

## Academic Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes - 16 February 2012

I. Call to Order at 11:05 a.m.

II. Report by Chair: President's Senior Staff Meeting

If a state tax referendum is not passed, the budget cut would include \$1.45 million in cuts for CMA. We can use reserve funds one time, but after that, we will have to figure out places to cut. Three referendums are up for consideration, two sales tax and one "millionaire's tax."

Our retention of students is better than it was.

CSU has created a Library Task Force – 80% of books in CSU Long Beach library haven't been checked out in last 8 years. There has been a proposal for a central CSU depository for less popular books.

New legislation has been proposed that any teacher must report child abuse or suspected child abuse. Question as to whether CSU faculty would be included in this, and in what context.

Captain Bolton is proposing Corps reorganization, back to three companies and four divisions per company on campus, segregated by major.

III. Announcements

President Search update: Two faculty representatives are Mike Kazek and Tim Lynch; student representatives are Drew Curlee and Shelsea Stoughton; Peg Solveson is staff representative; Ken Passe is alumni representative. The new president at CSU East Bay is also on the committee, as is Kim Estes, chairman of our industry advisory board.

IV. Standing items:

A faculty member sent the Chair a message expressing concern about the policy on Academic Standing. The Chair asks, does the Executive Committee want to pursue further discussion of this in the Senate? There was passionate opposition to the policy expressed at the December Senate meeting, which was sparsely attended. Has the policy been revised since the December meeting, per suggestions for modification made by faculty? Chair will check with Dean Pronchick on the status of this policy.

Executive Committee officers need to be elected for next year, as they serve one-year terms. Bill Schmid and Julie Chisholm have discussed switching positions, with Julie as Chair and Bill as Vice-Chair. Does anyone object or care to nominate another member of the committee for the officers' positions? With no other nominations or volunteers, Chair and Vice-Chair will switch roles next academic year and Michele Van Hoeck will remain Secretary.

V. Old business: Senate Re-Organization

The Chair proposed that the Executive Committee should create and pass resolutions and policies, taking on more of the business currently left to the Senate. This proposal would give the Executive

Committee more authority than it currently exercises. Our bylaws give us the power to modify and propose policies. In this proposed process, the Executive Committee would present drafts of new policies and procedures to the General Senate, gather feedback, and then make decisions based on consensus. There would still be elections where required. We will need to be more transparent and should be making our minutes public. Comment made that there be a way for General Senate members to request a vote on issues/policies that are deemed of greater importance.

The Chair will not be present at the next General Senate meeting; the Vice-Chair will present this proposal to the Senate at the March meeting.

VI. New business

A. Viability of SUMAs

Faculty member suggests in message to Chair that SUMAs do not help faculty become better teachers. The comparative national data they offer is suspect, as averages observed to three decimal places have not changed over a period of years.

The Senate has addressed SUMAs in the past. Graham Benton wrote up a position paper on SUMAs 10 years ago. Dean Kreta strongly supported SUMAs as an assessment of teaching. Faculty opinion on validity and usefulness of SUMAs has been mixed.

Does this debate and decision belong at the department level? Does RTP policy need revision if a different instrument is used? No, RTP policy does not specify that faculty specifically use the SUMA instrument. The Library uses its own form of student evaluation, and other departments could agree to do the same.

Executive Committee members will gather examples of other instruments and the Chair will discuss with Dean Pronchick and the Provost.

B. New consecutive meeting (Senate + CFA)

How did it go? Comment made that both meetings seem rushed. Comment made that new time constraint should drive our agenda to make it shorter. We will continue to test this format for the remainder of the semester.

The Secretary will create a survey asking for faculty feedback on the consecutive meeting.

C. Lloyd Kitazono has proposed the faculty RTP meeting be held in Spring instead of Fall so that faculty have time to work on WPAFs over the summer. Executive Committee agrees that this is a good idea. This would be for candidates only. There would be a shorter meeting in the Fall for reviewers.

Meeting adjourned at 12:25

Minutes respectfully submitted by Michele Van Hoeck