

Senate Executive Committee Minutes
October 8, 2015
3:15 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference room

Abstract

Minutes of 9/24 – Approved. Agenda – Approved. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. EPC Report. FSAC Report. Associated Students Report. SAC Report. CFA Report. Ratification of faculty members on WASC Steering Committee -Approved. Revision to Biology concentration – Zoology approved for Senate consent calendar. WASC recommendations discussion. Faculty Retreat Topic discussion. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Carmen Works, Ed Beebout, Michaela Grobbel, Sam Brannen, Andrew Rogerson, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Ron Lopez, Catherine Nelson (sub for D. Roberts), Laura Watt, Tom Targett, Richard J. Senghas

Absent: Deborah Roberts, Ruben Armiñana

Guests: Kate Chavez, Jason Wenrick, Murali Pillai

The meeting started 15 minutes later to allow members to attend the entire Open Forum on the Presidential Search. The Vice Chair chaired the meeting due to the Chair participating in the campus Presidential Search Advisory committee.

Approval of Minutes of 9/24 – Approved.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson shared a report sent to the Chancellor's Office regarding expenditures for the \$690,000 received for student success and completion. He said he had tried to undertake as much consultation as possible, but he was limited on time to submit the report. He handed out the first six pages, without all the appendices. He highlighted some issues of interest. In 2012, the campus had 241 TT faculty, 231 in 2013, and 225 in 2015. He said that even with the recent hiring the campus was only making a dent in improving these numbers. He noted that of the 9400 enrolled students, 1159 had not declared a major. They wanted to do something about that, particularly as 49 were juniors and 8 were seniors. He said bottleneck course was another area where they spent money. Bottleneck courses were defined as any course that was unavailable to students and prevented that student from completing degree requirements in a timely manner. He said they were using the waitlist to determine bottleneck courses, but wasn't sure that was the correct way to determine bottlenecks. Using this approach, the following courses were identified as the predominated bottleneck courses: POLS 200, AMCS 350, BIO 110, ENG 101 and AMCS 392. They were going to try online courses to help alleviate this problem. He said if anyone objected to this report, they could change it next year. A member asked if staffing needs were taken into consideration for lab classes. Labs could not

be offered at night due to lack of staff. The Provost said for bottleneck courses they were trying two strategies – online courses and more sections. He said the funding wouldn't cover all the expense, and the campus was also providing resources. A member asked if advising holds had been considered for students who had not declared a major. The Provost said, yes that had been considered as well as other strategies. He thought that good advising was one of the best ways for students to get through in a timely manner. The member noted a specific issue with impacted programs. Students who lack the GPA to get into those programs were taking all the required classes anyway, and in some cases, still did not have the GPA for the major. The Provost said that issue points to the need to populate under enrolled majors. This required good advising to help students consider majors they may not be aware of, or that might better suit their career goals. He thought they might resurrect the interdisciplinary major and create pathways for interdisciplinary degrees, for example Social Justice. That's another route the campus could move and it would take faculty and administrators to want to do this to make it happen. He announced that the university now had access to E-Portfolium.

(<https://portfolium.com/educators>). The CSU had purchased it and it was free to the campus. It was described as networking for alumni engagement and student learning and skills and could showcase projects, making students more competitive for jobs. He did not know how to roll it out to the campus. He thought it was a "glorified" LinkedIn and had not heard from faculty that it would be appropriate for academics. M. Lopez-Phillips said that he could see it interacting with internships and as a career exploration tool. It could not be easily qualified, though. The Provost said he heard that some students in CSU were using it and he asked the Associated Students to talk about it. He said three campuses were piloting it and it had massive buy-in. J. Wenrick said they did not have all the details yet. A member said a request had been sent to Academic Affairs for the Common Data set for Fall 2014 and the IPDES data and wondered when that would be given. The Provost said he would check in with S. Johnson on his progress.

