

MINUTES

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS

Wednesday, October 22, 2014
12:00 noon – 2:00 pm, Kellogg 5207

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

Ex Officio Present: Glen Brodowsky, ASCSU; Darel Engen, CFA; Kamel Haddad, Vice Provost; Graham Oberem, Provost;

Parliamentarian: Marshall Whittlesey

Staff: Adrienne Durso

(The meeting was called to order at 12:07 PM)

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion #1 M/S/P*

To approve the Agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 10/15/14

Motion #2 M/S/P*

To approve the Minutes of 10/15/14 with revision.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT, [Laurie Stowell](#)

- Gretchen Sampson has been replaced by Virginia Mann in the office of Planning and Academic Resources. Sampson has moved to CHABBS Dean's office.
- The first WASC essay date has been changed to 11/20/14, during U-hour in MARK 125. More than one essay will be presented at each of the two forums. Written information to follow for Senate report on 11/5/14.

IV. ASI Meeting Update, [Barry Saferstein](#)

- At the 10/17/14 ASI meeting, a speaker presented on the CALM initiative, an initiative to lower textbook costs for students.
- A Resolution for ASI support of the Student Access Initiative was discussed; no vote was taken. A CoBA representative voiced concern about 2-unit courses. Students want their voices heard during this process.
- There was discussion of recent changes in various ASI VP duties.
- Opting out of state student organization fees were discussed..

V. VICE CHAIR'S REPORT, [Debbie Kristan](#)

(No report given.)

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

Legend: M = Moved

S = Seconded

D = Defeated

P = Passed

L = Lost

W = Withdrawn

VI. **PROVOST'S REPORT, [Graham Oberem](#)**

- There will be three WASC Open Forums in the spring to review the essays. AVP Eisenbach is confident that the planning process is on track.
- Oberem attended the Chancellor's Office meeting the prior week with Whittlesey, VP of Student Affairs, Lorena Meza, and President Karen Haynes. Four representatives from each campus attended to discuss the Graduation Initiative. The meeting's intent was to establish new goals for 4-year and 6-year graduation rates and, separately for transfer students and first time freshmen. Additionally, discussion took place on the gap between underrepresented minority students (URM) and non-URM students; and Pell vs. non-Pell students.
- 2012 data was used (as follows), provided by [Education Trust](#). CSUSM's 6-year grad rate was 45%. Chancellor's office would like CSUSM to increase that to 52% by 2025. The 4-year rate at CSUSM is currently 13%. An 8% increase is the new goal (to 21%), by 2025. These goals will be strategic priorities within the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and ultimately drive a multi-pronged plan to help make them achievable. The meeting's emphasis was sharing and discussion of goals for the 6-year rate.
- The four-year graduation rate for transfer students was 68%. The two-year rate is 22%. The Chancellor's Office would like CSUSM to increase those rates to 74% and 30%, respectively.
- For URM, the gap on our campus is currently 10%. The goal is closing the gap to 5% by 2025. More recent data shows CSUSM is already closing this gap. Pell is currently 8% and the goal is a cut to 4% by 2025.
- Whittlesey stated that he was pleased to find out there are ways to improve graduation rates without lowering standards.
- The Graduation Initiative Steering Committee may have a mini-retreat to analyze and discuss this data. The composition of the committee will provide for one *additional* at large faculty member, adding to the Faculty Center Director and Senate Chair or designee. Additionally, there will be term limits on the two faculty (not including the Faculty Center Director), and the Dean position. Dawn Formo will convene the committee in early November and take the place of the previous First-Year Programs representative.
- RFPs that come from the Chancellor's Office are handled as follows: They are sent to the Presidents of campuses, with copies to the Provost. Forwarding from Provost's office is as follows: Technology projects to Interim Dean Bill Ward; Faculty development projects to the Faculty Center; Student success items are routed directly to the Provost, and from there to the Deans, who work with various faculty specializing in grant subject areas. (On occasion, Service Learning items to the Office of Service Learning and Community Engagement.)
- The issue of how the Provost chooses among competing grant proposals written by CSUSM faculty was raised. These are, at times, forwarded to the Provost who chooses which one is submitted from CSUSM. Oberem is confident that, with a pre-award office in place, the process will be centralized and improved.

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

- ***Student Access Initiative*** – Haddad has met with several groups, including CoBA Chairs and Biology Chair Tracey Brown. The issue of time between labs has been addressed by making minor adjustments. A summary has been sent to Brown, who agrees with the resolution of issues. CoBA Chairs and CoBA faculty have been consulted, as well. There are still concerns, including the impact on scholarly productivity of faculty. Haddad will attend the Sociology department meeting on 10/28/14. At EC officers' suggestion, more information has been shared via email outreach, including sharing of the PowerPoint presentation, and sharing a link to the video presentation. Graduate coordinators have been included, as well.
- ***Impossible to place courses*** – Support coordinator training has taken place, attended by some Chairs and Associate Deans. S-25 will be run and a list of, "impossible to place courses" will be available the evening of

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

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

10/22. On 10/24, this list will be sent to departments per the strata: largest cap classes will be placed first, and then the remainder will be scheduled. This process will take two days, instead of the previous two weeks.

