

MINUTES

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS
Wednesday, February 13, 2008
KEL 5207
12-2 p.m.

Members Present:	Patty Seleski, Chair Rika Yoshii, APC Marshall Whittlesey, GEC Gabriela Sonntag, PAC Dick Montanari, ASCSU	Janet McDaniel Vice Chair Kathleen Watson, BLP Joan Hanor, LATAC Martha S-Holmes, SAC	Glen Brodowsky, Secty. Betsy Read, FAC R. Ramamurthi, NEAC Olaf Hansen, UCC
Not Present:	Emily Cutrer, Provost; Judy Papenhausen, Nursing; Janet Powell, CFA; Marcia Woolf, Senate Goddess		
Guest:	Robert Erichsen, IITS		

I. Approval of Agenda

ADD: New Business, C. Academic Affairs Restructuring Task Force Report - Watson

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

II. Approval of Minutes of 2/6/08

Approval deferred to the meeting of February 20.

III. Chair's Report, Patty Seleski

A. Announcements: The provost is attending a system-wide meeting today. The February 27th EC meeting will be held from noon until 1p.m. due to a UBC meeting that will take place in the provost's conference room beginning at 1 p.m. on that date. Due to the shortened EC meeting, business/action items will be considered first before reports. Seleski will meet with the provost on Friday, February 15. Among the items on their agenda is the resolution to include faculty input in budgeting discussions and decisions, as passed at the February 6th Senate meeting. Seleski, McDaniel, Watson, and Montanari will meet with CFA officials on Monday.

B. Referrals to Committees

FAC Policy for Grant Application Review Committee
FAC Faculty Awards for Teaching – review eligibility/nature of dossier and recommend

IV. Vice Chair's Report: Janet McDaniel McDaniel attended LATAC and UCC meetings last week to begin familiarizing herself with the committees' work in preparation for assuming the Senate chairmanship next year. At UCC, McDaniel and Hansen discussed inclusion of student learning objectives (SLO) on course syllabi.

McDaniel also attended a 3-hour UBC meeting as non-voting member, along with voting members Seleski and Watson. The need for more UBC meetings in light of the budget situation was addressed. Indeed, more meetings are now set, including the aforementioned UBC meeting on February 27. At that meeting, the division VPs will present their preliminary suggestions of how they will absorb budget cuts. Academic Affairs faces a 7.5% pro-rata budget cut as part of the university's anticipated overall 6% budget cut. Based on the VPs' presentations and further discussion, UBC will make its recommendations to the president.

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

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

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the budget situation. A question was raised concerning how our budget deficit has developed – where have these funds been “borrowed” from and must they be repaid? It was explained that growth money in past years has been primarily in the form of fiscal monies that have been used to pay for things, but have left a permanent funding gap. This will be exacerbated by the fact that in the coming year, there will be no new growth money coming in. Furthermore, if you have a permanent gap, fiscal money does not solve the problem because fiscal monies are subject to being swept. There is a structural debt because we spend more money than actually comes in, and have come to count on a few million dollars from such things as salary savings to cover that spending. All divisions are currently operating with a deficit. Because structure, terminology, and processes differ from campus to campus, it is difficult to compare our situation with that on other campuses. It was noted that we spend more on IT due to our refresh program, and Veres has suggested reconsideration of the program and possible restructuring of IT contracts and loans.

Seleski noted that it will be prudent for UBC to proceed cautiously since the extent of the cut we will face is still unknown. At this time, the system has indicated a \$2.5 million budget cut is anticipated for our campus; however, our administrators are addressing our deficit simultaneously, which will add to the impact. The three criteria set forth by the president governing budget decisions are: (1) student access, (2) academic quality, and (3) facilitating graduation. It is also hoped that we can avoid layoffs.

EC members requested data on funds spent by this campus and others throughout the system on direct instruction to ascertain our status in this regard. This data is available for last year and mid-year this year, and will be provided to EC members. In addition, EC members suggested questions for an online FAQ which is being developed by UBC.

Additional questions and concerns raised included: (1) what steps are being taken to increase external funding? (2) the ongoing impact on workload and educational quality brought on by budget cuts; (3) that the faculty voice must be included in the decision-making process; (4) that whatever is given up in response to the cuts will likely never be regained; (5) that not rehiring lecturers also amounts to a layoff; and (6) that the faculty must endeavor to work with the administration to ensure that our response to the cuts is thoroughly considered and reasonable.

V. Secretary’s Report: Glen Brodowsky The following items have been forwarded to the administration:

APC Advanced Placement Credit Policy and Resolution
AS Resolution on Governance and Budget
EC Resolution on Proposed CSU MBA Fee Differential

VI. Provost’s Report, Emily Cutrer The provost is attending a systemwide meeting.

VII. ASCSU Report, Montanari Montanari and Brodowsky attended interim meetings last week and the budget was the main topic of discussion. Montanari attended a 90-minute presentation on an initiative to bring active duty military and veterans into the CSU. This is particularly relevant to CSUSM, given our proximity to Camp Pendleton. However, he noted that this new initiative, while important, comes at a time when the CSU is limiting its enrollments and scaling back its budget. This is compounded by the federal mandates requiring accommodation for students with disabilities – which may describe many returning veterans – and the additional costs such accommodations will require.

VIII. CFA Report, Powell Powell was unable to attend, but sent her thanks to all who attended the presentation by State Senator Denise Moreno Ducheny last week.

IX. Brief Committee Reports

APC: The graduate subcommittee is meeting with APC today to discuss issues surrounding concurrent undergraduate/graduate units, as well as graduate writing assessment.

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

FAC: The course evaluation survey is complete with a 29% response rate – 175 responses. FAC met with Steve Nichols concerning the policy for the evaluation of coaches. The policy has been sent back to athletics with FAC's comments. FAC is also making final revisions to the CoBA RTP document, and an RTP document from Political Science has been received for review.

LATAC: The campus IMAP was well received by the Chancellor's Office. Now, attention turns to how the plan will be implemented. Robert Erichsen reported on our campus's first efforts at the in-house conversion of materials into alternative formats. He reported that for spring '08, there were 127 requests for alternative format materials. In house, 56 books and 29 articles were converted and 26 other books were put into alternative repositories (requiring no conversion). Fourteen books were converted by vendors and publisher files provided two additional books. Erichsen was asked about the cost effectiveness of in-house versus vendor conversions. He replied that we do not yet have those numbers, and a next step in the implementation plan would be a cost benefit analysis. However, the quicker turnaround time may help us avoid costly lawsuits. LATAC is also currently reviewing the CSU security policy.

PAC: Sonntag provided a detailed explanation of the genesis of the annual assessment reports. The reports are an outgrowth of the original educational effectiveness council upon which Miriam Schustack served as a liaison to WASC. These reports were originally termed "audits."

The reports are part of the second of three WASC themes: (1) academic planning, (2) assessing student learning, and (3) retaining first-year students. PAC was tasked with the Assessment of Student Learning theme, which included the development of e-portfolios and the as-yet-unimplemented process of assessment of student writing comparing samples from the freshman and junior years. PAC was tasked by the WASC liaison to do this and might wish to consider whether or not to continue the practice after the WASC visit scheduled for 2009.

Sonntag highlighted the differences and changes between the original PEP and the newer program review process. This will be brought to EC in two weeks as new business. The central questions revolve around how we are incorporating the annual reports into actual program review, and how to take the program review burden off of departments. In so doing, departments would be able to select one or two areas of study beyond the study of student learning outcomes. Also, putting the data notebook online might be less cumbersome. In addition, PAC will work with departments to develop templates which will be placed on the website to streamline program assessment. There are no more resources than we have had in the past for carrying out review, but PAC's suggestion of creating an Assessment Fellow (see New Business item) would provide more support to departments. Another suggested initiative of PAC is to increase the number of external reviewers from one to two. One would be a reviewer from within the CSU while the second reviewer would come from outside the CSU system. The planning report in the current PEP was, in the past, a request for support. Now, PAC wants a system whereby the department makes a request for support and provides a plan for how to proceed.

Finally, PAC will include information about how it will keep the Senate apprised of program reviews.

UCC: The committee is still reviewing the proposal for a major in Global Studies. Also, UCC has received course requests from department chairs in January for inclusion on the fall 2008 schedule. It would be better if these requests came earlier to ensure that they could be processed.

X. Old Business None.

XI. New Business

A. Composition of Building Name Task Force EC members decided that the task force should include three members representing departments that are housed in Science Hall 2. Also, the provost should be invited to appoint a designee to this task force. The task force should consider the costs of any name change and also consider *not* including the word "science" in the name.

B. PAC Assessment Fellow Sonntag provided a handout as a precursor to a resolution calling for the creation of such a position, which would be analogous to the current ELF (Electronic Learning Fellow) position. Brodowsky and Montanari supported the notion of the Senate pro-actively asking the provost to create

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

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

such a position. EC member comments included: (1) that compensating local department members familiar with program content would be better than appointing and compensating a campus-wide generalist; (2) that creation of such a position by faculty initiative would demonstrate to the Chancellor's Office that the faculty takes assessment of student learning objectives seriously; (3) that some who have acted as departmental assessment fellows have not been compensated; and (3) that it would be prudent not to willingly relinquish any control of assessment processes, lest they be imposed by external agencies (as has occurred in California with the assessment of teacher education candidates).

C. Academic Affairs Restructuring Task Force A question arose, in light of recent budget challenges, of the need to continue this task force. The provost would like to proceed so that processes and principles could be put in place so that – in better budget times – the campus would be in a better position to make such decisions. While on other campuses such restructuring exercises might involve decisions to discontinue programs, that is not the goal here. Rather, the provost outlined four related tasks that Watson explained as follows.

1. *Defining Guiding Principles* about the establishment of new colleges, schools, or programs. Of particular interest is whether the environment would remain conducive for students not accepted into the new programs (the example of more pre-nursing students than slots available in the nursing program. Linda Holt and Dennis Guseman are working on this area.
2. *Processes and Procedures* would be developed to establish how, for example, the Academic Senate would be involved. Kathleen Watson and Mary Elizabeth Stivers are working on this.
3. *Defining Terms* of what constitutes a college, school, department, or program will be addressed by Jeff Marks from Institutional Planning & Analysis.
4. *Non-Academic Units* and how they fit into the structure. Examples include Southwest Riverside County, Global Affairs, and the SBRI. This will be considered by Laurie Stowell and Don Barrett.

These four sub-groups will reconvene on February 26th and present their findings on March 13.

EC members then discussed their own college's responses to the budget challenge. All agreed to keep EC informed of what is going on within colleges and departments on this important issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 2 p.m.
Glen Brodowsky, Secretary of the Academic Senate

Approved: _____
Glen Brodowsky, Secretary 07/08

Date: _____

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