs from a retroactive withdrawal – reply was that the consequence is the same, but not the same in terms of the wait; this requires a wait of five years, i.e. students did not perform well in the past, but then would be given another chance; discussion of what the downside would be, comment added that there's still a decision being made in each case; Suggestion that the Academic Appeals Committee should be given this charge instead of stated language in second paragraph on page two; noted that this policy can only cancel out two semesters; referenced last paragraph, if another institution has acted to



- remove course work, we only remove one semester of course work;  
agreement that this policy is a good idea to give people a chance;
- iii. ACTION: Minor edits on the third to last paragraph, recommend that Academic Appeals Committee gets the charge, then would go to Senate as first-reading item;
- b. \*Proposed Cross-Listing Policy (Curriculum)
- i. Background by Chair of Curriculum Committee: cross-listed courses have been problematic in terms of staffing; ad hoc task force created to deal with this; upshot is the need for coordination between cross-listed courses and the programs managing them; noted that references to “interdisciplinarity” were struck; coordination needed between staffing and compensation; noted prior comments about “no teeth to this policy,” which has been clarified in this revised version;
  - ii. Discussion: reference to item number two, there seems to be no mechanism to ensure this, i.e. there’s a form where chairs sign, but perhaps language should be added to say that the signature by chairs indicates that consultation has taken place per the policy, and will in the future; response was that what should be coming via the CurricuLog system is to build this approval system in; a simple addition to this point may be additional dialog boxes that appear after a cursor-hover; Suggestion to have accounting in place when a program wants to end their cross-listed course, we have steps for when one is wanting to be added, but what about when delisting is desired; reply that at the program level the program simply stops doing it, but not sure that other cross-listed program is informed; comment added that through CurricuLog, this would help to streamline other processes including delisting; further discussion of both chairs needing joint approval, recalled an instance where a course was cross listed, then a disagreement occurred later and one of the programs opted out; discussion of enforcement of communication, minimally every five years; discussion of further edits to Policy Text section to clarify approval process; discussion of the need for “exactly” in the phrase, “any new course may be cross-listed in *exactly* two program areas— further discussion to strike the word “exactly”; recommendation to ensure that communication is taking place; noted that this will come in the future, a heads up for those of us serving two terms, let’s also be sure to include A. Wallace in this institutional memory;
- c. \*Proposal to Establish a Center for Student Research (Centers and Institutes) – please review the four documents with names beginning with “CSR”
- i. Background: the four points that this addresses summarize a need for the creation of a new Center; we currently have a policy on Centers & Institutes;
  - ii. Discussion: Summarized that this is a good proposal and satisfies the need, noting that within the proposal a name change is suggested to begins the



title with “Center for”; this is something that people have been working on for several years; discussion if this center would replace SRAC and how is the center identified; the proposing committee felt strongly that the word “opportunity” should be included in the title; reviewed Policy on Creation of Centers & Institutes, which states that the proposing committee provides a recommendation to Senate; recalled that we’ve been clear that faculty participate in open calls for directorships of centers; question related to resources, this proposal comes well after the budget has been developed for the next academic year; the policy asks for a three year budget; CCI charge states that “All Centers and Institutes are expected to be revenue-generating or revenue-neutral, unless specific provisions are made for their intramural support; further noted this is not meant to be a mission center; recalled a previous example where the Alzheimer’s Center went away when funding went away; discussion of funding sources: UNIV 498s and money aside from programs; OLAS is currently providing funds, but we may not want to preclude General Fund support; proposal seems to preclude general fund support; question on what is meant by “full time” with respect to tenure track faculty, as any implication to a full time buy-out would be discouraged;

- iii. ACTION: tabling this, getting more info, bring it back to Exec to further discuss; could still come to Senate with these changes in mind;

#### 6. Chair Report

- a. C. Wyels thanked D. Wakelee and J. Grier for their assistance with what we can now provide for all of our teaching faculty, who are now eligible for the Presidential Teaching Award;
- b. Noted that reminder was sent to chairs and others about the timeline to present materials to Senate;
- c. Noted some Exec members are stepping up to lead on topics Exec thought important, such as S. Aloisio for tenure density and S. Kelly for faculty hiring process; C. Wyels taking on faculty service question, suggestion is to utilize white papers, i.e. do the analysis, write it down, put it out for Senate comment, then put it to the new provost; suggested homework timeline is by the end of the semester; suggested that after this hiring cycle is done to ask B. Hartung to revise the Spring 2014 hiring breakdown chart;

#### 7. For discussion and/or decision making

- a) Policy on Online Teaching & Learning – what are the means for consideration of issues and possible revisions?
  - b) Discussion regarding the management and ratio of face-to-face compared with online courses; question is how would we address issues like this – if it’s an ad hoc, it would go to Exec and then we can assign it to a committee or form an ad hoc committee; observed that this policy was recent as of 2015, and



even prior to that was a 70% - 30% split from a previous policy; discussion of instances where a chair and faculty disagree, and where loopholes may be present; observed that if 30% of the class or less is online, it can be counted as a face-to-face course; noted that it's not an Executive Order that designates the 30%, it's a statewide senate resolution, and also our campus has a Senate Policy; the statewide resolution shows a range of campuses who show 20% and up, AS3169-14, says "roughly" 25-30% are hybrid; WASC also has a definition;

- a. ACTION: Exec has decided that the issue raised in the email is not a policy issue (one individual) and needs to be handled via other means; people are going to make changes and/or cancel some classes;
- c) \*AA.04.007 Policy on Coordination of Data Collection for Purposes of Institutional Research – review IRB response; determine next steps
  - a. Background: policy revised to suggest that IRPE be the entity that has final approval on calendaring research on campus;
  - b. Discussion: Exec discussed some email history, referencing an email about four different surveys, we do need to be mindful of this so that the same people aren't being bombarded; IRB feels that this adds unnecessary oversight onto faculty research; it is the role of faculty to work with the administration to come up with a compromise; IRPE has asked DAA to collect and rank everything that comes from this division, which we have not had the capacity to do; it will be unknown what is occurring at the graduate student level; general question on who the stakeholders are; there are faculty who do methodological research, some of which does not get published; beyond faculty, question is what are the functional areas we need to draw from; recalled that Student Affairs sends an ample number of surveys out, as does Advancement; it appears that this policy as it stands will not pass Senate; discussion of what a relevant committee might be to help with this charge, e.g. could be Faculty Affairs Committee given faculty involvement, or RSP; suggestion that Exec proposes 4 faculty member representation, a DSA rep (ask Toni Deboni), IRPE, Advancement and RSP are optional, plus a student rep – this task force would work on a mutually acceptable policy; recalled that we do have an existing University Policy on this, but the amendments proposed by IRPE are not feasible; Exec suggests that the faculty member representatives come up with a joint effort for amendments that are mutually acceptable; it needs to come back to Senate, although one outcome could be that there are no changes to this policy, keeping faculty research exempt, but requiring it of students; under the current policy there have been cases where students have tried to conduct research, but were told that this is not an institutional priority; work can be done to maybe avoid the hoops to jump through;



