Executive Committee Meeting

December 5, 2013

Edited by Kate Fawver, Matt Jones, and Jan Gasco

Present: Brooks, Davis, Fawver, Gasco, Hill, Jones, Kalayjian, Salhi

2:30 p.m. President’s Report-Dr. Hagan-Hagan said that he did not have a lot, and most of what he had talked about at the budget presentation. Hagan said that he wanted to talk about the University Budget Committee. From his perspective it is not what he considers a full budget committee in the full sense of it and by adding additional members to it and expand its charge to look at things that expand the budget and making recommendations on how to spend money in addition to how to cut. We don’t have money to make recommendations on here’s how would should spend it if we get it. Hagan said that there really is no place for anyone to go to discuss what is on the budget. We are going to write this up and get it in place hopefully before the holiday. The UBC is where we will have these discussions.

Fawver asked if the new charge for UBC will include the former structure which included the University Planning Council. Hagan said that he looked at the Org structure before he arrived and noted that UPC exists but does not meet, and so what value is it. Any budget committee should have a planning role.

Pat said that PECS, UPC and UBC it seems that UBC is the only committee that has been functioning throughout.

Fawver said that we all have to complete program review and we do this through PRP which then submits the reports to the PEC. . Every division needs to have a Program Effectiveness Council. Fawver said that the problem with the PECs and the PRP and PEAT process is that the reports go to the level of the provost and they die. Fawver said that when faculty makes requests of administrators to view the information their requests are ignored. Fawver said that this UBC sounds great but she would like it to synchronize with the structure that is already in place.

Hagan said that he thinks that UBC should align with existing structure and if he had spotted an existing structure that was fully operational when he came to DH he might have done that. Hagan gave his sense of PECs, when he applied for the job 5 or 6 years ago we had a lot of committees that sounded perfect (a WASC evaluators dream) but he could not find the end product.

Fawver wanted to know if we still needed the AAPEC and she thought it was formed during the Spring 2012 in anticipation of making budget reduction recommendations.

Gasco said with regard to UPC, PEC and UBC the planning took in data from PEC and UBC had the information about the budget. PRP doesn’t do evaluating per se but they collect information that goes to the PEC and that then goes to the UPC whether it is effective or not effective and then UBC comes up. If it didn’t work it was abandoned.

Gasco suggested that we add planning to the UBC committee.
Hagan asked about administrative evaluations and whether we want them and what should they be and how?

Hagan suggested that we review the structures and decide what we need and want.

Torrecilha said that we are trying to streamline the review process.

Kalayjian said that she suggests we think about structure and envision what the campus will be in the future.

Hagan said that we need a vision of this campus and that should drive our plans.

Hagan said that the UBC at Fullerton had 23 people sitting on the committee.

Hagan discussed the current hiring of faculty and staff; he also expressed concern over the letters from managers he has received where their staff has taken on significant duties. He also mentioned how in the past a faculty member would retire and instead of replacing the position, the position would disappear. He wants to keep the faculty line in the department of origin.

3:00 p.m. Provost’s Report- Dr. Torrecilha-Torrecilha shared with exec a revised version of Academic Affairs Policy #AAAP015.003 that he wanted to get feedback on. The main changes in the policy are that students who have a total of 60 units completed or who have been enrolled for four semesters must declare a major before they may register for the next term. Also, students will not be allowed to change majors after the completion of 90 units. Exceptions will be granted only when compelling and serious extenuating circumstances exist.

Fawver was concerned about students not being able to change their majors after 90 units. Torrecilha said that changing a major after 90 units is bad for students, and we are not helping them when we allow this. He said that all of our programs have to conform to 120 unit limit. Jones asked about students who might change from math to physics where the student would still not go over 120 units. Hill asked whether a change of program from math to math education would count as a change of major. There was discussion about having a senate meeting on December 12th to discuss this, the majority of Execs did not want to have a meeting, but Fawver did want to have a meeting to talk about the new policy. Torrecilha said he saw no need to bring the policy change to the senate. Fawver requested the number of students who during 2011-2012 changed their majors at 90 units. Torrecilha said he did not know how many students changed their majors and would look into it. Fawver also requested to know how many other CSU’s have this policy. Torrecilha said most of the other campuses had this kind of policy and would bring the information on them in the future.

3:30 p.m. Cathy Jacobs-Jacobs reported that there is a problem with courses having 50% or more hybrid and not being in compliance with WASC. We talked about whether to have a senate meeting next week, and the majority of the Exec did not want the meeting. The decision was made that Tracy Haney of UCC would send out an email to all the campus with the information about the two courses being reviewed that are not used by other program—a special curriculum sharing. Also, it was agreed that the course
changes would be reviewed by UCC at its Dec. 12 meeting, and they might be provisionally approved (pending the results of curriculum sharing).

Reports

Chair’s Report-Jim Hill-
A couple notes on the general mood around here:
Chris Manriquez, the new CITO has started. I was just asking someone in IT today about whether they have any impressions yet and learned that he has scheduled a one-on-one with each of the IT staff. (I think this is a good sign.)
President Hagan was at the CFA luncheon today – and I believe felt welcome there ;) . The "new optimism" was apparent.
Part of today's agenda is --unlike the usual "next full senate agenda" item-- whether we need a meeting next week. (Remember we reserved the time in case it was necessary.)
Online PTEs: My proposed letter to dept chairs for Spring. [Some discussion about more content of it and the path to a better instrument.]
General faculty meeting in the spring: coordination with president & provost.