



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 29, 2016**

*Approved 1-24-17*

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

**PLN-120**

---

Present: Bonney, Brusckke, Gradilla, Matz, Meyer, Oliver, Stambough, Stohs, Walker

Absent: Dabirian

---

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order at 11:30 am.

## **II. URGENT BUSINESS**

- You were sent the draft resolution in support of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) to see if there were any changes needed.

### Suggestions:

- Change the wording on the third whereas to read: "Whereas DACA students like all students at CSUF..."
- Reorder the resolves, put the second resolve as the first resolve.
- Make the rationale the first whereas clause, and use only the first sentence.
- Have one of the first whereas clause be "the presidents of many university have written..."

Chair Bonney will make the revisions and circulate via email. The resolution will be put on the AS Agenda for the December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- Contact VP Kim to see where they are on the locks.
- We need to know what we are going to do about the sanctuary issue on our campus.
  - We want to be careful and thoughtful in supporting the DACA students; we need to march in step and have the support of the administration. If we are going to put something at risk for either of those sets of students, it's important we do so in an informed careful manner with the support of the administration.
  - We do need to be proactive; however, we need to be careful that we are not violating anything that in the end they wouldn't have the support or protection.
  - We need to look at the legal ramifications.

Chair Bonney will email the President and report back after the Council of Chairs meeting Thursday.

## **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4.1 EC Minutes (Draft) 11-15-16

M/S/P (Walker/Matz) Minutes were approved unanimously.

## **V. CHAIR'S REPORT**

- Read through the draft of the Academic Master Plan goals to be sure there are no errors.
- In the minutes we had a conversation about UPS 211.100 Appointment of Department Chairs and Vice-Chairs, and I wasn't clear if there were whether there were any changes we wanted made.
  - Yes, it was on the voting.
  - There was concern over how do we verify if the Lecturer gets their .2 vote as oppose to it showing up as a 1.5 vote. We wanted to have the data.
  - We wanted the data to be available to someone within the department.

Suggestion:

We take the last couple of chair elections and one of us go and see what the process was and what were the issues that came out of them and compare it with the policy. We can see if (1) they followed the policy and (2) if the procedures were in fact done. This way we can decide if the policy needs to be changed because of the practice or do we need to make sure the practices are done right.

We will bring this UPS back next week, and we can decide if we are going to make any changes.

- We need to have a conversation about UPS 211.000 Responsibilities of Departments and Department Chairs. The Faculty Affairs Committee is in the middle of this document. The proposal was to clarify what chairs actually do. They are going to put in something about a review procedure. The question has arisen why are they doing this?
  - The reason we had agreed we should do this was not to take an ax to the chair, but because this kind of review provides information for the chair to help the chair become a better chair and this is not captured in the normal review process.
  - One thing that would be helpful is if we actually had a committee where two of the members are current chairs.
  - We want to keep in mind the chair serves at the pleasure of the president. Has the President said anything about this with regard to how she would like to proceed? Does she have any input for us?
  - Why don't we say in the UPS we strongly recommend that chairs in departments periodically evaluate their leadership priorities and let them figure out how they do it?

Chair Bonney will take the comments to the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting this Friday.

- The Chancellor's office has asked all campuses to create a Critical Advisory Group. It is spear-headed on our campus by VP Kim and VP Eanes. The committee is responsible for what happens out in the quad, which is our public space. They have what they refer to as the quad squad. So as long as there is a group is out in the quad, there are people from Student Affairs at each of the four corners keeping track of stuff. They have three documents of our listed as resources: UPS 100.006 A Commitment to Civility at CSUF, UPS 230.000 Reaffirmation of Statement of Professional Responsibility, and UPS 300.000 Student Rights and Responsibilities. We will need to think about how we feel about that.
  - To give faculty awareness of this group, Chair Bonney would like to invite to the first Executive Committee meeting of the spring semester, representative from this advisory group with the idea they could make a ten minute presentation to the Academic Senate about what they do.

Q: What is their charge?

A: The Chancellor wanted every campus to have a group that was aware of who was coming onto campus to use the public space. If there were controversial people who had been invited to come as public speakers to campus, the committee is to be prepared and be aware. The idea is to not get surprised by a controversy and the business of the campus goes on.

- Monique Shay has a dynamite presentation on freedom of speech and what counts as harassment and what does not. There is no way we can do all of it as a presentation in the senate; if Monique is amenable to the idea, we will ask her if we can put her presentation in Dropbox for the Senate and have her come in and do a question and answer session in the Senate.

