



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
APRIL 26, 2016**

*Approved 5-10-16*

**11:30 AM - 12:50 PM**

**PLN-120**

Present: Bonney, Casem, Guerin, Meyer, Stambough, Stohs, Walker

Absent: Dabirian, Oliver, Sargeant, Stang

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Bonney called the meeting to order at 11:31 AM.

**II. URGENT BUSINESS**

State Legislation passed the no smoking policy for all Cal State campus; up to \$100 fine for violations.

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- (Walker) Scott Annin's Outstanding Professor Lecture was awesome.
- (Walker) When the chairs met with Provost Cruz last week, he mentioned that the one percent of the raises and the "me-too clause" may have to be borne out by the campus, which has implications on budgets.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

No minutes.

**V. CHAIR'S REPORT (Bonney)**

- Met with Provost Cruz this morning on the constitution and the textbook policy.
- Provost will not be meeting with us today. His report on faculty hiring: 31 accepted, 18 are pending, and 24 are in process.
- We discussed how the pay increases are going to get covered and that remains to be seen. We had two percent of salaries last year, which we did not use and we are supposed to be getting another two percent this year, which will be four percent, plus an additional two percent at the beginning of the year. So for next year we know where six percent is coming from, we don't know where the other one percent is coming from. What we don't have by next July is the additional 3½ percent that we are supposed to get next July and part of the six percent is one-time money and the "me too" money. So this will have an impact on the campuses and worse case, it will have a \$2.5 million impact on our campus, which is one percent of the Academic Affairs budget.
  - Looking at where we can cut and where we can't cut. Letter that is a draft version is coming from PRBC to the President, puts perspective on the deferred maintenance needs of the campus. The conservative estimate of the amount of money we are behind is \$150 million, slightly more than the total cost of building the Clays Performing Arts Center and Mihaylo Hall combined.
  - We are hopeful that the CFA and the Chancellor will be effective when they go to Sacramento and lobby. The Statewide Senate also.
- We discussed the Academic Master Plan and the Provost said his experience talking with the departments is that people are generally more favorable and inclined towards the Academic Master Plan than they were four months ago. There is a website that those of us who are on the steering committee will see today.
- We talked about searches because I was concerned about how the last couple of Administration searches have gone. I suggested that we were doing them too fast and having a search open for only six weeks was never going to bring in a large pool. Also if we are going to search for VP's we need to use a consultant because that is the only way we are going to get people who aren't actively looking, but would look if they knew. The Provost will talk to the President about the search for the VP of HRDI.
  - The only way we get the same results out of it without using a search firm is if we invest in infrastructure and build that up.

## VI. PROVOST REPORT

No provost report.

## VII. STAFF REPORT (Benjamin Report)

The All University elections are this week. Results will be out Friday, April 29<sup>th</sup>.

## VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

- 8.1 Assessment Educational Effectiveness Committee [Casem] W, 4-20-16, 1:00 PM – 2:15 PM, MH-141
- Quorum was reached and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.
  - ASI representatives Daniel Ramirez and Yessica De La Torre made a presentation regarding student awareness of assessment on campus. The students suggested that assessment and learning outcomes should be given more weight in an instructor's review of their syllabus and re-emphasized throughout the semester. They further suggested that learning outcomes be explicitly linked to course assignments.
  - The committee discussed the observation of our student representatives that in general (and extending to the ASI leadership) students do not know why they fill out SOQs, how those are used and even what it means to be a tenured faculty member ("tenure means your professor can do whatever they want"). It was suggested that a "best practices" document be created and disseminated through FDC and new faculty orientation.
  - Format of Table 2 in the PPR was discussed. It was recommended that a table be added to capture FTES for all courses taught in a department - not just majors' courses.
  - The committee was asked to review UPS 100.700 for discussion at the next meeting - May 18<sup>th</sup>.
- 8.2 Campus Facilities & Beautification Committee [Stohs] F, 4-22-16, 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM, MH-141
- Quorum was reached and approval of both previous sets of minutes approved.
  - Smoking on campus. Follow up with Academic Senate recommendations.
  - Chair of Senate brought up issue with President Garcia a week ago. The Senate Chair reported back, that she, our President, "thanked our committee and said that at the moment there was no clear path forward. The Chancellor seems poised to make the system smoke-free, and as he may have some provision for enforcement she is reluctant to commit any more time, energy or resources to doing anything about smoking at CSUF."
  - Continued discussion on biking, skateboarding etc. on campus. Impact of signage posted. Consideration of which areas need to be clear of any biking/skateboarding/scooter/hover boards. Review of map and recommendations. Should we recommend more signs or markings on campus (on the pavement) – we need a perimeter clearly marking no biking or skateboarding? Or perhaps, since other committees deal with this issue also, we should leave this issue alone. It will or may take someone getting hurt until the campus acts. Titan Shops should stop selling skateboards. Have on-line training for skateboarding and biking etiquette. Summary: we need clear guidelines that everyone understands. Primarily, walk bikes and skateboards across campus.
  - Continue this discussion next year? Hover board policy also needs to be included. If we continue, tie it in with parking (paths, etc. in by-laws) going forward – bicycle paths. Focus on what we (and campus users) CAN do – where they can and cannot ride bikes (etc.). Invite bike committee to first meeting next year.
  - Social space for faculty and staff
  - Academic Senate informal coffee or wine activity for faculty before the end of the semester. Will plan one for the fall. No time left for this year. Have some details; will request funds from Provost.
- 8.3 Library Committee [Walker] M, 4-25-16, 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM, PLS-260C
- We received a short report from Interim University Librarian Hewitt that was similar to the last report. We are in the process of approving an open access resolution and hope to get it on consent for the marathon meeting
- 8.4 University Advancement Committee [Stang] W, 4-20-16, 9:00AM – 10:00 AM, CP-810
- Committee decided not to meet in May but to circulate the PowerPoint Greg Saks has prepared. Michele Czeska gave a report about collaboration between university advancement and research and sponsored projects. The latter works on both pre- and post-award work and UA does only pre-award. Looks at private foundations and handles the clearances. Michele explained how the clearance process works. UA is developing an online system working in real time to help faculty identify appropriate sources of funding. In colleges faculty should go to RGS or alternatively if no RGS to DOD to do foundation search. She emphasized the importance of everyone knowing who is pursuing what grant. Three million dollars a year comes from an array of private foundations.

Foundations bring in about 18% of external funding. 200 applicants for intramural grants and only 61 approved. Roberta Rikkli commented on widespread faculty feeling that they are not supported. She noted there are issues with adequate reassigned time for grant writing, insufficient support in terms of buyout and no real support in most instances for post-award management. Michele said that UA has learned that CSUF is seen as not having enough partnerships in the private sector.

- 8.5 General Education Committee [Casem] F, 4-22-16, 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM, MH-141
- Quorum was achieved
  - The following two courses were certified for GE category C.3: AFAM 388 and PORT 385.
  - AMST 345 has been sent back to the proposer for more information.
  - The committee began a discussion of recertification of courses in D.1 and D.2 that will be concluded at our final meeting on May 6th.
  - Progress was made on the GE Assessment Plan. A micro survey administered through the student portal will be used as an indirect assessment of student learning. The committee developed the questions that will be used in that survey.

## IX. OLD BUSINESS

- 9.1 Revision to UPS 100.000 Academic Senate Constitution

Discussion continued on the removal of the At-Large Senate seats.

Chair Bonney had a conversation with Amir yesterday who could not be here today, and his recommendation is we have whatever discussion we are going to have and at the end of the discussion have an initial vote to see if we need to make a change or not, a straw vote using the clickers.

This is on the Agenda for Thursdays Academic Senate meeting.

- 9.2 Discussion: counting courses toward Major and GE

1. Memo from Mark Fischer.

It would be a really bad idea to bring this up at the end of the year. Don't think it is a good way to finish out the year.