California State  
University

**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**

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

- d) \*Review of self-nominations and recommendation of faculty to serve on search committee for Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs
- a. Background: Exec will recommend to Provost two faculty seats;
  - b. Discussion: request was if possible to have one non-tenure track and one tenure-track; general clarification if this position is kind of what B. Hartung is doing now – reply was yes, but more similar to a model that’s more typical at comparable institutions (AVP position rather than Assistant Provost); noted that CFA experience and having one or more lecturers on the committee would be positive; this position also deals with RTP; no nominees have been on RTP; discussion of each nominee;
  - c. Discussion of other faculty service opportunities: recalled P. Hampton presentation of the STEM Promise Program, asked if we should say to self-nominate to P. Hampton via the Senate email portal, no objections; in reference to the Interim Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences, were not yet ready for a call to be made; regarding the faculty working group to draft the “time place and manner” policy to replace the “free speech” policy – noted that this would necessitate a meet and confer under the CBA, it’s also a university policy—if no objections will include this in the call to self-nominate to Chelsea Bente, none heard; regarding the new position as Administrative Services II that includes the Multicultural Dream Center (noted that this is different from CME and intercultural services), that this is a director level position and not a staff level position; question if this would conflict with our policy when faculty serve on MPP searches – reply was no;
  - d. Discussion of faculty service on student fees committees: recalled meeting with Dottie Ayers and Dianne Wei, tried to clarify why we couldn’t do a call in spring for assumed service in the fall; they indicated a willingness to go to one faculty member for student fees committee, on each of the four; Exec agreed to keep two faculty members on MSFT and IRA; Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) has faculty representation, and they set the fees; clarified that we have two faculty on the larger SFAC, J. Delgado and L. Sanchez; summarized that we reduce faculty representation from two to one on the student health fee and recreation fee committees;
  - e. Discussion of General Ed policy supporting student success: we have an opportunity from CO to provide feedback; EO 1100 is the GE breadth requirements, CO wants meaningful feedback (by May 10<sup>th</sup>); regarding the question if would we support eliminating upper division GE; we received negative feedback from the system-wide Provosts group, but positive feedback from the system-wide Presidents group; being silent would probably not be the best response; clarified this is



not just about the 9 units of GE, correct; question is more about how we can focus, streamline, and stress the things that are more important; question on what's the process – reply was no process has been dictated; we could do a faculty, student and administration response, or an all-campus response; S. Frisch is following up with M. Noyes to see what the preference of ASI is; Provost offered support if needed; question is if the GE sub-committee is enough, do we need other calls – reply was GE committee plus program chairs would provide a good sample; observed that it's 2.5 pages of questions, each of which need 5-6 bullet points, approximately 30 total text points; recalled that we just did an external review, where S. Frisch has just written a response, optimal if these things reasonably aligned; the Office of the President will collect the response—sent out the deadline of May 10<sup>th</sup>; recalled that we also had a quantitative reasoning group; suggested that Exec needs to see drafts before final submission; same thing for the ethnicity report;

8. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration
  - a. Emergency Intervention Task Force update (follow-up to Fall ItRQ)
    - i. Noted that we've been clear to them on how our timelines work in Senate, they'll have a presentation time slot;
  - b. SISC Faculty Feedback/ Idea Generation
    - i. Regarding the Strategic Initiative Steering Committee, this will come as an announcement, and there will be an update on how we're doing with tenure track hiring and diversity;
  - c. Community Time use?
    - i. Noted that we value our community time as it's currently designed, and as such have held off on adding structure to it such as pre-agenda items or discussion platforms; further Exec discussion of our diversity climate and our efforts to address historically under-represented groups; most people assume they can show up anytime from 2-2:30pm, so for discussions on e.g. faculty hiring process, community time might not be the best format; an all-faculty meeting was called previously, and good discussions took place, yet brown bags were poorly attended; noted that those who ask to present at senate to announce to “all faculty” should know that only 11-12% of the faculty are present at any given Senate meeting;
9. Other Business
  - a. Curriculum Committee Chair: just passed a set of course modifications for MA in Education, which introduced two Master's programs: one is MA in Higher Education, the other is MA in Educational Leadership, relevant to CO mandate that emphasizes had to share 51% of required curriculum; next steps are presumably to add both to the Academic Master Plan; these proposals will go to the APC and



California State  
University

**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**

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

then the Senate; discussion of changes to SoE curriculum and emphases; recalled that CO mandate only has a list of recommended courses of action; we could be offering a program in a fall semester without it being on the AMP and without CO approval, but on paper would look like we have another new degree;

10. Meeting adjourned at 4:12pm

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