Suggestion:

We have a session for the presentation. It was a very valuable presentation, and it would be worth it for us set up a time for anyone that is available and wants to see the presentation.

- We will be talking about the Graduation 2025 Initiative next week because we have a retreat on it in March.
- Chair Bonney has been working on creating a narrative from the retreat responses we received. There are no huge surprises, but it would make a nice piece for the Senate Forum and we can figure out if there is other ways we want to distribute it.

## **VI. INTERIM PROVOST REPORT – 12:30 PM**

No report.

## **VII. STAFF REPORT**

No report.

## VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

- 8.1 ASI Board [Bonney], T, 11-15-16, 1:15-3:45PM, TSU Legislative Chambers  
No report.
- 8.2 Diversity & Inclusion Committee [Gradilla], W, 11-16-16, 9:00-10:00AM, EC-605  
The committee discussed and voted on two motions and discussed a third action.
- To issue a brief statement (yet to be written) in support of the Sanctuary Petition being circulated. The statement (word choice may change) would be presented to Senate Exec and to the Academic Senate.
  - To present a resolution (also yet to be written) that more broadly responds to the election outcome to Senate Exec and to the Academic Senate for consideration etc.
  - The third item is more difficult to describe, but some sort of proposal for near-term activities during the spring semester.
- 8.3 Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee [Bruschke], W, 11-16-16, 1:00-2:15PM, MH-141
- General unhappiness with compliance assist but Su Swarat informed that no change is coming soon. Added “educational effectiveness” to bylaws to expand the mandate to include institutes; the new phrase is:  
“formulate, review, and recommend university policies for assessment of undergraduate and graduate student learning, and effectiveness of educational programs”
  - Ongoing questioning on the purpose of the committee. I \*think\* the direction is to define the confusing terms and return to the bylaws later. They will address the documents they have received but want to clear up how broad the mandate is.
  - Two particular issues that came up were what happens when a center re-organizes – which has happened recently. How to handle this is not mentioned in any document. There was some concern about whether the group that reviews department creation should also review, have input, or take the lead on center creation.
- 8.4 Writing Proficiency Committee [Matz], F, 11-18-16, 9:00-11:00AM, PLS-299
- Approval of October 21, 2016 Minutes
  - Based on our email ballot, the two previous student petitions were approved.
  - Old Business
  - Issue Bin – student petition for approval of work from electrical engineering course at CSUN. Consider establishing a spreadsheet to keep records. M/S Fischer/Goodrich – petition is approved
  - New Business
  - Proposal from the Executive Committee to split UPS 320.020 into separate policies for undergraduate and graduate writing requirements.
    - Discussion of modifications of UPS
    - Add reference to location of definitions of “intensive” and “complementary” in documents
    - Discussion of requirement for completion prior to 90 units which may exclude programs that place their writing intensive/complementary courses in the 400-level course work which student might not reach prior to 90 units.
    - Suggest change that removes language regarding “90 units” and specify purpose of providing opportunities for development and remediation for writing in discipline.
    - Motion to move revised UPS to senate M/S Casem/Fischer
  - Pre-emptive election of new committee chair.
    - Election of Casem as chair for Spring 2017 semester
- 8.5 Faculty Affairs Committee [Bonney], F, 11-18-16, 10:00AM-12:00PM, MH-141  
No report.
- 8.6 Academic Standards Committee [Matz], F, 11-18-16, 1:00-2:00PM, MH-141
- Quorum (isn't that impressive on a Friday afternoon before break)
  - UPS 300.040 Academic Standards for Postbaccalaureate Students – small changes; committee chair will forward to Senate Exec
  - UPS 300.020 Grading Practices – further discussion on plus/minus - no changes
  - Discussion/information items
    - \$2M grant from Chancellor's office will serve 860 identified who could be on target to graduate in four
      - Putting together a plan that will serve them – more information to come
        - ✓ Tuition support
        - ✓ Course support

