Executive Committee Meeting  
January 19, 2010  
Minutes

Present: Vasquez, Verba, Norman, White, Gasco and Brooks. 
Not Present: Fawver, Kalayjian

Old Business:

There was a discussion about how to proceed with the Emeritus Status Resolution that was passed at the previous senate meeting. Gould was concerned that the provost would not accept the resolution because of the wording “serious and compelling” so Bill offered language that did not include this phrase. “the president shall decide upon emeritus status and inform the retiring Faculty member of his (or her) decision. Emeritus status shall normally be granted to any eligible faculty member who receives a favorable faculty recommendation. If a favorable recommendation from a department (or the Leaves and honors Committee) is overturned, then the reason for this action will be communicated in writing to the retiree.”

Mike White suggested that we leave things as they are. The senate has already passed the resolution and the provost could take Bill Gould’s wording and use it if he wishes or not. When the provost came to visit we shared this with him and he agreed to look at what Gould wrote and see if that would be agreeable or not. The Executive Committee was in agreement to leave things as they were.

There was a discussion on the staff survey schedule. Vasquez had not initiated it yet. She clarified that the goal is to find out the impact of the 5 day work week on departments and programs. Jan Gasco had asked for data that supports the decision to keep the 5 day work week. We don’t think we will get it. We need to see if the flow on Fridays is different than the Monday through Thursday flow.

Departments would need to track the number of phone calls, number of walk-ins, number of students who come in for advising, the number of contacts. We could make a chart with 5 columns Monday through Thursday. We are looking at using the month of February as the month to document.

New Business

Chair’s Report-Vasquez reported that the CSU Council of Chair’s will be meeting at the chancellor’s office on February 17, 2011. The main discussion will be online teaching and online evaluation. A CFA representative has been invited to answer questions.

FPC Report-Thomas Norman-Norman reported on Vogel’s propel and said that they on are revision #4. White updated the document and verified with Norman that all the changes were there. We decided to put the document into a resolution format and bring it to the floor of the senate. White and Norman would prepare the resolution for the senate in the next week and let all of exec review before bringing to the senate 2/2/11
EPC Report-Jan Gasco-Gasco reported that she is still working on the two resolutions that were passed in 2009. Information Literacy and Academic Technology. Academic Technology is straightforward and was meant to be guidelines and should have been sent out to the college curriculum committee and the university curriculum committees. There have been changes in the past two years to the document they need to be updated and Gasco is almost done.

Gasco said that if you are a faculty member who wants to do distance learning. We want to have all the information you would need in one place for you to use and so Gasco is working on this as well.

Gasco said that the system is looking at having an information technology assessment for students to take to see where they are and also have an online tutorial to learn from. This is baseline knowledge and possibly we can share with other campuses to see what they are doing.

Parliamentarian Report-Ericka Verba-Verba reported that there is 1 faculty member needed for the student grade appeal committee. Sheela Pawar has been nominated. The election will be on 2/2/11 at the next senate meeting.

There was a discussion about possible articles for the newsletter. Vasquez proposed sending out a call for submissions. Verba said that she would send Brooks a list of faculty that have been elected to various committees. We decided to open this up to the senate for possible articles and news. We could discuss the emergency meeting we had with the president on budget.

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m. Naomi Moy and Sandra Parham-Affordable Learning Solutions. Moy and Parham went over the program and showed us the new website. Dominguez Hills is a lead campus. We are past the launch and are in the middle of the process. The website has mini infomercials. There is no competing entity on the campus. The former CTL which is under IT now is in collaboration with the Library. Students can get copies of books right in their blackboard mailbox. They can copy up to 60 pages. Moy will give a full presentation at the next senate meeting.

3:45 p.m. Richard Kravchak-Curriculum Modification Process-Kravchak passed out a handout to all of us. He said that he would like the charge of the curriculum committee to be check to see if syllabi are to be checked by UCC. The department chair should be the one to do that. Vasquez said that Brooks would locate the charge and send it to Richard Kravchak. Vasquez also said that this should go to the EPC and that Richard Kravchak should work with them. Kravchak agreed to put his comments and proposal in writing and to share it with SEC.

4:00 p.m. Provost’s Report-Ron Vogel-We talked to Vogel about the Emeritus Status resolution that was passed in the senate last month. We gave him Bill Gould’s new suggested wording and Vogel said he thought it looked okay the concern was any language that would limit the power of the president. We left it with administration how they wanted to handle this and we decided to leave the past resolution as is.

There was discussion about the RTP policy that FPC is working on. Ron reviewed the draft document sand felt that it looked okay. We will put in resolution format and bring to the senate as a first reading item.
Vasquez asked if UPC would be re-instated and Ron said that it would and their charge would be to look at their charge. This committee appears to be more of an information delivery mechanism for the university.

Verba asked about the February 1st deadline to request a position and wondered if the date could be later. Vogel said that the deans could poll the chair’s to see how long it might take. Vogel needs to hear this request more broadly and not from 1 person. Vogel said that he has not heard there was a freeze and that we are going forward with the accepted requests but have not heard if we can hire. Vogel will find out for sure from the president. Norman said that he would like a secondary deadline.

Vasquez asked if there will be a new submission process for departments and programs who previously submitted updated RTP guidelines and that were not approved by Academic Affairs. Vogel said that some disciplines have no guidelines or articles and asked if there should be a process through the college to the dean. Should there be requirements such as never tenure anybody below XYZ? A process for each department. We need to revisit the department to the dean or chair’s council or? Gasco said that she was certain that NBS has standards because she has seen them. Norman suggested that we bring this up in the senate meeting. Do we have guidelines every 3, 5 or 7 years? Each department must review. Verba asked how do we deal with equity across the departments. What happens after the department comes up with a process or guidelines. Vasquez asked for a follow up discussion to solicit and approve RTP guidelines.

Vogel said that it should be tied to program review or RTP guidelines.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:25 p.m.