AGENDA

Executive Committee Meeting CSUSM Academic Senate

Wednesday ~ September 26, 2012 ~ 12–2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207

 Approval of 	agenda	а
---------------------------------	--------	---

- II. Approval of minutes of 09/19/2012 meeting
- III. Chair's report, <u>Jackie Trischman</u> "Funding the Future of the CSU" event on October 11

Referrals attached

- IV. Provost's report, Emily Cutrer
- V. ASCSU report, Glen Brodowsky
- VI. CFA report, <u>Don Barrett</u>
- VII. Committee report: **SAC** attached
- VIII. Consent Calendar items
 - NEAC Recommendations attached
- IX. Discussion items
 - Parking safety concerns
- X. EC members' concerns & announcements

Referrals

September 19, 2012

APC:

- update Credit by Challenge exam policy
- update the Latin Honors policy

FAC:

- Should the format of the university's official student evaluation of instruction be changed to allelectronic? At present, online students use an online format, and have a five-day window to respond. Could this be extended to all students, no matter the instructional mode? A FAC member asked if this would not be more efficient for both faculty and reviewers of WPAFs. In the discussion, FAC members raised pros' and cons. Other members were concerned with low and/or biased response rate. Per Janet Powell, Matt Ceppi is interested in exploring all-online evaluations. Several committee members observed how frustrating it is that the current system digests student comments, and requested making a change so that comments stay connected to rest of the data provided by each student. FAC recommends the matter be discussed fully.
- <u>Janet Powell raised a concern about current practices having to do with the situation when a faculty goes up for tenure in what would normally be the 5th year. In the situation that a faculty member choose to go up for early tenure in the 5th year, and is not granted early tenure, the practice has been that no material from the unsuccessful early tenure review is placed into the PAF. This means that there is also no 5th Year period Review in the file. The University RTP Document does not speak to this. JP believes that making this explicit in the URTPD would be widely beneficial.</u>
- Per JP, the URTPD does not provide the answer to who has the "last word"—the candidate or the committee. [Candidate--IV.A.3; PRC--IV.D.9; P&T--IV.I.10]. Can the URTP give faculty the last word, providing a definite end point to the back-and-forth that sometimes develops?
- <u>Is the option for filing an electronic WPAF open to lecturers?</u> Per JP, the answer is yes, but is this codified yet? Not being able to present WPAF online is a disadvantage to those faculty who teach online.
- New CBA will require that "all courses shall be evaluated" and "all evaluations for courses taught" be included in WPAF. FAC has already been charged with making our URTPD comply, but the question is whether we want to enforce this or take up the opportunity for a committee/president to make an "exception" to the "All/All" policy.

LATAC:

- Become experts on Cal State On-line and on-line teaching issues in general
- Identify faculty and academic issues involved in on-line education and bring to EC to be referred back to LATAC or to another standing committee (How can we help them succeed?)
- Evaluate Cal State On-line and recommend how we should participate
- Identify policies that are needed for on-line/Cal State On-line work
- Take an on-line inventory to give us a baseline. How many fully on-line courses do we have? Do we have programs (existing or in the pipeline) that are completely on-line.

NEAC:

Parameters for NEAC purview re non-Senate committee appointments

EC 09/26/2012 Page 2 of 4

SAC report to EC

September 26, 2012

Response to Student Grade Appeals Committee (SGAC) report

At the 9.5 Senate meeting, the annual report of the SGAC was shared with the Senate. In the report, virtually all grade appeals from students were initially sent back to students with a request for students to follow the informal process before beginning the formal appeal process. This informal process is detailed in the Student Grade Appeals Policy and Procedures. There was a question from a Senate member as to why this was the case: it seems inefficient for all parties to for this to happen. The SAC Chair was charged with learning more about why this was the case. The SAC Chair spoke with Karno Ng, the Chair for the SGAC. She reported that referring students back to follow the informal process was inefficient and burdensome. She is working to move the entire process online, in part so that when students go online to file an appeal, they will first encounter a few questions that will screen if students have already completed the informal process. If not, they are directed to the procedures and only when that is completed, would they be then given access to the formal appeals process. The SGAC Chair also is interested in a way to provide better guidance/advisement to students who are considering a grade appeals. Could SAC perhaps be charged to explore this?

Student Grade Appeals Policy and Procedures-response from Provost

The Provost responded to the proposed revision to the *Student Grade Appeals Policy and Procedures*. She expressed interest in articulating further the qualifications of the students serving on the Student Grade Appeals Committee (SGAC), suggesting that perhaps students could have a minimum earned credit requirement in order to serve on SGAC. SAC discussed this and noted that, according to the existing policy and procedures, the students are appointed by ASI, using procedures that ASI established. The SAC Chair requested that the ASI representative to SAC take the Provost's inquiry about student qualifications to serve on the SGAC back to the ASI Board. The SAC Chair requested that ASI report to SAC what their procedures are. Existing ASI procedures may already have similar qualifications. SAC also requested to review the ASI procedures to understand the process better.

EC 09/26/2012 Page 3 of 4

NEAC Recommendations

For September 26, 2012, Executive Committee meeting and October 3, 2012, Academic Senate meeting

Committee	Seat & Term	Name(s)
Academic Senate	CEHHS 12-14	Deborah Bennett, Anne René Elsbree
Academic Senate	CHABSS 12-14	Karen Glover, Reuben Mekenye
Academic Senate	CHABSS 12/13	Sheryl Lutjens
Academic Senate	SSP-AR 12/13	Camilla Williams
General Education Committee	CHABSS-SBS 12-14	Aaron Finkle
Library & Acad. Tech. Committee	CSM 12-14	Ed Price
Student Affairs Committee	At large 12-14	Jay Robertson
Student Affairs Committee	At large 12/13	Reuben Mekenye
University Curriculum Committee	CHABSS-SBS 12/13	Aaron Finkle
Professional Leave Committee	CHABSS-SBS 12/13	Bud Morris
Student Grade Appeals Cmte.	At large 12-14	Chetan Kumar
Student Grade Appeals Cmte.	At large 12-14	Ahmad Hadaegh
Student Grade Appeals Cmte.	ALT At large 12-14	Stephen Zera
Student Grade Appeals Cmte.	ALT At large 12-14	Deborah Kristan
Student Grievance Committee	CHABSS 12-14	Zhiwei Xiao
Student Grievance Committee	CSM 12-14	William Kristan
Arts & Lectures Advisory Cmte.	CHABSS 12-14	Francisco Martin
Co-Curricular Funding Cmte.	At large 12/13	Francisco Martin
Graduation Initiative Steering Cmte.	At large 12-14	Elisa Grant-Vallone
OCSL Advisory Board	CEHHS 12/13	Paul Stuhr
OCSL Advisory Board	CHABSS 12-14	Heidi Breuer
OCSL Advisory Board	CSM 12-14	Youwen Ouyang
Student Media Advisory Council	At large 12-14	Jonathan Berman
Student Media Advisory Council	At large 12/13	Matthew Atherton
University Global Affairs Committee	CoBA 12/13	Beverlee Anderson
University Global Affairs Committee	CEHHS 12-14	Sawssan Ahmed
University Global Affairs Committee	CHABSS 12/13	Rebecca Lush
University Global Affairs Committee	CSM 12-14	Youwen Ouyang
University Global Affairs Committee	Library 12/13	Melanie Chu
Veterans & Active Duty Steering Cmte.	At large 12-14	Kimber Quinney
Veterans & Active Duty Steering Cmte.	At large 12/13	Charles De Leone

EC 09/26/2012 Page 4 of 4