

**MINUTES**  
**Academic Senate**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
Wednesday, March 25, 2015  
12:00 – 1:50 PM, Kellogg 5207

**Voters Present:** Laurie Stowell, Chair; Deborah Kristan, Vice Chair; Vivienne Bennett, Secretary; David Barsky (APC, ASCSU); Melanie Chu (Library); Suzanne Moineau (UCC); Carmen Nava (FAC); Karno Ng (TPAC); Toni Olivas (Library); Barry Saferstein, SAC; Linda Shaw (PAC); Pat Stall (BLP); Richelle Swan (NEAC); Marshall Whittlesey, GEC

**Ex Officio Present:** Daren Engen (CFA); Kamel Haddad, Vice Provost;

**Not Present:** Graham Oberem (Provost)

**Parliamentarian:** Marshall Whittlesey

**Staff:** Adrienne Durso

---

(The meeting was called to order at 12:03 pm.)

**I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

- The agenda was amended to add Discussion Item F—Stall: Process When BLP or UCC Does Not Approve a Program

**Motion #1 M/S/P\***

To approve the Agenda of 3/25/15 as amended.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- Suggested revisions were made to the Minutes of 3/18/15.

**Motion #2 M/S/P\***

To approve the Minutes of 3/18/15 as amended.

**III. CHAIR'S REPORT, Laurie Stowell**

**Referrals to Committee: (None)**

- 
- CSU Trustee and Vice Chair Eisen's visit takes place 3/26/15; she will meet with EC members at 10:00 AM in the University Advancement Conference Room (Craven 5306). Stowell asked EC members to forward suggested discussion items to Vice Chair Kristan. In addition to Kristan, Bennett, Nava, Moineau and Whittlesey expect to attend.
  - The WASC survey and feedback deadline is 3/27/15. Stowell urged all EC members to respond.
  - Stowell thanked FAC on its quick turnaround for the Exceptional Service to Employees Policy. Via Statewide Senate Chairs' email discussions, some have mentioned inconsistencies as to who is included when, "Unit 3" is stated. This needs clarification by the Chancellor's Office. Once this is cleared up, the item can be reviewed again by EC and, if approved, placed on the Senate Agenda.

*\*All motions were passed unanimously unless stated otherwise.*

Legend: M = Moved

S = Seconded

D = Defeated

P = Passed

L = Lost

W = Withdrawn

IV. VICE CHAIR'S REPORT, [Debbie Kristan](#) (None given.)

V. SECRETARY'S REPORT, [Vivienne Bennett](#) (None given.)

VI. PROVOST'S REPORT, [Graham Oberem](#) (Not present.)

VII. VICE PROVOST'S REPORT, [Kamel Haddad](#)

- CSUSM has been awarded one of the \$2.5-million State Department of Finance grants that were open to the CSUs, UCs and the California Community Colleges. The grant application highlighted first year programs and campus partners such as AVID, ACE, the Veterans Center and the success that our campus has achieved in retention rates and closing the Achievement Gap. The deadline for budget submission is 4/10/15. The budget will support expenditures in the areas of innovation and success.
- Classroom rush update: There were 79 Impossible to Place Classes (IPC). Some courses have been relocated including the use of specialized rooms not in the database; some courses moved to an online format and one was deleted. In other cases, enrollment caps have been decreased or parameters relaxed so more rooms will fit needs. It assists the IPC process when responsibility is transferred to departments that may offer more diversified scheduling or make use of, "puzzling" rooms.

VIII. ASI Board Meeting Update

- Chu attended the ASI Board Meeting on 3/20/15 which included two major items for discussion and action.
  - Next fiscal year's budget passed without issues.
  - The ASI Bylaws will go through the election process the week of 3/30/15. There are no substantive changes. Changes in positions and language pertaining to how many votes are needed to remove someone from a college seat are reflected. This item passed as well.

IX. ASCSU Update

- Barsky attended the CSU Statewide Plenary Sessions in Long Beach. Barsky outlined resolutions as attached to the Agenda. One resolution supports the system librarians' decision to not renew the system contract with Wiley Publications due to Wiley's bundling options. Faculty are encouraged, where appropriate, to consider using non-Wiley material in their courses. Discussion included a look to the future and similar considerations expected from other publishers.
- Plenary attendees discussed providing guidance to the Finance and Governance Affairs Committee for their lobbying efforts in Sacramento in regard to 10 Senate bills and 20+ Assembly bills.
- With a waiver of the rules for a first reading item, ASCSU passed legislation thanking the Governor for his proposed budget and asking the legislature to support an increase to higher education funding.
- Regarding the California Community Colleges (CCC) baccalaureate programs, the CSU has chosen to not oppose nine programs, issued statements of concern regarding four programs, and cited two duplicate programs. The CCC is moving ahead with nine at this time. The remaining four will proceed, with consultation with the CSUs.
- Concern was expressed about graduate courses being a part of Coursematch.

X. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. FAC: Final Review – Application for Salary Increases for Market ~~or~~ Equity Purposes

- A brief discussion took place regarding edits to this document, removing the words, "or Equity".

*\*All motions were passed unanimously unless stated otherwise.*

Legend: M = Moved

S = Seconded

D = Defeated

P = Passed

L = Lost

W = Withdrawn

**Motion #3 M/S/P\***

To place item *FAC: Application for Salary Increases for Market ~~or Equity~~ Purposes* on 4/8/15 Academic Senate Agenda.

**B. Senate Officers: Draft Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 – The need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom**

- The Senate Officers shared a Draft Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14. The Officers sought opinion as to if such a resolution should come from EC or from Senate.

**Motion #4 M/S/P\***

To place item *Senate Officers: Draft Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 – The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom* on 4/8/15 Academic Senate Agenda.

**C. FAC: Emeritus Policy**

- Nava presented FAC's Emeritus Policy including an updated rationale which incorporates recent feedback. Two major changes have been made – elimination of a top rank requirement across the five categories of faculty; and, the review committee has been changed from, 'local' (in a department or college) to, 'university level' (i.e., the Faculty Awards Selection Committee).
- EC members expressed thanks to FAC for its work and deliberation on this policy. The spelling out of Emeritus titles by rank area is especially appreciated.
- Nava noted that a proposed timeline has been changed to a deadline.

**Motion #5 M/S/P\***

To place item *FAC: Emeritus Policy on the 4/8/15 Academic Senate Agenda*.

**D. GEC: GE New Course Certification Request**

- The draft updated GE New Course Certification Request form was shared by GEC. There was discussion regarding whether this form needs to obtain Senate approval. Moineau stated the new program proposal template did not go through Senate for approval but as an information item. Barsky noted that the GE form is a curriculum form and those need to be approved by Senate.
- Whittlesey will revise the GE form and bring one representative version to EC for review/discussion and to possibly place on a Senate agenda.

**E. Senate Chair: Diversity Mapping Actions Assigned to Senate**

- Stowell led discussion regarding the President's memo on Diversity Mapping recommendations and the Diversity Mapping Action Matrix, specifically addressing items assigned to the Academic Senate, stating she wishes to move forward with outlining what Senate could propose as responses and actions.
- Vice Chair Kristan suggested it is not the role of Academic Senate to take the lead on some of the assigned Matrix items.
- Stowell clarified she'd like to look at this as an opportunity to see a broader picture with Senate overseeing conversations with the Faculty Center and colleges. This could also include requesting resources for items for which Senate *can* take the lead.

*\*All motions were passed unanimously unless stated otherwise.*

Legend: M = Moved      S = Seconded      D = Defeated      P = Passed      L = Lost      W = Withdrawn

- Concern was expressed that a strategic plan may be forthcoming from the Office of Diversity over the summer, written without faculty input. Stowell will obtain clarification from Arturo Ocampo on this issue and perhaps invite him to address EC.
- Stowell will draft a response to President Haynes and share with EC, seeking input.

**F. BLP: What Takes Place When BLP and/or UCC Do Not Approve a Program?**

- EC discussed what should happen to a program proposal if one or more committees (i.e., BLP, UCC) do not approve it. Barsky provided some history, noting that in the past (over 15 years ago) an item would not get on the Senate agenda unless it was approved, endorsed, or recommended by the committees reviewing it. Ten years ago BLP said it would no longer make recommendations (approve or not) about programs; that its charge is to prepare an analysis of the resource impact of the program and let the Senate vote, based on that information. Stall stated that at the start of this academic year BLP agreed that, upon completing its review of a program proposal, committee members would vote to 'recommend' or 'not recommend' approval of the proposal in BLPs report to Senate.
  - The following remarks were part of the discussion:
    - If BLP does not accept a program as viable, should it proceed to Senate? If UCC does not accept a program as viable, it is sent back to the proposer or the college.
    - Swan stated that the Constitution states BLP makes a, "recommendation", so the item would still go to Senate for readings and a vote whether recommended by BLP or not.
    - Bennett stated that a proposer whose program has not been endorsed by BLP or UCC should be informed of this decision and told that their program will go to Senate but that Senate will be informed that it comes to them without the recommendation of one (or both) committee(s). Program originators will be afforded the opportunity to withdraw the program at that point so it will not go to Senate for first and second readings and a vote. The chair of the committee which does not recommend the proposal could be the person contacting the proposer with this information.
    - Barsky noted that UCC and BLP signature lines on P forms are review lines. The Senate signature line is the approval line.
  - This topic will be more thoroughly discussed at a future EC meeting.

**XI. Presentations (None)**

**XII. EC Members Concerns & Announcements (None)**

**The meeting was adjourned at 2:08 PM**

Submitted by Adrienne Durso, Senate Coordinator.

**Approved by the Executive Committee:**

 5-4-15  
Vivienne Bennett, Secretary Date

*\*All motions were passed unanimously unless stated otherwise.*

Legend: M = Moved

S = Seconded

D = Defeated

P = Passed

L = Lost

W = Withdrawn