Senate Executive Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

Provost’s Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

Attendees – Virgil Adams, Geoff Chase, Genevieve Evans-Taylor, John Griffin, Antonio Jiménez Jiménez, Sean Kelly, Jennifer Perry, Steve Stratton, Kaia Tollefson, Greg Wood, Cynthia Wyels, John Yudelson, Jeannette Edwards (Staff)

Meeting Called to Order – Chair, Virgil Adams called to order at 2:33pm

Approval of the Agenda – [Senate Exec Agenda for 9-26-2017](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C2-senate-exec-09-26-2017-materials%5C1-senate-exec-agenda-9%20-26-2017.pdf) V. Adams motioned to add the Provost to item (b) under Other Business.

The revised agenda was approved with no objections.

Approval of the Minutes from September 05, 2017 - Approved with no objections [Senate-exec-minutes-09-05-17.pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5C1-senate-exec-minutes-09-05-17.pdf)

Continuing Business – V. Adams declared there was no continuing business. *This was stricken from agenda.* [1-senate-exec-agenda-9 -26-2017 Revised.docx](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%20Internet%20Files%5CContent.Outlook%5CDLF9X2VZ%5C1-senate-exec-agenda-9%20-26-2017%20Revised.docx)

New Business

1. C CI Multicultural Requirement C3B
	1. Email to programs from curriculum of changes
2. Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Task Force
	1. A GWAR Taskforce is needed to bring CI into alignment with new Chancellor’s Office Executive Orders. The GE designation C3b is going away, so now must revise. GWAR had been addressed through our UDIGE courses, but the new Executive Order 1100 & 1110 removed this designation. This will not be a committee; however, we do need people involved in the process to develop and decide where GWAR will reside. Names suggested for committee. Opened for questions/discussion.
		1. C. Wyels asked if the committee will work under Senate? V. Adams responded that it will be a Senate Taskforce. He added that we have until fall next year but needs to be addressed and done correctly. C. Wyels asked for clarification, “until fall to implement?” V. Adams stated he thinks they will need to on the running then; implications for knowing what the courses are, having people in place to teach, and being in the catalog.
		2. S. Stratton asked what is the charge of the Academic Senate Executive Committee? V. Adams responded it was create a taskforce.
		3. C. Wyels stated that there are many changes coming down the pike about the new Executive Orders. This would be a good way to notify people, manage the big picture, provide context (some have not read the EOs). Typically, Curriculum and GE committees have said that they will review/assess and report back. We need a different role now to manage this giant change. Is that GE? V. Adams responded that it seems like we need a taskforce to oversee all these processes, working with Curriculum and GE committees. Also need to create the GWAR Taskforce. C. Wyels asked if we should look at the committee charges. V. Adams stated that according to the By Laws, Senate Exec is charged with creating taskforces as needed. Maybe the question should be “What is the task?”, to make us compliant with EOs 1100 & 1110? J. Yudelson asked if we really want that done. V. Adams added that there has a been systemwide push back on 1100 & 1110. Some campuses have been successful at having implementation deferred, but none have been successful in getting out of it completely. V. Adams asked if the union will sue. J. Griffin stated that was likely. J. Yudelson added that it was shared at the last meeting that no consultations or shared process. Statewide Academic Senate passed resolution to have Executive Orders put into abeyance for further review. Lauren Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor, is involved in these conversations. Not sure at this point if campuses that are unable to implement it in a year can get a delay. S. Stratton added that not good practice to wait and see. He suggested that we move forward as if it is happening. If we get relief, good. If not, then it will be expected that we are ready for the fall. K. Tollefson and S. Kelly both voiced their agreement.
		4. A. Jiménez Jiménez asked if categories A, B, and C are all a part of the Executive Orders. V. Adams confirmed that they are a part of it and added that GWAR needs to be redone because UDIGE is going away, c3b, the multicultural requirement is going away, and other changes in the GE, such as getting rid of the remedial courses tied to these. A. Jiménez Jiménez asked if V. Adams is thinking about an overreaching committee to oversee all three. V. Adams stated that he is unsure at this point. He confirmed that GWAR taskforce is needed but now realize we need someone overseeing the whole process. Curriculum Committee will need to approve courses and something will need to be done about their workload because it is not feasible to continue with current workload. Their attempt to make program reviews only possible every 5 years is a response to unrealistic workload. A. Jiménez Jiménez clarified further by asking if we should have an Executive Taskforce that then addresses these different issues to other people who would work on them. He added that it should be a global perspective and understanding of how things work. He suggested having key people on this more executive committee that would then decide how to farm these tasks out.