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson for D. Roberts

C. Nelson said the Statewide Senate committees would have their interim virtual meetings the next day. She was Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee and they would be discussing the difference between Master and Bachelor level education. She said the Chancellor's office had been involved in efforts to change the portion of Title V requirements for Graduate education. They had run into some roadblocks and wanted to start with conceptual language and move forward from there. They would also be looking at the Honorary Degree policy. There were guidelines now and they wanted to make it a policy. She also had just heard that there were some issues regarding the transferability of upper division GE courses, specifically regarding Course Match. She noted that 12 of 23 campuses have passed resolutions regarding open presidential searches and more were considering similar resolutions. A member asked if honorary degrees were offered at other levels besides Doctorates. It was clarified that that was the only Honorary Doctorate degree offered. A member asked for more information about what the Academic Affairs committee was discussing. C. Nelson said they were looking at the intellectual requirements of the levels of degrees, such as the level of analysis. The member also asked if Graduate courses could be cross-listed and wondered at what level this was prohibited in the CSU. C. Nelson said this was an issue coming up the conversation, but was not part

of the conceptual discussion. She noted this was particularly important to small majors.

Vice Chair Report – C. Works

C. Works said that S&F found a second faculty member for Copeland Creek – Owen Anfinson. This would go to the Senate for approval. S&F continued to talk about APC.

Vice President of Student Affairs Report – M. Lopez-Phillips

M. Lopez-Phillips reported that the IRA (Instructionally Related Activities) Board would start taking new applications *to be considered* for IRA funding. He wanted to know the best way to put out the announcement to faculty and noted that they would tell faculty how much money they had, so they did not get so many applications. The members agreed that Department Chairs would be the ones to disseminate the information to faculty. M. Lopez-Phillips then discussed “amnesty funds.” He said funds had been “swept” last year to cover a deficit in their reserve. He said some people were saving those funds, so they were allowing them to reapply for them. In the reapplication process, they were trying to creatively leverage those funds for academic integration grants. He asked if anyone had ideas for this to let him know. He reported that that they would be hiring a part time temporary person for CAPS because the need has been so great. They had seen a unprecedented need for counseling and psychological services this year. They continued to search for a Victim’s Advocate. A member asked how much money would be left over in IRA. M. Lopez-Phillips said he would not know until the amnesty money applications were decided. Members asked for clarification of amnesty funds. Previously, IRA recipients were allowed to hold over money from year to year for purchases in the summer or to save for larger purchases. They changed the policy because some of those monies just sat in the fund and were never used. Since they needed to be financially responsible and address their deficit, this was how they were addressing that need. However, they did not want to prevent active programs from being able to save, they created the application process to do so. The amnesty program was for one year. Since the funds are comprised of fees paid by current students, they wanted to spend them this year to benefit current students. A member voiced concern about the new process creating more work for faculty. M. Lopez-Phillips said part of the problem was that this decision was made late in the year.

EPC Report – L. Watt

L. Watt reported that the Chair of UPRS had visited EPC and they had a productive conversation. EPC would be working on populating all their task forces and start getting things done. A member discussed the issue of closing the loop for program reviews and the implications of that issue for the WASC re-accreditation. L. Watt agreed that this process was not well articulated. She reviewed the work of the task forces – the curriculum guide, implementation of the Online/Hybrid policy and the policy on Academic Certificates. A member asked if a course was going from face to face to online needed to go through EPC. L. Watt said that currently EPC did not have a mechanism to review the course mode, so they would be working on that. A

member asked about the timeline for the Academic Certificate policy. L. Watt said she did not know, and she was still trying to create a group to work in it.

FSAC Report – E. Beebout

E. Beebout reported that FSAC had a good discussion about the RTP revision. Their goal was to have the revision to the Ex Com in November. A member asked why the timeline for first and second year faculty was originally set in February. E. Beebout said they did not know for sure, but it was speculated that if faculty were not reappointed it would give them time to look for another job. E. Beebout said he would look into it.

Associated Students Report – K. Chavez

K. Chavez reported that the AS had several resolutions to consider. One was to ask the Library to expand their hours during finals week. She thanked the administration for helping students out that were living in unfinished spaces in Cabernet.

Revision to Biology concentration – Zoology – L. Watt, M. Pillai

L. Watt introduced the item. She said the Zoology concentration had been phased out and was phased in last year and now included more specificity. M. Pillai said this was what the Department was already doing, so this would update the catalog and help with advising. **Approved for the Senate consent calendar.**

SAC Report – R. Lopez

R. Lopez reported the SAC was looking over the attendance policy. He summarized the issues and said that they were tasked with potentially changing the policy. They had heard from various people on this topic. They had reached a consensus that the policy was probably as good as it was going to be and that the problem was with inconsistent language among various policies. So they were going to make the policies consistent. He also announced he had learned that his department would not receive the release time he accrued from chairing SAC. If this was not resolved, he would resign from SAC. There was discussion about the release time issue. There was concern that this kind of issue with release time would negatively affect faculty serving in governance. A member asked what other policies had attendance language in them. R. Lopez said that there was attendance language in the Shared Responsibilities and Mid Semester Evaluations. He articulated other issues they discussed, such as large classes and faculty responsibility for including clear information about attendance in their syllabi. A member clarified that the Dean had the release time money and the Provost said he would ask the A&H Dean about his decision regarding the release time for SAC.

CFA Report – C. Works

C. Works said the strike vote would start the week of October 19th. Faculty will have two weeks to vote. They would provide many avenues to vote. She said the second

day of mediation was this day. There was no movement so far. All voting was anonymous.

Ratification of faculty members on WASC Steering Committee

C. Works reported that S&F reviewed the names of faculty on the WASC Steering committee and was nominating those names for the Steering committee. **Deborah Roberts, Emiliano Ayala, Cathy Kroll, Melinda Milligan and Karen Thompson were approved.**

WASC recommendations

C. Works noted that during this item they could discuss who would be reporting back from the Steering Committee. She noted that the attachment showed what recommendations WASC had in 2009, and said that the "closing the loop" portion of program review had been particularly frustrating in 2009 and not much had been done on that issue. She also noted that assessment was another issue governance need to talk about. J. Wenrick said that at the first WASC Steering Committee meeting, they decided what area would take the lead on various sections of the WASC report. The Provost said that the "action" committee, which was probably misnamed, included people who would attend WASC workshops. Faculty on that committee would really make things happen and they would get release time and stipends. The Provost noted that R. Whitkus thought the campus need a Program Review "guru" to help close the loop on program review. The Provost thought they could release a faculty member for two years to do this. Another idea was to have such a person in each School and give them generous release time. He thought there could be another committee beyond UPRS that would really see if things are getting done. There was substantial discussion about the topic, including specific recommendations to the Provost, the role of UPRS, assessment issues showing up as well, inconsistent procedures in various departments, and the role of the Provost in the process. The Provost noted that on the 21st of October, a WASC liaison would be on campus and would hold an open forum.

Faculty Retreat Topic

C. Works announced that the Faculty Retreat was a paid work day for faculty. She asked if there were any more suggestions for the Retreat. R. Senghas asked if anyone knew of someone who would do a good workshop to let him know. The topic of managing change was brought up again as a topic for the Retreat.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Richard J. Senghas
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items: Revision to the Biology Zoology concentration – emailed

Information Items:**BUSINESS**

1. Senate statement on desirable qualities in our new President – First reading - attached
2. WASC Discussion - attached

There was discussion about item #1. R. Senghas said that they received a lot of input at the Open Forum that day. He said the search committee was very impressed with the campus, people really seemed to care and the committee members thought it would not be hard to bring good candidates to the campus. He thought the Senate might have extra input. There was some concern about having the current President at the Senate meeting when this was discussed. It was decided that L. Watt and R. Senghas would put together a summary of the themes that had been identified so far to bring to the Senate.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes