

AGENDA
 Executive Committee Meeting
 CSUSM Academic Senate
 Wednesday ~ January 22, 2014 ~ Kellogg 5207

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of 12/04/2013 meeting
- III. Chair's report, [Vivienne Bennett](#) Referral: UCC Curricular forms: indicating opposition
- IV. Vice chair's report, [Laurie Stowell](#)
- V. Provost's report, Graham Oberem *unable to attend*
- VI. Discussion items
 - A. ROTC
 - Meeting with Captain Orezzaoli
 - Implementing Senate resolution
 - B. Diversity mapping
 - C. Addressing UCC's workload / creating Graduate Studies ***Time certain 1 pm***
 Program & Policies Committee, Gerardo Gonzalez
 - D. Memo re ANTH discussion in Dec. Senate from group of CHABSS dept chairs *attached*
 - E. Directors as eligible faculty *attached*
 - F. Curricular and program forms: What does a signature in opposition mean?
 - G. Permanent standing committee meeting times
- VII. EC members' concerns & announcements

Coming soon to EC & Senate		
EC	3/19 President Haynes will attend	
Senate	2/5 Palliative Care Institute & Student Union update	3/5 Graduation Initiative update

Next meeting: January 29, 12-2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207

1 **Resolution Regarding Military Science (MILS) 101, 102, 201, 202 and Any**
2 **Further Proposals for MILS courses and/or ROTC Activity at CSUSM**
3 **(Passed by the Senate 12/04/2013)**
4

5 WHEREAS, The US Army submitted eight ROTC courses for review in 2008 and only the four lower-
6 division ROTC courses in 2013; and
7

8 WHEREAS, The Army has already notified CSUSM that it would like to submit the four upper-
9 division ROTC courses to CSUSM for review in Spring 2014; and
10

11 WHEREAS, The Army has also notified the campus that it would like to have a full ROTC program at
12 CSUSM; now, therefore, be it
13

14 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate at CSUSM postpone the vote on lower division MILS courses
15 and any future proposals for upper division MILS courses until after a more extensive discussion by
16 the Academic Senate to determine the Senate's disposition regarding a full ROTC program on our
17 campus. Such a discussion shall solicit input from across the University's faculty, staff, and
18 students.

1 **DATE: January 17, 2014**
2
3 **TO: Vivienne Bennett, Chair, and**
4 **Executive Committee**
5 **Academic Senate**
6
7 **FROM: Concerned Chairs**
8 **College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences**
9 Jocelyn Ahlers, Liberal Studies
10 Roger Arnold, Economics
11 Michael Hughes, Modern Language Studies
12 Sheryl Lutjens, Women’s Studies
13 Cyrus Masroori, Political Science
14 Elizabeth Matthews, Global Studies
15 Michael McDuffie, Philosophy
16 Salah Moukhlis, Literature and Writing Studies
17 Liliana Rossmann, Communication
18 Miriam Schustack, Psychology
19 Jill Watts, History
20
21 **RE: Curriculum Process and December Academic Senate Meeting**
22

23 We write to share with the Senate Executive Committee our deep concern about the Senate
24 discussion of the Anthropology course proposals at the December 4, 2013 Academic Senate
25 meeting. The issues of concern are several, and from our perspective, each of them requires urgent
26 action on the part of the entire Senate and its committees.
27

28 First, the procedural concerns: the Senate facilitated a discussion of courses that had already been
29 vetted and approved by two required levels of faculty scrutiny of curricular proposals. In terms of
30 process, the CHABSS curriculum committee had already reviewed, reconciled, re-reviewed, and
31 approved the courses. The CHABSS curriculum committee sent the approved courses forward to
32 UCC with memos from Native Studies, Anthropology, and the committee itself in order to provide
33 UCC with a complete account of the college’s decisions to support the Anthropology courses. The
34 UCC received the Anthropology proposals (after this lengthy and surely delayed review and
35 decision), conducted its own review, and unanimously approved the courses. UCC’s decision to put
36 the courses on the agenda for floor discussion and vote, rather than onto the consent calendar, ran
37 counter to its usual practice. To agendize these courses rather than placing them on the consent
38 calendar had the effect of undermining of the work of the CHABSS CAPC and the UCC; it had the
39 further effect of privileging the concerns raised by the non-approving faculty member above the
40 responses of the proposing department *and* the careful consideration of the curriculum
41 committees. UCC’s decision to not place these courses on the consent calendar represents a
42 change in practice that should be examined and articulated; it also implies that the “do not
43 approve” mark made by one faculty member should take precedence over two years of
44 deliberation, and unanimous approval, by both College and University curriculum committees.
45

46 We therefore request that the Senate consider and articulate the meaning of the “do not approve”
47 box on curricular forms, as well as its procedure for handling irreconcilable opposition to courses
48 and programs in future.