K. Tollefson asked if would be like the SSP model of several years ago. She mentioned that is was effective in getting a lot of work done in a short amount of time, while spreading the workload. C. Wyels added that after looking at the charges in the By Laws, she thinks the GE can serve as an overarching committee, and we help them assemble subcommittees to respond to the particulars of the Executive Order. Their charge is appropriate and returning members on the committee would have the most information about GE as it is now.

* + 1. V. Adams stated we have the GE committee as an overarching committee, but what about GWAR taskforce. Would they report to the GE committee? S. Stratton stated that GWAR is separate from GE on most other campuses. Confirmed that GE has asked Senate Executive members to set up GWAR taskforce and Dean Meriweather concurred to the request. J. Perry stated she is in favor of an umbrella task force, in which, there is GWAR and GE reporting underneath it. C. Wyels asked how we would coordinate everything, communicate. If encapsulated within GE, still compelling to having something over the top, as K. Tollefson mentioned. J. Perry asked for clarification on what is entailed aside from just notification? S. Stratton clarified that is all that is required. GE sends a note out saying this has ended. A. Jiménez Jiménez reiterated that is an GE requirement.
		2. V. Adams summarized that there could be a GWAR taskforce with representatives from GE. Then have GE work on c3b and the UDIGE courses. J. Perry asked if we should have something the GWAR, GE, and Curriculum committees to have a vehicle to coordinate conversation…is something needed above that to manage? J. Griffin suggested the Chairs of taskforce and the committees could facilitate that. V. Adams concurred. S. Stratton raised the concern of overloading the people involved. J. Perry suggested we provide additional assistance as needed. S. Stratton mentioned that we would need to find some way in the By Laws to get them more members for the year. V. Adams mentioned the 8 to 9 faculty that expressed interest in serving but that were not appointed to any committees as an option. K. Tollefson added that while it may be a lot to ask these three to chair the umbrella committee, but would be less work in the long run if they are the ones in charge of the conversation/tasks to begin with, rather than having to respond to others leading the charge. V. Adams summarized that we will ask these three to chair the umbrella committee and then let them ask us if additional people are needed and their charge will be to bring us into compliance with Executive Orders 1100 & 1110. C. Wyels mentioned that if discussing 1110 also, then that changes who needs to be at the table. She clarified that GWAR, GE, and CC are all part of the EO 1100. The only person we’ve talked about with any obvious role in 1110 is chair of CC. If everybody else thinks this works, OK. J. Griffin asked if there is a timeline for how long the taskforce will be active. V. Adams stated it would be through the academic year and may continue to next year. J. Griffin suggested that stating it would be a one-year commitment may help.
		3. J. Yudelson asked how big the taskforce should be. V. Adams suggested no more than 5 because more than 5 can make it impossible to set up meeting times. J. Yudelson also asked if we are looking for any specific background. V. Adams stated that it would be beneficial to have people who know writing and have other faculty from Composition. S. Stratton suggested that it would also be good to have a student from the LRC/Writing Resource Center. Virgil concurred and suggested Sohui Lee, as well as Blake Gillespie as a good choice, too.
		4. J. Yudelson asked C. Wyels what are the benefits and costs in addressing Executive Orders 1100 & 1110 together? C. Wyels stated that the costs are that the people we’ve discussed up to this point are not deeply involved in those areas. This means that there will be a steep learning curve. She added that come, late September, we will be starting over again. She said the benefits should be a university effort, not a math faculty effort. That said, a fair amount of background needed to implement 1110 effectively. G. Evans-Taylor added that it could be duplicating efforts with the efforts of the CSU Graduation Initiative taskforce and the Strategic Committee that work with the Chancellor’s Office. S. Stratton suggested leaving the GE committee and the Curriculum committee, create the GWAR taskforce and let them interact with each other. Provost Chase stated that the Executive Orders 1100 and & 1110 are slightly different from one another. He also cautioned not to duplicate other efforts. He stated that GWAR is a separate issue and won’t take a huge group of people to make a proposal and pitch it to faculty. All CSUs handle GWAR very differently. A small group could come up with a proposal, and then bring it to the faculty. He believes it makes sense to have people connected to writing on a GWAR taskforce. V. Adams asked if we need a separate committee to handle Executive Order 1110. The Provost responded that 1110 is connected to developmental math and English. Admissions Advisory Committee is now working on developing a way of trying to figure out how to determine where students should be placed when they come into the institution, both in terms of math and English.

Developmental math initiative part of this – C. Wyels and others are working on this and developing several options. People in math, advising, psychology have begun to tackle the issue. A. Jiménez Jiménez mentioned that English isn’t a problem because of the Stretch Composition, but acknowledged that it is a problem for Math. J. Griffin asked if that means new courses to be developed. C. Wyels responded that is her assumption. The goal to have students get to the same place. There is data on remedial math that those students were not passing the next course at the same rate as the students who came in “college ready.” J. Yudelson asked about quantitative reasoning recommendations from Senate – other courses that would fulfill math requirement (e.g., stats classes, numerically based). Any discussion along those lines? C. Wyels responded that we already have some of those. Possible to develop others. In 1110 world, getting rid of remedial math and supporting students through GE and major-required math, that hasn’t been an issue. Focus has been how do we support them through existing curriculum.

* + 1. S. Stratton moved to ask the following people to be a part of the GWAR taskforce: Stacy Anderson, Mary Adler, Marie Francois, Sohui Lee and a student from the WMC. K. Tollefson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously

1. UDIGE courses invalidated by EO 1100
	1. Do we want a senate exec officer to sit in on this process
		1. Background: c3b was rolled back to GE. They will notify programs that were affected by it.
		2. S. Stratton moved that we assign Cb3 and UDIGE work to GE. Let them know to communicate with us if they need more bodies to work on their tasks this year. J. Yudelson seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Antonio asked if GE committee will bring a plan to Senate? Do we need to approve what they come up with? V. Adams confirmed and added that committees cannot set policy. Any changes needing to be done must come forth as proposed Senate policy.
2. Empty election slots from Committee on Committees
	1. Question on the floor: What do we do now – leave them
		1. V. Adams stated that Ivona Grzegorczyk sent in a nomination for Jason Miller to take the “math” seat on the GE committee. There are no provisions in the By Laws addressing what to do now. C. Wyels stated that in the past, Senate took volunteers after the fall elections. S. Stratton expressed that he is ok with that practice. J. Yudelson asked if the volunteer for the seat must be a senator, or can a lecturer volunteer if interested? V. Adams clarified that the By Laws stipulate it has to be a member of senate, which means that the 5 lecturer representatives would be eligible. J. Yudelson mentioned that the President’s Policy and Planning council has lecturers. S. Stratton responded that the PPPC is a university committee, not a senate committee. He added that one can elect themselves to a committee (e.g. Nancy Deans to the Faculty Affairs Committee) The workload is an issue – must have 6 or more units to be eligible to be elected. C. Wyels further explained that standing committees’ composition is that members are elected for two years staggered terms. Nothing there about senators or non-senators. Tenured, probationary, and lecturer faculty with at least 6 units are eligible. J. Yudelson suggested going with the 8 to 9 people that volunteered to serve and if none of them want to step in, we can open it up to lecturers.
		2. V. Adams clarified that we are talking about two 2 things: an open seat on the GE committee and vacancies on University Committees. There are also open seats on the Administration Evaluation Committee. We need to ensure this is a safe service, and prevent repercussions from happening. K. Tollefson asked if there is a policy in place. Is it ok for volunteer to fill if no one is elected? Should there be a process to open the door? V. Adams stated that there is nothing in the By Laws.
		3. S. Stratton moved that we accept the volunteer to GE for this year. A. Jiménez Jiménez clarified that it would not be a general rule, but just for this year. C. Wyels seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
3. Student Representative – temporary replacement
	1. Still no permanent student representative; no ASI Chair yet. Director of Operations will sit in as temporary rep until elections happen.
4. 17/18 Priorities
	1. V. Adams stated that Senate needs to address the By Laws. For instance, who is “Behavioral and Social Sciences” or “Arts and Humanities” These positions are not defined in the By Laws or the constitution. Virgil posed the question: What do we want to do, as a group; move something along?
		1. J. Griffin asked when the By Laws were last reviewed. C. Wyels responded that it had been a few years. It was worked on over the summer, Greg Wood and others came back with recommendations. S. Stratton mentioned it may have been 2013; that was the last time we adjusted quorum. C. Wyels stated that there were 10 recommendations from last year’s senate executive committee, which did not include; recommendations for the Fiscal Policies Committee to revise charge and composition, asked if time to move from representative senate, and groupings by major discipline. J. Griffin expressed it is time for a major overhaul of By Laws. J. Perry agreed that this seems reasonable.
		2. A. Jiménez Jiménez mentioned that with the changes in the Administration, they have waited to see what would happen. He added that many things depend on the final structure, which we don’t know yet what it will be. University-wide RTP, CC, and so forth. If there are different schools we can have different committees by schools. V. Adams stated that the Strategic Initiative process will guide us on our structure in the future but not sure what it is now. A. Jiménez Jiménez suggested putting off the By Laws review until the structure is established. Provost Chase assured that no structural changes would be made overnight. The Strategic Initiative Committee will have proposals. To V. Adams’ point, strategic initiatives groups will come forward at end of Fall. They will be working with Deans on Academic planning and budget issues They are starting this process now. At this point, no change is immediately coming. V. Adams asked the Provost if he is very optimistic that change will happen in January, realistically next year? Provost Chase responded that proposals will come out and the President will review them. It is difficult to give a timeline.
		3. V. Adams recommended piece meal fixes to the By Laws would be most appropriate now. Consensus – agreed.
		4. A. Jiménez Jiménez proposed that the composition of some committee may allow them to request more members. V. Adams responded that GE, and CC have ex-officio members from Records, Scott’s office, Enrollment, and more. They need to be there, but they are not included in the By Laws. S. Stratton countered that we could figure out what constitutes Behavioral & Social Sciences. K. Tollefson asked what were the priorities of the Senate Executive Committee last year. C. Wyels stated that it was issues with quorum - discussion some years ago regarding an “opt-out” model. One suggestion was to consider an “opt-in” model. Some were not attending but didn’t “opt-out” either, which effected quorum. Some we have never seen in years who could disrupt business because they lack context, but show up when an issue concerns them directly. Designated a position on senate executive committee for lecturers also came up last year. Last time, the By Laws were revised we went from 2 to 5 lecturer representatives. Also considered making that proportional rather than constant number. In regard to the Fiscal Policies Committee, their recommendations should be seriously considered re. their charge and structure of committee.
		5. V. Adams recommended the Senate Executive members give it some thought. At the next Senate Executive meeting we will make decisions. We can review the “handover” list and redress.

Chair Report -

* 1. PPPC policy on time and place
	2. Policy is fine, implementation is a concern
	3. How to gather information without compromising the freedom
	4. To view policy click below: <https://www.csuci.edu/president/presidentscouncil/>
		1. Discussion: Senate officers have been asked to review the policy to see if there are any ramifications for Senate. Concurred that there are no academic implications. However, separate group is Preparedness Group. When it comes to implementation of that policy, we do have faculty issues. Specifically, the topic came up, how can we get faculty to report when they have non-university faculty/visitors coming to campus? G. Evans-Taylor informed members that the Preparedness Working Group is looking at all outside speakers to determine if there is something the University will need to do to be prepared for the visit. This is not to give approval or disapproval, but rather to capture all the people coming to campus. If there is an outside speaker, we can often see this fi facilities or other services have been requested. There are many places that information can be caught. However, might not capture this is a guest speaker is coming to a class and no services were requested. It would be helpful for the Preparedness Working Group to know, to be prepared for potential ramifications on student body, and the campus in general. G. Evans-Taylor affirmed that the group is asking Senate how can we capture who is coming into individual classrooms.
		2. J. Griffin asked if this is a security concern. S. Stratton provided an example: when OSHER speaker was invited. It would have been good to know that this person is followed around the country by a cadre of protestors. This happened in the library during finals week and was extremely disruptive. V. Adams mentioned incident at UC Berkeley as another example. 1200 police were brought in to deal with a speaker situation, which cost the University $600,000.00. He stressed that we need to be aware of what’s going on and he posed the question, “How can know when people from the outside are coming on campus?” J. Yudelson asked if it was concern if he Skypes someone into the class. G. Evans-Taylor acknowledged that was a good point, but clarified that the group would still want to know. There could still be ramifications. J. Perry asked who is assessing whether controversial or not, or anticipates the likelihood of a controversy. How would communicating this allow us to be pre-emptive? G. Evans-Taylor responded that person inviting would know that best, but the group would make the assessment. J. Perry asked if faculty are to report about possible concerns. V. adams clarified that no, faculty only asked to report name. G. Evans-Taylor further clarified that group is seeking a mechanism for collecting the information. K. Tollefson asked if there is a way to frame the need for this information that is less defensive and less deficit orientated. J. Perry added that it is hard to keep up with all of the opportunities on campus as it is now. If she knew speakers were coming, it would provide opportunities to connect. She suggested framing it as a way to ask if resources were needed; such as press, opportunities to connect with other programs. Allow any anticipated concerns as one element? S. Kelly voiced concern with the additional burden on faculty. This just adds another layer of work if required to fill out more forms to bring a speaker to campus. We want to be careful about adding more work to faculty. If needing to provide more and more information to in in who the person is, then it becomes my burden to search out all of the information. J. Yudelson concurred adding that we close those doors nor on purpose, but because it creates a chilling effect on extending these invitations. It could create controversy where none existed before, by publishing speakers. Also worry about academic freedom. G. Evans-Taylor assured that the effort is about managing risk, being willing to accept it but manage it well. If we know about it, then we can manage it.
		3. A. Jiménez Jiménez suggested bringing it up at the Chairs’ meeting. Make a request for the data to the Chairs. The Chairs could communicate with faculty – possibly create a mechanism for collecting the data. Cindy added that this goes beyond just the classrooms, for instance, LSAMP often brings speakers.

Senate Agenda Review *for Exec consideration*

1. Luis Sanchez announced the Fall Student Research Showcase 2017 at the last Academic Senate meeting

Other business

1. Announcement for nominations from faculty for Honorary Degrees
	1. G. Evans-Taylor announced that the committee met. This is not be announced at Senate – nominations have been received and are no longer accepting nominations. Reminded members that list is highly confidential. Nominees presented to members – unanimous agreement that all viable candidates
2. Provost Comments: 2 announcements
	1. Update on Strategic Initiatives Steering Committee – groups have created websites that you can visit. Last week, all of the groups met as a whole and then groups broke up in to their own committees. The Strategic Initiatives Committee has been charged with creating proposals to bring to the President by December to be implemented in the spring. They are encouraged to think big, and to think about things that can be scaled, and to think about the evidence used to determine success. He stated that the subcommittees are relatively small with 6 to 7 people per committee. Therefore, it is important for them to be consultative and to talk to others including planning, forums, staff, students and more. Encouraged to participate – if you receive an announcement about a group meeting, please participate. It would be helpful if it important to you to attend and participate in the meeting. He shared that there is some concern about student participation. He has talked with Greg Sawyer, who is bringing groups of students together around specific topics so the Strategic Initiative groups can come in and talk to students to receive their input. Encourage faculty to visit website. You will be able to see the survey results and meeting dates. Meeting tomorrow with the Deans regarding strategic planning and budgeting relative to academic affairs. J. Yudelson mentioned that he hopes the groups will meet with the veteran students and the Extended University students. Provost Chase acknowledged these were both great suggestions.
	2. New Interim Den of Extended University and International Program here Monday.
3. Virgil opened for comments/questions
	1. J. Griffin stated that CFA in tentative agreement to extend contract a couple of years. J. Yudelson asked if there was an agreement for healthcare only. J. Griffin stated it was not. He added that there was no salary increase this year and benefits will stay the same, but 2.5% following year.
4. V. Adams asked if all agree to the Intent to Raise Questions. S. Stratton responded yes, he has response from Ray Porras.
5. V. Adams adjourned the meeting at 4:25pm

Minutes submitted by: Jeannette Edwards, Academic Senate Coordinator

Minutes Approved by: Kaia Tollefson, Academic Senate Secretary