Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 11, 2017
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Simone Aloisio, Blake Gillespie, Dan Wakelee, Sean Kelly, Steve Stratton, Cindy Wyels, Mary Adler, Jacob Jenkins, Greg Wood, Travis Hunt, Genevieve Evans Taylor
Staff present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Call to Order
   a. C. Wyels noted the full agenda as we go into the second to last meeting, recommended to please make comments germane and concise;

2. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Moved DRP requests to SAPP to agenda item #7; also we can remove item 8(c) from today's discussion; meeting agenda approved as amended;

3. Approval of the Minutes from Mar. 14, 2017
   a. Meeting minutes from 3/14/17 approved with no objections;

4. Continuing Business
   a. *Proposed Academic Renewal Policy (SAPP)
      i. No further comments from Exec;
   b. *Proposed Cross-Listing Policy (Curriculum)
      i. No further comments from Exec; items 4a and 4b will both go up for a second reading on the Senate floor;

5. New Business
   a. *Proposed revision of SP14-18, Policy on Centers and Institutes (Committee on Centers and Institutes)
      i. Background: recalled that a Word doc was sent out, with minor changes beginning on page 8; reminded that the charge of Exec is to decide if its ready to be debated on the Senate floor as currently submitted; no objections on it moving forward to Senate floor;
   b. *Proposed Policy on General Education Course Characteristics
      i. Background: summarized that there has been wide conversation about this involving the GE Committee;
      ii. Discussion: it looks like in B-3 that there's a major change: is this allowed on the Academic Master Plan (AMP)?; in our current plan one of our "B" classifications does not map to the CSU outline, could be mentioned in the rationale / background or researched and discussed on the floor; question

if S. Frisch is taking a look at this to make sure we're following Title V, could be introduced with comments included in the background; observed that it's a long document, maybe add a bulleted list to indicate what has been added/changed/removed… would be useful to know what changes are required by EO versus other changes not required; looked up definition of "B3" from EO 1100, defined as "laboratory activities associated with B1 and B2";

c. *Proposed Policy on General Education Course Requirements
   i. <u>Background:</u> reminder that our charge as Exec is to determine if it's ready for Senate;
   ii. <u>Discussion:</u> suggestion to consolidate the effective dates into a separate section; agreed that discussion on the floor would allow for concerns to be raised; question regarding whether the number of GE courses is a problem or could be an organizational question; concern is we're not having the discussion of "changing the way we're thinking about GE on this campus"; GE classes help define campus identity, so if we change this then we may be changing too much; comment that GE Chair brought this to chairs meeting, question to him there was how does this relate to GWAR,, response was that GWAR is a separate policy; raised concern that if we adopt this policy, we may then be out of compliance with GWAR; further discussion about programs that may have problems meeting the 20-25% limits, citing examples from Physical Science and Astronomy; e.g. Geology is not a program it's a service function here at CI; the GE Committee is open to holding a discussion and making changes; discussion of programs that require a UDIGE course; suggestion to add choice versus mandated changes regarding EO 1100; recommended that the exhibits listed at the end be linked so that they can be available as well; noted that the limit on the amount of GE that is upper division does not have a mechanism in this policy, and the only way to enforce this is to inform programs that they're out of compliance and that they may have to eliminate courses; B3 in our GE pattern is math, and B4 is computer information technology—this creates issues when bringing in or taking out credit; anyone that feels strongly about these things should contribute to the Chancellor's Office (CO) feedback portal, as they are assessing whether there are changes coming to EO 1100; question if this policy would mean longer time to graduation, if we're adding more GE courses separated from major requirements: especially in high unit majors or those with external requirements like Nursing; what is meant by "program"?

d. *Proposed Senate Bylaws revision, part 1 (Senate Officer elections)
   i. <u>Background:</u> The current situation with no senate chair nominee conflicts with our bylaws, which do not allow nominations after Apr. 1st; the proposed revision to bylaws basically adds to Article 3.3 to provide a fix for this omission; clarification that this proposed policy is to revise our

bylaws so that we can move forward should we not have nominations for any of the Senate officer positions;

    ii. <u>Discussion:</u> what happens if there are no nominations received by the last Senate meeting – reply that under Part (i) there would be no Senate chair into the next term; discussion of who would then run the meeting, discussion of Exec appointee or Vice Chair; no nomination perhaps demonstrates a lack of interest in shared governance; alternative could be that the clock resets at the first week of the next semester (on Monday); noted that the Committee on Committees is tasked with filling the vacancy as soon as possible; our current bylaws make no provision if there is a vacancy as chair, and we have extended our nomination period as late as possible; agreed that we as Exec should decide on the process; consideration of what if the process begins again on Aug. 29th; discussion of options in the absence of a nomination; suggestion "to stop the process at the last Senate meeting and to empower Exec to appoint a willing chair to serve a minimum of one term"; debated possibility of having member(s) of Exec form a council that serves the role of the chair, possibly rotating responsibility; discussed option to conduct the nominations on the floor of the Senate, which did used to occur in the past, but is not preferable; observation that our ability to conduct shared governance is in conflict with our ability to support it;