- LAMP will meet on 10/31/14.

VIII. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. FAC: Applicability of Department RTP Standards – Rationale, [Carmen Nava](#)

- The Rationale is long because FAC wanted to be clear they had processed feedback from Senators and wanted to demonstrate FAC's continuing conversation with CFA this year and last. The proposal includes language FAC would like added to the current RTP document. The *Rationale* was discussed.
- CFA appreciates the intent to allow faculty to have a say in this process. FAC believes this proposal is better and more workable than that of CFA, in terms of what will work for faculty.
- FAC chose to build into this article a focus on the tenure decision: tenure and promotion, and promotion to full. Every faculty member is responsible for knowing what standards will be looked at in the next step of their review process.
- FAC wants to protect the right of the individual faculty member upon the creation of new or substantially revised standards.
- A separate paragraph is included regarding newly hired faculty who come in under new or substantially revised department Standards that have just been approved. FAC does not think they should be exempt. There is also the variable of when the document is signed. It is possible new or revised standards would not be signed until after the start of an academic year. FAC wants to be clear in adhering to the contract, but wants to accommodate the scenario when this is the case.
- Hearing no objections, this item to be sent forward to Academic Senate for first reading on 11/5/14. Edits/comments should be forwarded to [Nava](#).

B. FAC: Guidelines – Department RTP Standards, [Nava](#)

- It was noted that there is no definition of, "excellent" performance. Nava stated the committee did not think this was necessary because this would be defined, if needed, by individual departments. Discussion ensued. Key points:
 - It is up to each department to define what excellence is.
 - Could add, "excellence as defined by department standards."
 - Could substitute, "meaningful faculty development."
 - Could remove the word, "excellent."Nava will consult with FAC and bring a recommendation to next week's meeting.

Comments may be forwarded to [Nava](#).

C. Student Access Initiative, [Stowell](#)

- Stowell queried EC to see if members are ready to bring a resolution in support of the Student Access Initiative to Senate, with Senate officers presenting and revising a resolution at 10/29/14 EC meeting. Discussion of key points:
 - EC could endorse the initiative (in principle) with a resolution and bring that to Senate as information item
 - EC could endorse the initiative with a resolution, bring to Senate, and have Senate vote whether or not to endorse.
 - It was suggested that a resolution should include wording, "...fine tuning once implementation begins is expected."

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

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

A draft, written by EC officers, will be brought to EC for consideration 10/29/14.

D. Officer and Chair Course Release Guidelines, Stowell

- Stowell asked for support of these guidelines.
- Line 15: change “may” to “will”
- Hearing no objections, EC has endorsed these as guiding principles.

E. BLP: Pre-Proposal Form, Stall

- This form is in response to charge by EC, in order to assist program proposers in deciding whether to launch a program stateside or through Extended Learning (EL). An introductory paragraph has been added. BLP suggests this form should be attached to the A-form to assist with where to launch, and with the option of including resource implications. In process, this form would be revised and submitted with the P form. Signature lines are included, and “Print Name” lines will be added.
- Dean of Student Affairs will be included on signature lines/review, to assist in sharing of workload and resource information. This form is intended to be an online form.
- **Suggestions:** 1) Pre-Proposal form needs more lines for answers or a recommendation to complete on a separate page. Needs clarification of how long/detailed answers need to be. Or, include, “answer not to exceed (**number here**) words.” Or create answer box with limited size. 2) Include line for signature by Dean of Students; 3) Should BLP include in resource implication pages, a review by AVP for Enrollment Management?
- Included with the Pre-Proposal form (and attached) are two spreadsheets labeled “SAMPLE SPREADSHEET.xlsx”. These are an **option** to use as a helpful tool with the Pre-proposal form to assist in determining if a program should be funded stateside, or through EL. (They will be **required** with the P-form.) Haddad shared that this planning at the pre-proposal stage will assist BLP in proper review of form submittal, i.e., realistic enrollment in the first five years, realistic FTES return in revenue, and, whether the program will break even in the first five years. Further, this would aid in planning for new faculty hires, equipment purchases, renovation of space, and ways to address shortages. Additionally, in planning for possible funding shortfalls, it will help identify early funding sources, i.e., augmented funding for the first few years.
- There are statements in the “Tips” sheet that suggest working with one’s Associate Dean and/or the Office of Academic Programs when completing the form/spreadsheets. It was suggested that BLP should decide if the spreadsheets should be required or an option when the Pre-Proposal form is submitted (i.e., will an A-form + Pre-proposal Form be deemed insufficient because cost hasn’t been properly evaluated?)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 PM

Submitted by Adrienne Durso, Senate Coordinator.

Approved by the Executive Committee:



Vivienne Bennett, Secretary

11-3-14

Date

Next meeting: October 29, 2014 ~ 12:00-1:50 p.m. ~ Provost’s Conference Room – Kellogg 5207

PLEASE NOTE: THE EC MEETING AND ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING OF 11/5/14 WILL BE HELD IN THE MCMAHAN HOUSE.

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

Legend: M = Moved

S = Seconded

D = Defeated

P = Passed

L = Lost

W = Withdrawn