

MINUTES

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS
Wednesday, October 16, 2013
12 – 2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207

Voters Present	Vivienne Bennett, Chair David Barsky, APC Marshall Whittlesey, GEC Linda Shaw, PAC Yvonne Meulemans, Library	Laurie Stowell, Vice chair Staci Beavers, BLP Ed Price, LATAC Jay Robertson-Howell, SAC Glen Brodowsky, ASCSU	Linda Holt, Secretary Carmen Nava, FAC Richelle Swan, NEAC Matthew Escobar, UCC
Ex Officio Present	Graham Oberem, Provost		
Guest	Mayra Besosa, CFA Lecturer Co-Representative		
Not represented	CFA		
Staff	Marcia Woolf		

I. Approval of agenda

ADD: VI. B. FAC Online course evaluation pilot program

Motion #1 M/S/P*
To approve the agenda as amended.

II. Approval of minutes of 10/09/2013 meeting

Motion #2 M/S/P*
To approve the minutes as presented.

VI. Discussion items

A. Lecturer issues (*taken out of order for time certain*) Bennett noted that the issues presented earlier by the group of lecturers was appropriate to bring to the Senate, since issues for Senate consideration may arise from anywhere. The officers have discussed the lecturers' concerns and have some ideas: (1) increasing representation on Senate by creating a new lecturer seat for each college and the Library on Senate, with two seats for CHABSS; (2) possible parameters for eligibility to serve on Senate; and (3) a lecturer seat on the Executive Committee. Concerning lecturer compensation for service, the officers have talked about specifying a threshold below which lecturers would be asked to sign a volunteer form, and above which they would be compensated. Bennett noted that there is currently a request for compensation from a lecturer who serves on a standing committee, and added that it would be best to determine the compensation issue in general and then respond to this lecturer's request. Another related issue is our constitutional definition of "eligible faculty" (Article 3) which allows full-time lecturers to run against tenure track faculty for Senate and committee seats; this "right" may actually ill serve the lecturers, since they may be less likely to get elected when running against a better-known tenure-track faculty member. Besosa suggested that the EC look at historical data concerning this last point to determine whether the language has been effective.

EC members comments included: (1) suggestion that each representative body designate one of its Senate seats for a lecturer, with both full- and part-time lecturers eligible for these seats; (2) suggestion to make a proviso that each college is guaranteed one lecturer seat which may be filled in the event no lecturers win election to a regular Senate seat; (3) full-time lecturers teaching five classes a semester are not volunteering because they are not evaluated on or compensated for service, and such service is just too much work; (4) need to ensure that

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

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

we capture those lecturers not serving in the academic units which currently enjoy Senate representation; (5) suggestion that we create formulas for determining number of lecturer seats; (6) lecturer time may be better spent on the standing committees than the Executive Committee; (7) concern about adding "weak" rather than strong voices to Senate (Besosa responded that lecturers feel secure and would not be afraid to speak up); and (8) a lecturer seat on EC may provide a useful bird's eye view of how the university functions and lead to a stronger voice for lecturers. Concerning lecturer compensation, Oberem noted that funding would have to be built into the Senate's three-year rolling plan, and he urged the Senate to work closely with Faculty Affairs (Michelle Hunt) on issues potentially affecting lecturer entitlements.

Besosa suggested that many of the full-time lecturers are not aware of their current eligibility for service. Bennett suggested the new lecturer liaison could help get this word out. Besosa also raised the issue of representation for Athletics faculty. She noted that the AAUP-recommended model calls for equal eligibility for all faculty. She also indicated that lecturers feel left out at the department level as well as these other levels being discussed.

It was decided that the officers would discuss these ideas further, consult with Besosa as needed and perhaps with Swan, after which they would bring more refined proposals back to EC for discussion. Besosa may be invited back at that time to EC.

III. Chair's report, Vivienne Bennett: • Bennett attended the systemwide Senate Chairs meeting last week where AY 12/13 tenure track searches were discussed; at first blush, it seems other campuses did significantly more hiring than we did, but the numbers need to be contextualized. Also discussed was difficulty filling committee seats. At Channel Islands, seats which go unfilled after the annual election become at-large seats and then revert back to the unit at the end of the seat's term. Sonoma State invites all those who serve in any capacity to an annual social which helps to make visible the number of people engaging in campus service. • Bennett also reported that she and Oberem discussed the need for a metric for our counting and reporting of part-time and tenure-track faculty, and it was decided this issue would be assigned to the new vice-provost.

A list of referrals was printed on the agenda.

