

**AGENDA**  
 Executive Committee Meeting  
 CSUSM Academic Senate  
 Wednesday ~ February 5, 2014 ~ Commons 206

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of 01/29/2014 meeting
- III. Chair's report, [Vivienne Bennett](#)
- IV. Provost's report, Graham Oberem
- V. Consent Calendar items
  - NEAC Recommendations\*
  - UCC Course & program change proposals, reconciliations, inactive courses list\*
- VI. Discussion items
  - A. APC Graduate probation, disqualification, & reinstatement policy revisions\*
  - B. FAC Sabbatical leave policy revisions\*
  - C. FAC Brakebill award policy revisions\*
  - D. BLP Self-support delivery of existing programs
  - E. Directors as eligible faculty *attached*
  - F. Addressing UCC's workload / creating Graduate Studies Program & Policies Cmte.
  - G. Memo re ANTH discussion in Dec. Senate from group of CHABSS dept chairs *attached*
  - H. Senate chair & vice chair terms
  - I. Permanent standing committee meeting times
- VII. EC members' concerns & announcements

\* see Senate agenda packet

<b>Coming soon to EC &amp; Senate</b>	
<b>EC</b>	3/19 President Haynes will attend
<b>Senate</b>	3/5 Graduation Initiative update, Palliative Care presentation

*Next meeting: February 12, 12-2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207*

1 **BLP: Proposed Procedures for Expanding Existing Stateside Programs to Include**  
2 **Self-Support Delivery**  
3

4 ***Rationale:** CSU policy does not allow existing state-support programs to be "supplanted" via*  
5 *Extended Learning offerings; however, CSU campuses can offer existing state-supported*  
6 *programs on off-campus sites. Proposals to expand existing stateside programs to include self-*  
7 *support delivery may include a fully online, self-support version of an existing program; off-site*  
8 *delivery; or other self-support mechanism that will not serve to supplant the existing stateside*  
9 *program. CSUSM's policy on "Extended Learning's Roles and Responsibilities" was signed by*  
10 *President Haynes on June 27, 2012. This policy indicates that CSUSM's existing for-credit*  
11 *programs can be offered via Extended Learning if "approved by the Dean (or designee) of the*  
12 *College offering the programs, the Dean of Extended Learning (or designee), the CSUSM*  
13 *Academic Senate (via a policy to be developed by the BLP), and the President (or designee)."*  
14

15 Procedures:

- 16 1. Proposals to expand existing stateside programs to include self-support delivery.  
17 shall be generated by faculty within those programs. Faculty generating proposals shall  
18 work closely with the Dean of Extended Learning (or his/her designee) to fill out all  
19 required paperwork. This paperwork shall include any documentation required by the  
20 Chancellor's Office as well as CSUSM's approved template (attached).  
21
- 22 2. Proposals shall be approved by the Academic Senate after review by the
  - 23 a. appropriate College-level planning committee;
  - 24 b. appropriate College Dean;
  - 25 c. BLP.  
26

**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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Persons with work assignments that are substantially similar to the duties and responsibilities of persons holding MPP appointments are excluded.<sup>3,4,5</sup>

---

**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."

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.