49
50 Second, concerns about the personnel affected: the UCC and Senate Executive opened the
51 discussion of the new Anthropology courses to the full Senate and visitors, at the expense of the
52 Assistant Professor who proposed and would teach these courses. As stated above, this discussion
53 took place at the instigation of UCC itself, rather than because a Senator requested that the courses
54 be removed from the consent calendar for floor discussion; such an action runs contrary to the
55 usual practice and happened in spite of UCC’s unanimous approval of the courses. These facts
56 together had the effect of heightening the impact of the discussion, because they implied that UCC
57 and the Senate shared the concerns raised by the objecting faculty. This was compounded by the
58 fact that the discussion was allowed to focus in many points on the qualifications of the proposer of
59 the courses, rather than the course content and curricular value. Decisions about who might or will
60 teach proposed new courses are solely a departmental responsibility, and subjecting the courses to
61 the scrutiny of a large group of Senators, ad hoc observers, and non-faculty guests had costly
62 consequences for Dr. Laurette McGuire, who was hired to teach the very courses that had been
63 proposed. The debate about the courses impugned Dr. McGuire’s credentials, expertise, and
64 experience, and did so publicly; in essence, her competence, rather than the content of the courses
65 and their curricular appropriateness, became part of the debate. One outcome of this is that Dr.
66 McGuire has, understandably, withdrawn from the Senate; another, broader, outcome is to create a
67 general climate of fear and hostility on the Senate floor, particularly for junior faculty members who
68 may wish to participate in the Senate.

69
70 It is our recommendation to you that the Senate take immediate action to restore Dr. McGuire’s
71 reputation and to do so publicly.

72
73 Beyond the inappropriate critique of an assistant professor’s ability and right to teach courses for
74 which she was hired, important matters of disciplinary and interdisciplinarity are raised.
75 Specifically, who has the right or privilege of criticizing Anthropology’s disciplinary methods, subject
76 matter, and development? More broadly, what assumptions about the relationships among
77 disciplines inform the curriculum process? And the necessary interdisciplinarity which means,
78 among other things, that our social and intellectual realities can be studied from varied disciplinary
79 perspectives at the same time, and that one department or unit does not own a part of reality? As
80 Department Chairs, these questions concern us greatly. We would like to see a careful look at the
81 spaces of conflict created by the curriculum process, including, for example, how approvals are
82 sought and from whom and what understanding of the horizontal approvals (or vetoes) is
83 imbedded in curricular traditions. It also seems crucial to us that we restate the principles of
84 collegiality, respect, and trust that have for so long informed our acceptance of each department’s
85 integrity and responsibility to hire qualified faculty to teach courses that are not owned by
86 individuals.

87
88 We look forward to hearing from the Senate leadership on these issues.

89

Directors as “eligible faculty”

Constitution & Bylaws excerpt: Article 3: Faculty Membership

Voting members of the Faculty shall consist of tenured and tenure-track persons holding faculty rank, library faculty, Student Services Professional-Academic Related faculty (hereafter, SSP-AR), and full-time temporary faculty holding at least one-year appointments in academic departments.¹ Faculty with the voting franchise shall be called eligible faculty.

Persons with substantial managerial and supervisory responsibilities that involve faculty and academic programs are excluded from membership. Persons holding MPP appointments are excluded.² Persons with work assignments that are substantially similar to the duties and responsibilities of persons holding MPP appointments are excluded.^{3,4,5}

Endnotes

1. Disputes shall be resolved by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

2. MPP, addressing the employment rights, benefits, and conditions of The CSU employees designated as 'management' or 'supervisory' under the HEERA. The Calif. Code of Regulations, Title 5.Education.Division 5: Board of Trustees of The CSU, Article 2.2: Management Personnel Plan uses definitions as specified in HEERA. Supervisory and managerial employee work assignments are described in HEERA.

3. HEERA California Codes, Government Code, Section 3580.3 "Supervisory employee...With respect to faculty or academic employees, any department chair, head of a similar academic unit or program, or other employee who performs the foregoing duties primarily in the interest of and on behalf of the members of the academic department, unit or program, shall not be deemed a supervisory employee solely because of such duties; ... Employees whose duties are substantially similar to those of their subordinates shall not be considered to be supervisory employees.

4. HEERA California Codes, Government Code, Section 3560-3562.1. Definitions: Section 3562 (1) - "managerial employee means any employee having significant responsibilities for formulating or administering policies and programs. No employee or group of employees shall be deemed to be managerial employees solely because the employee or group of employees participate in decisions with respect to courses, curriculum, personnel and other matters of educational policy. A department chair or head of a similar academic unit or program who performs the foregoing duties primarily on behalf of the members of the academic unit or program shall not be deemed a managerial employee solely because of those duties."

5. CBA 2002 contract, Article 20, Workload: Administrator as used in the CBA refers to an employee serving in a position designated as management or supervisory in accordance with HEERA. The CBA provides further definitions of faculty.

"The primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity; and service to the University, profession and to the community. The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member's field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform.

"The assignment of a librarian may include, but shall not be limited to, library services, reference services, circulation services, technical services, online reference services, teaching in library subject matter, service on system-wide and campus committees and task forces and activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research.

"The assignment of Counselor faculty may include, but shall not be limited to, individual counseling, group counseling, consultation and referral, intern training and supervision, teaching, service on system-wide and campus committees and task forces and activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research.

"Faculty members have additional professional responsibilities such as: advising students, participation in campus and system-wide committees, maintaining office hours, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues, and participation in traditional academic functions."