- Discussion on a faculty advisor hotline for questions
    - Asked to inquire with Pam Oliver (not Ron's wife)
  - The new model that puts enrollment under Student Affairs
  - Adjourned – next meeting February 17, 2017 (unless we send them items)
- 8.7 Planning, Resource, & Budget Committee [Meyer], F, 11-18-16, 1:00-2:30PM, CP-1060-05
- Announcements:
    - The Drowsy Chaperone Opens tonight
    - Please complete the Library Survey
  - Minutes from the October 21, 2016 meeting were approved.
  - Discussion and Approval of MS in Engineering Management
  - Discussion and Approval of Certificate in Spanish for Hispanic Media.
  - Presentation by Ali Izadian, Associate Vice President for Capital Programs & Facilities Management on changes in Capital Programs & Facilities.
  - Good news is the Approval of funding from CO on work on McCarthy Hall and the VA buildings.
  - Discussion of the need to follow up with reactions to the election, there is concern for Students, Faculty, and staff. The ASCSUF Executive committee will be discussing these issues on Tuesday November 29.
  - Motion by Bill (Amir absent) to adjourn @ 2:14 PM
  - Next meeting December 9, 2016
- 8.8 Graduate Education Committee [Oliver], F, 11-18-16, 2:00-4:00PM, H-219
- The meeting was called to order and the minutes of the October 10th meeting were approved.
  - Announcements
    - The subcommittee formed to work on new Graduate Student Learning Goals is finalizing their work and it will be reported at the next meeting.
      - ✓ Input was to simplify the GSLG and include some type of preamble and preface – recognizing the importance of diversity and other issues
    - The Qualtrics survey on graduate student writing distributed to graduate program advisors is being summarized and will be reported at the next meeting.
      - ✓ Pete Evanow reported the deadline to turn the survey was extended to November 30. Sixty-One surveys were sent out and so far there have been 8 responses.
    - The University Writing Committee will revise UPS 320.020 to focus exclusively on undergraduates; GEC will draft a new UPS on graduate-level writing; survey input will be reviewed and used to make appropriate revisions of UPS 320.020 as it pertains to graduate students.
  - New Business
    - UPS 410.170 Doctoral Programs was discussed and revisions made – it will be sent to the Senate Executive Committee.
    - UPS 270.102 Graduate Committees and Advisors was discussed and revisions made – it will be sent to the Senate Executive Committee.

## IX. NEW BUSINESS

### 9.1 UPS 100.601 Procedures for Department/Program Name Changes

- Section 2B add “an” after within

Q: Are academic unit and programs things or people? Because it alternates between their and its in the document.

A: According to the definition that we are creating for an academic unit, it would be an “it”.

#### Suggestion:

Revised wording for Section 2.F:

A challenge is a formal request to disapprove a name change proposal on specific grounds. A challenge shall be sponsored by an academic unit and submitted to the Chair of the Academic Senate. In the event of a challenge, the parties involved are encouraged to undertake steps to resolve the issue.

Q: Several times in the document it says “within 30 days”. Is that commonly understood to mean academic days?

A: We will put 30 work days. Also we will change 14 days to 15 working days.

We will add this to the Academic Senate December 8<sup>th</sup> agenda.

## 9.2 UPS 100.001 Academic Senate Bylaws

We added the meeting times for the standing committee meetings. We will add this to the Academic Senate December 8<sup>th</sup> agenda.

## 9.3 Petition to Amend the Constitution

There are three possible outcomes in terms of the procedures:

#1 – the Senate approves it without dissent, then you send the amendment around to the entire electorate. If you get back a petition by 10% of the electorate challenging it, then the amendment gets placed on the ballot at the next all-university elections.

#2 – if the Senate approves it by an absolute majority (25 people), then it gets placed on the ballot at the next all-university election.

#3 – if the Senate does not approve it, then you have to get 10% of the electorate to sign the petition to be on the ballot. It has to be approved by the majority of those voting, and at least 50% of the Academic Senate electorate must vote.

- It does not fix all of the issues. At-large seats and terms for at-large seats are in other places in the constitution. This would result in that change, but we would still have in the constitution at-large seats. So if we are serious about putting this on the agenda, let's get all the issues fixed at once so we only have to vote on it once.

### Suggestions:

- Make it clear to the voting members what needs to be done and how it is going to affect the entire document.
- It require changes in the Bylaws.
- Refer this to the Constitution Committee and have them go through the Constitution and Bylaws and make all the changes, then bring it to the Senate for an “up or down” vote.
- Put it on the agenda and vote to send it to the Constitution Committee.

We will continue this discussion at next week's meeting.

## 9.4 Revision to UPS 410.103 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Programs

### 1. UPS 410.103 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: New Programs

We will continue this discussion next week because the UCC is going to deal with the issue about program changes. We will move it until they have had a chance to talk about it.

## 9.5 Revision to UPS 411.100 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses

## 9.6 UPS 230.000 Statement of Professional Responsibility

## 9.7 UPS 210.200 Performance Review of Administrative Personnel

## 9.8 UPS 610.000 Conflict of Interest Policy for Externally Funded Proposals

## **X. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### 10.1 General Education Gets an Integrative Learning Makeover

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

M/S/P (Dabirian/Oliver)