

Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 2, 2017
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Sean Kelly, Steve Stratton, Simone Aloisio, Dan Wakelee, John Yudelson, Jacob Jenkins, Cindy Wyels, Jeanne Grier, Greg Wood, Mary Adler, Travis Hunt.

Staff present: David Daniels

1. Meeting Call to Order
 - a. Meeting called to order at 2:30pm; noted that B. Gillespie cannot attend due to travel schedule; G. Evans Taylor may have a schedule conflict as well;
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda approved with no objections;
3. Approval of the Minutes from Apr. 11, 2017
 - a. Meeting minutes from 4/11/17 approved with no objections;
4. Continuing Business
 - a. *Proposed revision of SP14-18, Policy on Centers and Institutes (Committee on Centers and Institutes) – updated since last Senate meeting
 - i. Background: noted that track changes shows most of the updates; these were revisions made based on comments on the Senate floor from last time;
 - ii. ACTION: no objections on moving this forward to Senate as a second reading item;
 - b. *Proposed Policy on General Education Course Characteristics – updated since last Senate meeting
 - i. No objections to moving forward to Senate as a second reading item;
 - c. *Proposed Policy on General Education Course Requirements – updated since last Senate meeting
 - i. Background: call for any questions before the move on to a second reading item in Senate;
 - ii. Discussion: yes, a question if the impact on specific majors has been shared with chair—concern about not having a wider discussion before coming to Senate; noted that the effective date for the new policy will begin in AY19-20; recalled that Curriculum Committee has considered holding off due to implementation of new CurricuLog system; observation that it could be two policies, one for lower division courses and one for upper division; summarized that some people may disagree, but the responsibility of Exec is not to question this logic, but to say whether it is ready to move forward to

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

Senate; concern voiced that there isn't enough time built into the proposals to debate them, especially the second one; didn't really get the debate, in some ways the second policy is a first reading item, but has fairly large implications for the campus; the people on GE have spent many hours working on this, so as much time as possible should be allotted for debate on the floor; discussion of applicable Robert's Rules (noted that the rules don't indicate first or second readings); noted that in statewide it would be a second reading; comment that regardless of what happens in Senate, the conversation could come back around due to Chancellor Office-level discussions and their solicitation of feedback on GE requirements system wide;

- iii. No objections to moving updates forward to Senate as a second reading item;
- d. *Proposed revision of SP14-09 Policy on Academic Disqualification (SAPP)
 - i. No objections to moving this forward to Senate as a second reading item;
- e. *Proposed Policy on Priority & Scheduling of Registration (SAPP) – updated since last Senate meeting
 - i. Background: noted that SAPP committee removed the references to intercollegiate athletes based on feedback from first reading;
 - ii. Discussion: no objections to moving this forward to Senate as a second reading item;
- 5. New Business (none)
 - a. None;
- 6. Chair Report
 - a. Referenced T&I business practice email that was recently circulated, i.e. that you have to get approval to conduct any surveys; recalled that they wrote a business practice to reflect campus policy, but it was not in line with campus policy, so the email directive was rescinded; further discussion of the nuances of IRB approval;
 - b. SAPP informed Senate Chair of a number of questions relating to DRP – these will be taken up in AY17-18; also announced that Kirsten Olson will be leaving campus to return to a position at UCSB;
- 7. Senate Agenda Review – for Exec consideration
 - a. Tenure Density update, projections
 - i. Recalled that at last Senate meeting B. Hartung gave us facts and figures on faculty hiring and gender ethnicity demographics; she would like to come back this time to update, and would also like introduce Faculty 180, which is scheduled to start in the Fall – this is the online faculty portfolio (for RTP purposes);
 - b. Senate Attendance Report (informs quorum and representation decisions)



- i. Chair has been working with D. Daniels to pull this data to show trends over the last couple years; once finalized could talk to Senate about this, i.e. showing general trends of the consistent group that always go, the pool that never attend, what percentage show up later, etc.
 - c. Presentation on potential campus solar energy project – 15 min. requested by BFA
 - i. Recalled that E. Blaine and J. Gormley asked for 15 minutes; awareness that discussion and debate on GE policies will be time consuming, discussion of timing to accommodate both objectives;
 - d. Report from Fiscal Policies
 - i. Agreed this report is necessary, and would come before the solar energy report time;
 - e. Academic Preparation
 - i. Background: referenced the academic preparation document from the CO; summarized that every student should have a chance to earn 30 units of college credits in first year, question whether this is something that could go into the Chair's report;
 - ii. Discussion: observation that the CO has said a lot of things about campuses doing "stretch math," at last trustee meeting noted that they don't want students taking courses that do not move them toward graduation; recalled similar stance from EVC Blanchard from his visit; anticipate that an EO will come this summer about the future of developmental programs; impacts will be significant, no more remedial English or Mathematics, discussion of potential summer coursework; CO may let this be worked out at the campus level; Exec agreed that this should go into a Chair's report, good to let people know, maybe a link to the document;
 - iii. ACTION: suggested that item "c" will be after Continuing Business, "d" will be immediately following Continuing Business;
- 8. For discussion, decision making, and/or leaving a record
 - a. Search committee for Interim Associate Dean, A&S
 - a. No faculty nominees for this committee, G. Wood, J. Jenkins, and C. Wyels offered to assist;
 - b. Also do not have any nominees for the next CIS mission director; usually we do a fall election, but this is an appointed position from a Provost; will follow up with a person who came to mind, S. Stratton will follow this lead;
 - b. Service Roles Distribution (from last chair's report) – going to Cabinet. Request for Senate Exec input.
 - a. Background: referenced the two bar charts with senior vs. junior faculty role distribution, basically we've only worsened the distribution for next year; asked if this could be presented at Cabinet and was approved, asked Exec for any recommendations;



- b. Discussion: suggested that since we had trouble finding a Senate Chair, a faculty seat on the search committee for Interim Associate Dean for A&S, and a nominee for CIS director, that we could add this to our communication; added that it's important to note that not all committee service is equal; noted that at last audit some committees did end up getting dissolved, citing lack of meetings; recalled that Senate officers spent hours trying to assign everyone who volunteered, would be good to get some reporting on this; reminded that we don't want the take-home message to be that we don't want to involve the faculty, great job of how this was presented at Senate last time; comment added that this is when the Senate Chair being a member of Cabinet would be helpful; discussion of some committees meeting for the sole purpose of recording in the books as having met; also important to recognize the role of lecturers and lecturer service; talking about the 'invisible service burden'; anything more on this topic would be helpful to communicate;
- c. Suggested revisions to Senate Bylaws
 - i. Background: wanted to capture things that we've found that we may want changed the next time the bylaws are revised;
 - ii. Fiscal Policies suggestions (from last Senate Exec discussion)Discussion: asked who approves changes to our bylaws; recalled that the President signed off on our last change, but would this be necessary if it's the Senate's bylaws;
 - iii. In terms of quorum, suggested that we could have an "Opt-in" model instead of an "opt-out" model, and then everyone who indicates at the beginning of the year that they do want to participate could do so;
 - iv. In terms of chair's term, added that we could also have a two or three year of past / current / chair or extending the term lengths of a chair;
 - v. In terms of current level of lecturer representation, depends on if we go to opt-in or not, all levels of participation could be negotiated; suggested to let's put this as a "consider" item;
 - vi. In terms of current guidelines of debate, in that right now we can't speak more than twice to a motion, then there's a five minute time limit (a long time for one person to speak); Statewide Senate limits the number of people who can speak in favor or against, to 3 of each, then before someone speaks they start with whether they're in favor or against; further discussion of Statewide comment and debate procedures; recalled in standard Robert's Rules that you ask for someone in favor, then alternate with those against, otherwise why keep going with comments if they are all in favor or all against; further discussion of campuses not bringing materials to Senate if they don't think it's going to pass;
 - vii. Clarity regarding approval process



California State
University

ACADEMIC SENATE

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

- i. Discussion continued (from ciii): question regarding who approves bylaw revisions; when looking at the bylaws, states that revisions to the bylaws will be approved by two thirds vote, doesn't state anything about gaining presidential approval; observation that we don't think we want to get permission to change, they are Senate's bylaws and we don't need to ask for this permission; suggested that in the future that we don't ask for this permission; consideration of the fact that we can't change anything in the operation in the Office of the President by passing a policy, so why would the lines of power run one way but not the other; counter example cited where the charge of Fiscal Policies Committee (FPC) is to examine the entire budget of the university, and we were cognizant that this charge was signed by the president, and so this boosted the authority of the FPC; discussion if bylaws are policy or not; cautioned that if this door is opened, hypothetical situation could come where our passed bylaw revisions are changed; could we add "in consultation with President's Office" to communicate that we are consultative; bylaws currently say that they shall be amended by two thirds majority, additional clarity would be valuable and welcomed; suggested additional language on maintaining a good working relationship but that a signature of approval is not being sought; referred to our constitution, seems that we are not being responsible for some things that we should be responsible for;
- ii. Encourage next year's Exec to go back and take a look at our constitution; suggest another constitutional amendment about having the Senate Chair being a member of Cabinet;

9. Other Business

- a. Thanks to all members, and reminded that we'll be seeing each other on May 22nd; meeting adjourned at 3:36pm;