

Senate Executive Committee

MINUTES

Tuesday, November 29, 2016

Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

Attendees: Cindy Wyels, Steve Stratton, Mary Adler, Beth Hartung, Greg Wood, Jeanne Grier, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Simone Aloisio, Jennifer Perry, Sean Kelly, Jacob Jenkins, Travis Hunt.

Staff Present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:33pm
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Noted that given the long agenda, let's be concise and on topic, but of course still feel free to please speak up; also, per Senate Chair meeting with D. Wakelee, B. Hartung and K. Harrington re tenure density, moving to amend the agenda to add information on this topic (see Sec. 3(b) below);
3. Approval of the Minutes from Nov. 8, 2016
  - a. Meeting minutes from 11/8/16 approved with no objections;
  - b. Discussion (topic added by amending agenda): B. Hartung referred to the previous meeting on tenure density, summarized that we're now deferring to the Chancellor's Office (CO) statistics; received other and different numbers from CI Finance; summarized that the CO number refers to head count numbers, which would exclude counselors and tenure line Library personnel; last year we had 38.6 percent, the lowest in the system, after comparing people with people; our number will go up a percentage point this year, and with hiring 70 new lecturers the needle will be moved slightly; the number presented by CI Finance / Business and Financial Services is one based on funding for teaching needs, but it ends up overstating our density considerably; this has been worked on for the last year in attempt to account for fixed costs in Academic Affairs such as release time; we currently don't have any visibility into faculty that are bought out on grants; so if we were able to take into account release time and nothing else, we would have a number closer to 50%... for now the recommendation is to stick to the CO figures, but BFS are looking at dollars for instructional time; Observation from Exec that if we can get a number from BFS that we need "x" amount of teaching time for "x" amount of students, that may make sense; e.g. if we have 6000 students divided by 25 it would be 240, but it seems like in practice we're funded for a number closer to 3000 students, not even close to having 240 tenure track faculty; confusion lies in trying to reverse engineer our needs since grant buy outs take away from instructional time; summarized that currently we're either looking at



California State  
University

## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

the cost of instruction or a headcount, which result in two different sets of numbers; our capacity is reflected in a number that compares FTES to tenure track faculty; comment that it doesn't appear that we'll make any traction in staff hiring levels either, observing that Library staff still at same level as compared to 2008 numbers; C. Wyels offered to do what she can to see if we can get some campus agreement; further observation that BFS doesn't include chairs in their faculty count, which adds another loop in the equation; observation that if you look at the last five budgets, sometimes you'll see no chairs in some but reflected in others, sometimes lecturers in some and not in others; we can handle complexity, it's an ongoing discussion... summarized to ask if there is a plan, is there a target, and if not can we encourage this to move forward; concluding comment that some of the assumptions from a Spring 2014 model are no longer current, such as an 8% growth rate, which we ended up being well above;

### 4. Continuing Business

#### a. Policy on Course Numbering (Curriculum)

- i. Discussion: Curriculum Committee (CC) is considering having a separate UDIGE course identifier (similar to UNIV courses); it is a second reading, so not sure how they're going to handle that;
- ii. Questions raised: would this remove all the cross-listings? Given that the prefix of the class shows you what is listed, how would students know what majors are included; How would it work if someone counts the course in their major;
- iii. Responses: this may free up other numbers over time; agreed that would be an interesting question; if CC brings this to the floor as a friendly amendment, recommended that we be prepared;

#### b. Tenure Density Resolution (Statewide Senate)

- i. Discussion: noted that this isn't really coming from Statewide Senate, it's coming from Senate Exec; question if we want to add on a distribution section on this to reflect other Resolution language, other than just the CI President; S. Aloisio offered to draft this and will then submit to C. Wyels; background on this is that it came to Exec because S. Aloisio was kind enough to put forth the work; question if we normally don't endorse a given policy, we're just saying whether it's ready or not to go to Senate; answer noted that resolutions are different, compared to policies that list the personnel from the origin committee; for example, the resolution we worked on over the three day weekend, we could either say it comes from Exec or with no origin committee; recommendation to change "Statewide Senate" to "Senate Exec"; noted that any single faculty member could propose a resolution;

### 5. New Business

#### a. Cross-Listing Policy (Curriculum Committee)

- i. Question raised if this goes to the floor;