IV. Vice chair's report, Laurie Stowell: From Stowell's meeting with EL Dean Schroder: (1) The call for Commission on EL grant proposals should come out this week and our faculty should know before winter break whether their proposals are being submitted by the campus so they can make any revisions in time to meet the February 2nd Chancellor's Office deadline. (2) An International Forum Panel will be held in CHABSS on October 31st from 11-1 and will include mini presentations on Global Affairs initiative such as Study Abroad, raising money for scholarships for our students to study abroad, internationalizing the curriculum, etc. (Schroder has invited other colleges to do something like this and the deans are checking with their leadership). (3) Regarding ownership of the content of online courses, our campus policies include right of first refusal for faculty, and Schroder's impression from conversations across the CSU is that online courses are subject to joint ownership (if a faculty member who created an online course leaves, she takes the content with her but the institution may also continue to offer the class). This issue is less clear with Cal State online but Pearson does not own the course; the intellectual property belongs to the institution and the faculty. Joint ownership also applies in this case. (4) Extended Learning will continue working to educate the campus about EL's budgets. When Schroder came to CSUSM, EL received 20% of the budget from a program or course, then 25%, and now it receives 30%; he doesn't anticipate any increase over the next 5 years. When the campuses recently received cuts in their budgets, EL made contributions to the campus budget. The 30% figure is not just decided by EL; several constituencies negotiate that. The funding mechanism in each college (at CSUSM) is different because each college is so different. CSUSM budgets differently than other universities across CSU and in different states. When a student enters a program in EL, their tuition rate is locked and cannot be raised, which is good for students.

From last week's UBC meeting: We reviewed the charge of UBC and the ranked recommendations from last spring's UBC. The President and Executive Council determined what was funded and how (base budget, one-time funding or AESS fees), and for the most part the highest priorities were funded. Highest priorities were:

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

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

bottleneck courses, safe and secure campus, expanded services to veterans and active duty, support for grants (additional employee in IPA), accreditation and assessment (CoBA, SoE, SoN, Chemistry, etc.), library (staff, subscriptions and expanded hours), co-curricular funding, deferred maintenance, tenure-track faculty hires, and Athletics' transition to NCAA. The full budget is available on the Budget Office website. As part of the State's 13/14 Budget Act, there is a funding increase to the CSU totaling \$511.1 million over a four-year period ending FY 16/17. This plan assumes no increase in the State University Tuition Fee for AY 14/15. The Governor will send his State budget to Chancellor's Office in January, and UBC will meet in February, March and April to determine budget priorities and make recommendations to the President. UBC also reviewed the multi-year budget model and the amounts that go to each division.

V. Provost's report, Graham Oberem • The search committee and Provost interviewed eight strong candidates last week. Four dates are being held for campus visits for 3-4 candidates: October 28th, 30th, 31st, and November 4th. Oberem suggested that members of certain standing committees as well as the lecturer liaison be invited to meet with these candidates along with the Senate EC. • The upcoming campus visits by Chancellor White and WASC Liaison Oberg on October 24th are being arranged in an effort to encourage as much participation as possible. • Work-teams for the WASC re-accreditation process are being developed by Oberem, Eisenbach, and Hamill and should be named by the end of the fall semester.

VI. Discussion items (continued)

B. FAC Online course evaluation pilot program Nava explained that FAC has been working with Institutional Planning & Analysis Director Matt Ceppi on piloting the student evaluation program as online only. The question arose of how to announce the pilot program to the faculty. It was agreed that a joint IPA/Senate announcement would be sent by the Academic Senate Office.

C. SAC Changes to constitutional charge Some editorial changes were made to the proposed language. This will now go to NEAC for inclusion in a referendum to be conducted later in the year.

D. BLP Resolution re LAMP report EC members engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the logistics for presenting the report in the spring and for gathering feedback from AALC and the Senate Executive Committee with the goal of a Senate vote on the report at its first fall meeting. It was agreed to change "review" to "comment" in line 66. Beavers will work with the LAMP co-chairs on a rationale to accompany the resolution.

Motion #3 M/S/P*

To forward this item to the Senate for discussion in November.

E. GEC GELOs placement on syllabi The GE Committee has agreed to the EC's recommendations that any proposed language be added to the current syllabus guidelines (rather than propose it as policy), and that syllabi include a link to the GELOs rather than a list of the learning outcomes. Whittlesey plans to confer with the WASC Liaison Officer regarding these issues and to bring the document back to EC on October 30th.

The remaining items were postponed to the next EC meeting due to lack of time.

Meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Marcia Woolf, Senate Coordinator

Approved by the Executive Committee _____
Linda Holt, Secretary Date

*All motions were passed unanimously unless stated otherwise.

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