    iii. <u>Action:</u> agreed that we do think that we should have an end game, and that Exec should help to resolve; suggested that if a reopening of nominations fails, then Exec would meet again "before the formal end of the academic year" to appoint; discussion of implications to move this to a second reading; finalized the wording for the proposed bylaws revision;

e. *Proposed Senate Bylaws revision, part 2 (Fiscal Policies)

    i. <u>Discussion:</u> Is this proposal for changes from FP ready for Senate to discuss?; Question about if a budget analyst request needs to be included in bylaws—perhaps an acknowledgement of the role should be included; question if this person is a voting member or ex-officio, can someone who is not a member of Senate vote on a Senate committee—Reviewed other Senate committee bylaws, SAPP is an example where a person not a member of Senate has a vote; Exec recommends that this analyst be non-voting;

    ii. <u>Action:</u> recommended that the proposal needs to be submitted as existing bylaws with track changes displayed, so this current version is not yet ready to go to Senate;

f. *Proposed revision of SP14-09 Policy on Academic Disqualification (SAPP)

    i. <u>Discussion:</u> examples cited of cases where students have a GPA too low to avoid getting disqualified; revision would allow for more flexibility; noted that Records & Registration disqualifies students, but that is not stated in this policy; question on what is meant by "significant improvement";

ACADEMIC
SENATE
C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S
California State
University

          ii.   <u>Action:</u> recommended that information be added regarding who is making the decisions and with what criteria; after this it's ready for Senate;

     g.   *Proposed Policy on Priority & Scheduling of Registration (SAPP)

          i.   <u>Discussion:</u> agreed that it was a wise approach to set percentage limits; recommended formatting changes to indent the section for Groups; further question on Open University students—clarified that they are not in any priority registration group; question on why student senators do not receive priority registration, yet NCAA athletes would;

          ii.   <u>Action:</u> Exec agreed that this is ready to go to Senate;

6.   Chair Report

     a.   Senate Chair thanked everyone who made time for meeting with Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard; recalled quote from EVC Blanchard regarding pending changes to curriculum, "will ensure that students have 30 academic units before their second year…"; further noted that remedial education in its current form, i.e. non-credit bearing, is going away within a year; this is going to be a major change: for, example, about 55% of our freshmen are in remedial math, and then half of them do not finish college; in many conversations references are made to the five campuses that have "stretch math" and summer programs; also looking at methodology in placing students;

     b.   DRP has made a request to SAPP and met with T. Itkonen and P. Murphy; noted that there's an EO that mandates when we have course modifications with reasonable accommodations; other considerations are requests for graduation requirement waivers; these issues may be bigger than SAPP; proactively this committee is generating the questions that need to be addressed – will make a recommendation on what parties need to be engaged on these issues;

     c.   Reminded that we only have two Senate meetings left; Senate has been recognized as a good partner and informed decision-maker; shared the data and evidence on service time [displayed graph summarizing faculty service time; please see additional notes below in Sec.8(e)]; asking us as Exec to continue to maintain this positive tone, noting that the more we can make Senate useful as a collaborative decision-making body, the better off we'll be;

7.   For discussion and/or decision making

     a.   *IGER Report (CCI)

          i.   Exec accepts the recommendation as stated on report;

     b.   DRP requests to SAPP; review of needs and discussion of appropriate channels

     c.   Proposed revision to Executive Order 1099 (EO 1099), Self-Support Programs and Courses – critical changes p. 11 and p. 17, https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6ZfPJPjiGGpeDdkenNKdGk3Skk/view

          i.   Summarized the Supplant section in 2.18;

8.   Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration

     a.   Update on TT Faculty numerical and racial/ethnic diversity trends

          i.   Tabled due to time constraints;

    b. Intellectual Policy feedback piece
       i. Tabled due to time constraints;
    c. Proposal for SROC (include C&I policy if to Senate Exec)
       i. Decision was taken by proposer(s) to not resubmit at this time
    d. 5-min. announcement for Insight Conf 4/21 (Brittany Grice)
       i. Tabled due to time constraints;
    e. Faculty Service Report
       i. Referred to Excel spreadsheet, which aims to figure out where we stand in terms of our cumulative faculty service load; added that if there are specific things that you would like to see or specific questions you have about faculty service load, please email C. Wyels;
    f. Senate Engagement Report (combine w/ above?)
       i. Summarized that this will basically be a graph that will be displayed that shows what percentage of the faculty come regularly to Senate; could also be incorporated into the Blog and also in the Senate Chair Report;

9. Other Business
    a. Tabled due to time constraints – meeting adjourned at 4:21pm;

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