California State  
University

## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

- ii. Discussion: located a few verb choices that may need to be changed; question raised concerning the policy text, “A course can be cross-listed in two program areas”— this phrase may introduce confusion, i.e. students may have participated in classes that have three or four program areas, not sure if CC should be deciding to or is intending to do away with these; response that this will need to be clarified; this subject later returned to with the observation that we shouldn’t get into quadruple course listing;
  - iii. Further discussion: question whether this policy fixes the things that are broken; answer was that it is not clear from the background what was broken; question on where is the mechanism to ensure interdisciplinarity-- is the problem the cross-listed course or a lack of oversight?; response supports the lack of oversight, adding concern for blended or face-to-face courses; after reading background section, one can summarize “a lack of communication”; comment that we may not be able to set policies for collaboration; appears that this has good intent for a cross-listing policy, but observation that cross-listed courses sometimes drop off the map because one program doesn’t offer it anymore, so one side should be talking to the other; Question: is there some mechanism where a program could initiate a removal?; It should be communicated if this happens without a conversation;
  - iv. Further discussion: seeing lots of issues here, i.e. we’re going to cross list this so we can use one body to reach out to more students (“cross disciplinary”), but you may also want interdisciplinary as another reason to cross list course – would argue that more than one teacher would have to occur for interdisciplinary, whereas one teacher could cover a cross disciplinary; cited example where interdisciplinary numbering system was intentionally not applied for a writing / sociology course; comment that if we’re truly interdisciplinary then we need to have two faculty in that room, and this requires funds;
- b. Internship Policy (SAPP)
- i. Reintroduced with the observation that SAPP did everything that Senate Exec asked them to do; needs some punctuation in Title B, other than that it’s open for comments; Observation that it’s difficult to understand where changes were made without track changes applied; agreed that comments in document were helpful; noted that in the last paragraph “opinion of SAPP that procedures should not come to Senate, etc.”... should go into the Background section; remaining confusion over the “supervising faculty member” and how responsibilities are ascribed as well as what documents are required; discussion of what the student is responsible for and whether we want them engaging the organization before they’ve been assigned an internship; summarized changes discussed, to be forwarded back to SAPP; confirmed that this is ready for Senate.

6. Chair Report

- a. C. Wyels offered a heads-up re Thursday meeting with President Beck, 11:30-12pm meeting with entire Senate Exec, in regards to the University Initiatives Steering Committee; summarized that this is to initiate campus-wide planning for the 2025 Graduation Initiative; background was that if we're going to look at university planning, each division has different initiatives, but rather than having these individual initiatives try to achieve our strategic plan, it is more efficient when taken as a smaller subset as a graduation initiative; added that UISC would go beyond 2025 G.I., for additional considerations of how does the overall plan work and how does this body (Exec) help to inform the President; can also help to connect the strategic plan with the budget, making sure that the budget really helps to support the strategic plan;
- b. Faculty needed for committee representation: need calls for ASI Exec.Dir. Search Committee, Student Health Advisory, and Senate Exec Spr'17 sabbatical replacement; want to send one email that covers all three openings; noted that bylaws are silent, may not need a special election for these; confirmed that this is the case, echoed by the Committee on Committees;
- c. Academic Master Plan: no changes from last year; noted that we're trying to fix this process, we need to submit a plan to CO by January 3<sup>rd</sup> that is approved in Senate – good news is that there were no changes, so it could potentially be included in the Chair Report as is;
  - i. Discussion: observation that this is the same master plan going forward as the last 2-3 years; noted that it's an indication of the current work being done on streamlining the process; part of why this year there are no changes, because of the new office capabilities will be able to implement these changes in the Spring; asked if the fact that it has not changed mean that we have had no new programs proposed; answer was that the plan itself is just the one page document, along with the implementation dates; asked if will anything fall off the list if nothing is done;
  - ii. Discussion with S. Frisch: [*Senate Exec asked S. Frisch to please join this meeting*]; Given that it's the same plan as last year, it could be placed within the Chair's Report, or we could put it on the agenda as consent item; S. Frisch summarized that no new programs were added, and that there are three that timed out, but each asked for an extension that has been approved; Curriculum Committee said that because it's the same plan, they were fine with taking it to Senate; suggestion from Exec that it would be good to list as a consent item from an informational standpoint; added comment that if someone does choose to move it would be a first reading item; noted that the President will send it to the CO, with or without Senate approval; recalled that in the past Senate has changed the document on the floor, although it then may be changed back; S. Frisch summarized that the idea is that next semester we'll be making



California State  
University

## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

- recommendations for the process and document after studying it; noted that when a new program is added it is given five years;
- d. Exceptional Service Awards: noting no changes to the CBA, will continue through AY1718; we have the opportunity to offer for Fall'17 or Spring'18; we could ask Professional Leaves Committee (PLC) to re-engage this for a Spring 2018 award – ACTION: will put this on the Exec agenda for our first meeting in January to consider guidance to PLC;
  - e. Environmental impact meeting at University Glen re U-Glen Phase 2 Housing: C. Wyels offered to go to this meeting if no other Exec representatives want to go, but would prefer attendance from someone who lives there; this is in reference to the time that Senate gave this group a few weeks ago; member(s) of Exec saw their presentation, in that they're building new apartments and 171 new senior housing units; recalled that we did decide that this is not Senate business, so maybe this doesn't have to happen; agreed that we could just put it out there as being voluntary, it might come up as a campus issue at some point; noted that there may be a study by the state i.e. what will the impact be from 900 new people living here; question if there is a homeowner's association with faculty representation; recalled that there is a University Glen Advisory Board, S. Clark and J. Elliott are on this; ACTION: Exec agreed that it would be good to send them to this meeting;
  - f. Search for new chair of Nursing: current update is that the Provost is currently in negotiation with candidate for chair of Nursing;
  - g. Noted that will move the Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQs) about having a sanctuary campus, will move this to the discussion section today; considering a possible joint statement;
  - h. Question from Exec requesting an update in Senate about the Provost search; answered that yes we're in the quiet phase; added comment that a brief update would be good;
7. For discussion and/or decision making
- a. Recommendation re Administrative Reviews (*SP11-04* + verbal update)
    - i. Discussion: background is that SP 11-04 provides a reference that faculty can play into evaluation process of an academic administrator; there is also a once every three years clause; per policy B. Hartung is up for review after being three years in the position; other possibilities are H. Dang; the complicating factor was when the Committee on Committees did an election when we only had three members of this committee; observation that this never made it into the bylaws, but that this year we have five committee slots; question re do we solicit for two or three additional faculty members to serve on this committee; question if the review takes place during the third year or after the conclusion of the third year; referenced J. Meriwether as an example, looked up his start date; referenced in the policy that "newly appointed administrators cannot be evaluated in the first year"; back to the first question on forming a