## X. NEW BUSINESS

- 10.1 Committee Vacancies - Standing Committees

Worked on creating the list of faculty to invite to serve on the GE, Grad Ed, IT & PRBC committees.

- 10.2 UPS 210.007 and UPS 210.500 Appointment of Administrative Personnel

[Source: FAC]

1. UPS 210.007 – track changes
2. UPS 210.500 – track changes

These documents came to us once again from the Faculty Affairs Committee. We have not taken them to the Senate and will need to get them there before the end of the year.

- I will note that UPS 210.500 should not be called “Procedures”.
- The committee does not understand why these are in the 200 series because these are about the appointment of administrators, not about the appointment of faculty. So they are recommending they be renumbered and put in the 100 series as administrative documents.

Q: As a procedural matter, can we do two separate things: change the number first, then deal with the changes to the document in case the changes to the document do not pass.

A: Yes, we will take care of getting them renumbered first then look at the document.

We will put the renumbering on the consent calendar, then put these documents on the AS agenda.

Q: Are they still unlikely to get signed?

A: Not in their current form. I do think it is probable that one will not get signed. The committee agreed it would allow people to rank on the search committees. If the President says no, they will bring it back and fix it.

10.3 Revision to UPS 411.100 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses [Source: UCC]

That's on the agenda for the UCC again this Friday. So we will hold off on this document until our next meeting.

- Mark explains what they did in his letter. They just turned colleges into academic units, it allows colleges to create courses which is not a good idea.
- They were trying to strike some balance between allowing these programs that already have some courses and have faculty (like Honors) and then have UCC serve as the college committee and do the college approval.
- What are the courses that this is trying to resolve?
- To treat them like a department or an academic unit is not the way to go. There should be a separate section rather than treating colleges and divisions as though they were comparable to departments. Is this a conversation we should have with the chair of the committee?
- We need to push back on the idea of colleges and divisions generating courses.
- We need to get an inventory of which courses need to be changed, not change the policy.

Chair Bonney will do research to see what we are doing about Honors courses now and which other ones don't fit in.

10.4 GE Golden Four and the Grade of C-

We had the coded memorandum on the advice of counsel.

Q: What will happen to the places where we require a "C" not a "C-?"

A: If it's not in the Golden Four, won't matter.

We have no choice on this. On advice of counsel, we have to accept a "C-" in the Golden Four. We will add this to the AS agenda for Thursday.

10.5 Discussion UPS 260.100 Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

We are not ready to do anything with this document. Both the UPS and the CBA gives specific dates for which these should be in effect.

- Jon Brusckie sent out an email last week saying: "I assume that since we are extending the contract, that we are extending these awards".

The problem is the contract states specific dates for when the program will be in effect.

Even if the contract is ratified it doesn't change this. Program is not for the period of the contract, it's for specific years.

Q: I thought there was an out in the policy, I thought we wrote it in a way where we could easily renew it?

A: You would have to put language in that says "or for as long as this policy". I looked at the CBA and it does not state in case we decide to ratify/extend this contract it would continue.

Research is being done at the Provost Office and Michele Barr is doing her part.

10.6 Revision to UPS 300.020 Grading Practices [Source: ASC]

The revisions on this policy were done by the Academic Standards committee. We will put this on the AS agenda.

10.7 Discussion UPS 210.020 Review of Tenured Faculty

We received a request from the Dean of H&SS to take a look at the post-tenure review process because she cannot figure out why you need more people in a room for a post-tenure review meeting then you do when you have a tenure review.

- I would suggest we send this back to FAC with an explanation of why we are sending it back to them and have them look at this to make sure it is in alignment with UPS 210.000.
- We can discuss this more on next week.

ITEMS BELOW WILL BE MOVED TO NEXT AGENDA 5-3-16.

10.8 Position Statement - Promoting and Supporting a Culture of Research and Scholarly and Creative Activity at CSUF

10.9 Review of Chairs

1. Bakersfield
2. Channel Islands
3. East Bay
4. San Bernardino
5. San Jose

10.10 Revised ECS Exemption Resolution – Jon Brusckhe

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.