committee to carry out one or more evaluations this year; comment that since we have a policy in place, we should make every effort to do it; Exec agreed; observation that the institutional research person no longer reports to the Provost and instead to the President, we could ask about this; comment that this is a list that should be maintained by the Provost and not Exec; ACTION: C. Wyels noted that she would get this back to the Provost in recognition of policy and will ask for Provost purview on which names to submit; called for volunteers to help fill committee slots – S. Aloisio offered to ask someone to be on this committee;

- b. Guidance for Committee on Centers and Institutes (*CCI requirements for OLLI*)
  - i. Discussion: summarized that CCI is asking Exec if OLLI should be recognized as an educational institute at CI; question on why would we do this and if any benefits were outlined; answer was that this info wasn't provided; other Exec member(s) recalled that this was a conversation started with G. Berg in effort for greater transparency; added comment that summarized that OLLI was an institute and is not being treated as such; added comment that it was the first institute; further comment that it wasn't mission-based; referenced SP 03-13 establishing OLLI as an institute affiliated with Extended Education; suggestion that the only addition to this in terms of guidance to CCI would be "no additional funding would be coming from the CSUs"... opinion that they are a model institute; C. Wyels added that in hearing no objections that Exec believes that it should continue to be listed as an institute; question from Exec re next steps; question if we should talk to the CO to see if they agree with this policy; further observation that there is the question of annual review; additional question if "continuance" implies that there was a discontinuance at some point; Exec agreed they could manage this;
- c. Report from Quantitative Reasoning Task Force – campus reports now needed. Senate Exec – how to divide and conquer/ what questions should be addressed, and who should address them? (two attachments: *LJB memo* + *QRTF Final Report*)
  - i. Discussion: request is whether by February 6<sup>th</sup> faculty recommendations could be written, which results in something being written this semester; noted that if you didn't get to the full 40 pages, the first two summarize the recommendations; observed that one of the recommendations is that high schools require four years of math, but some high schools don't or can't offer four years of math; summarized the question if you would want our report to reflect on our feeder schools – answer was yes; it's about taking quantitative as a senior; suggestion that we could probably get some info from the Ventura County of Education, they could help us with some of these data; further discussion of the appropriate method for contacts, agreed that a direct contact to VCOE by M. Remotti would be beneficial; ACTION: G. Evans Taylor offered to get this to S. Frisch as a resource so that Exec wouldn't need to do the actual contacting;



- d. Question (previewed in email): Senate Exec role in remainder of this year?
  - i. No further comments expressed by Exec;
- e. Doubling back: SR 11-03 and “implementation of innovative and affirmative initiatives” regarding faculty and administrative hiring (*SR11-03*) – POSTPONED
- f. Sanctuary campus
  - i. C. Wyels summarized lots of conversations regarding the term Sanctuary Campus, including the Dreamer Director among others; there’s a national movement about this, but a lack of clarity on what it really means; referenced letter from Chancellor White, noting that the term “sanctuary campus” is vague, but highlighted the action steps that would be taken (i.e. with campus police); sent the question from InRQ to the President’s Office; asked if Exec should have a joint response on this question; considerations about the symbolism of this versus the concrete actions; letting people know that this response is information on what mechanisms are in place currently; question is if Exec wants to be involved in a joint answer to the question, and if so what pieces would go into it;
  - ii. Discussion: would be helpful to outline what is going on here already and independent of this label; question on what form this response is taking; answer was text on a PowerPoint; suggestion that it could be several things, what does it take to be “a” sanctuary campus, versus what does it take for “us” to be a sanctuary campus; suggestion that our answer could be “no accepted definition; here’s what we’re doing”; further quoting the Chancellor’s letter that “the term sanctuary would be misleading to the very people we support”; suggestion that we could use some of this language from Chancellor White to include within our response;  
ACTION: C. Wyels summarized that in the interest of time she will craft something as a draft, then send via email;
- 8. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration
  - a. FAC presentation of possibilities for electronic portfolios? [TABLED]
  - b. Extended announcement: Sean A., for FAC re [TABLED]
- 9. Other Business
  - [TABLED];
  - Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm