

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES** – Approved 3/30/17  
**March 2, 2017**  
**University Hall, Room 277**

**Members Present:** Henige, Li, Lisagor, Schmidt-Levy, Schutte, Smith, Spector, Stein, Swenson, Wolfbauer (Recording Secretary)

**Members Absent:** Dermendjian, Grant

**Guests:** E. Adams, L. Becker, I. Carvajal, D. Lemus, K. Michaud, S. Murray, J. Oh

Faculty President Swenson called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

**1. Approval of SEC Minutes**

MSP to approve the [SEC Minutes for February 2, 2017](#) as revised.

**2. Announcements**

- a. Swenson said he will email the Faculty President's report to SEC.
- b. Smith recommended a couple of books about shared governance.
- c. At Schutte's request, Swenson agreed to send an email to faculty asking them to encourage their students to complete the Sexual Violence Prevention Survey and to possibly offer extra credit to their students for completing the survey.

**3. Approval of the Spring 2017 Election Slate**

It was suggested that links to the faculty profiles be incorporated into the ballot.

MSP to approve the 2017 Senate and Faculty election ballots.

**4. Discuss Making the Best Use of Robert's Rules of Order at Senate Meetings**

Swenson read a statement and provided an explanation about what went wrong at the last Senate meeting having to do with the Resolution for Institutional Support of and Protection for Undocumented Students at CSUN. SEC members listened to Swenson's viewpoint and offered their advice and feedback.

**5. Policy Item – Educational Policy Committee**  
Larry Becker, Chair of EPC

**Action Item** – [Standardized Breaks in Classes](#)

Becker reported that some Senators suggested that this policy be a requirement instead of a recommendation. EPC considered the request and decided to keep this policy as a

recommendation. They believe it's best to continue leaving the decision to the discretion and good judgment of the faculty member. Also, there are no major instances of students complaining about not getting a break.

Again, there was discussion about the word, "Standardized" being used in the title since a break is not mandatory or fixed. A suggested new title name was, "Recommended Breaks in Classes".

**MSP** to forward the policy to the Senate.

6. **Policy Items** – Personnel Planning and Review Committee  
Sean Murray, Member of PP&R and Daisy Lemus, AVP Faculty Affairs

**First Reading** – [Section 606 \(Personnel File\)](#)

Lemus said this revision is to make the language in Section 600 consistent with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). It adds language to Section 600 about the Personnel Action File (PAF) needing to have a log sheet. The custodian of the file will log all instances of access to the PAF, including access to the file by administrators.

An SEC member requested to add the word "business" in Section 606.2.3.b to read, When a faculty member requests an appointment to inspect the file, it shall be scheduled promptly, within two (2) business days, during normal business hours.

**MSP** to forward to the Senate for a first reading.

**First Reading** – [Section 635 \(Evaluations and Recommendations on RTP\)](#)

Lemus said that this policy change is necessary to accurately reflect what is stated in the CSU-CFA (CBA). Article 15 explains that faculty members have 10 days from receipt of their letter to respond to a RTP recommendation. In an effort to maintain the deadlines dates set in the Personnel Calendar, recommending agencies will be asked to offer electronic copies of their recommendations to faculty who may not have immediate access to their campus mailboxes.

A suggestion was made to give faculty the exact date that their RTP letter will be placed in their PAF, which is the same date that their response letter is due. A few editorial revisions were suggested.

**MSP** to forward to the Senate for a first reading.

7. **Provost's Report** – Provost Yi Li

Provost Li reported on the following:

- a. Li said that the Board of Trustees is still considering a tuition increase, but there is a good chance we will receive more money from the State and the increase will not be implemented. However, we will need to use some money from our reserves.
- b. He and President Harrison met with the College of Humanities to hear about their programs and their Student Success Initiatives.

- c. There are four searches currently underway: AMC Dean Search, Director of EOP, Director of Institutional Research, and Vice Provost.
  - d. Last Friday was the Provost's Planning and Professional Development Retreat. Attendance was excellent and people were engaged.
  - e. He spent the last two days at the Chancellor's Office Academic Council where they discussed the budget and student success.
  - f. We will admit 300 more incoming students this Fall. However, we will lose some enrollments in tier two admissions. Impaction will continue in the Departments of Kinesiology, Psychology, and Cinema and Television Studies. In addition, Biology, Health Sciences and Communication Studies will also be impacted this Fall.
  - g. SAT has changed their scoring system. We, along with other CSU campuses, have seen higher scores for African-Americans applicants. However, the CSU minimum eligibility index has remained at 2900.
  - h. Provost Li shared some of the Student Success Initiative projects that are currently underway on the campus. It was suggested that we compare courses that typically have high DUFs, with sections where students are doing well, to see what faculty are doing differently to get the positive result.
8. [Resolution In Support of Administering Student Evaluations of Faculty Online](#)  
Janet Oh and Kristy Michaud, SEF Task Force Co-chairs

Oh said that we've always had the option of doing online student evaluations of faculty. Last year, a Task Force was appointed by the Faculty President to do a pilot study. The SEF Task Force found that if students are given time in class to complete online evaluations, response rates are better than when no class time is given and are comparable to, or better than, response rates for paper evaluations. An added benefit is that students who are not in class, will be able to evaluate their course online outside of class. It was mentioned that the quality of the open-ended questions was also better, and that students wrote more when faculty gave time in class. We are in the process of purchasing a software license called Course Eval, which will allow us to go fully online. It was suggested that Senators receive the best practices document when they are sent the resolution. SEC members were reminded that all questions on the evaluation form are selected by their department.

The resolution resolved that, beginning Fall 2017, all student evaluations of faculty will be conducted online and faculty teaching classes with face-to-face meetings are recommended to give time in class for students to complete the online evaluation form. This resolution will be forwarded to the Senate for consideration.

9. **Policy Items** – Personnel Planning and Review Committee  
Sean Murray, Member of PP&R and Daisy Lemus, AVP Faculty Affairs

**First Reading** – [Section 637 \(Decision of the President\)](#)

Lemus said that when faculty go through an RTP appeal, PP&R reviews their file before meeting with the Provost. In the past, PP&R did not receive a copy of the Provost's decision

letter. According to the CBA, the President (or Provost) shall provide their decision in writing and shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the letter shall be provided to the faculty member and to all levels of review. It is also placed in the PAF. This policy revision updates the language in Section 637 to say that PP&R will also receive a copy of the decision letter since they are one of the levels of review.

**MSP** to forward to the Senate for a first reading.

**First Reading** – [Section 641.2.4 \(Advanced Award of Tenure\)](#)

Lemus said that Section 641.2.4 has been revised to clearly explain to faculty and recommending agencies under which circumstances the advanced award of tenure may be considered advantageous to the University. The policy revision attempts to more clearly express that the early awarding of tenure must be advantageous to the University's mission, programmatic needs, or priorities. The previous wording was unclear, often leading to faculty and recommending agencies failing to explain requests and recommendations for advanced award of tenure in RTP materials.

**MSP** to forward to the Senate for a first reading.

10. [Discussion about Changing the Composition of PP&R the Committee Membership](#)

Lemus reported that PP&R brings this recommendation to SEC for discussion purposes at this time. The current composition of PP&R is based on FTEF. Twelve elected members shall be apportioned annually among the Colleges, the Library, and Student Affairs by the SEC according to the number of FTEF each employs during the semester of election. The method of major fractions shall be used, provided that no represented unit shall have less than one member or more than four. The Faculty President is a standing member. Since FTEF can fluctuate from year-to-year, and terms on PP&R are three years, it didn't seem logical to PP&R members to allocate positions this way. They propose that each College have one representative and that the two remaining seats be elected members at-large. The at-large PP&R members would be elected similar to the Senators-at-Large during the annual Faculty election process.

Changing the Composition of PP&R requires changing the Faculty Bylaws; this would require approval by the Faculty Senate. If the Senate approves the amendment, the Faculty President must forward it to the Faculty for a vote. All amendments to the Bylaws are subject to approval by the University President.

The following comments were raised:

- 1) We need to emphasize that members at-large represent the University.
- 2) The language needs to be clear that the election would be conducted by the Senate Office. The way it is written sounds like Senators will be electing the two members.
- 3) Since Section 600 says that faculty are obligated to serve on a personnel committee if asked, they would not be able to refuse a nomination. We may want to consider contacting faculty first to determine interest before officially making a nomination.
- 4) An SEC member asked that the entire Section 2 of the Faculty Bylaws be included when this document is considered by the Senate.

## 11. **Set Agenda for March 9, 2017 Senate Meeting**

- Special Order - Institutional Support of and Protection for Undocumented Students at CSUN Resolution
- Action Item – Standardized Breaks in Classes
- First Reading - Section 606 (Personnel File)
- First Reading - Section 635 (Evaluations and Recommendations on RTP)
- First Reading - Section 637 (Decision of the President)
- First Reading - Section 641.2.4 (Advanced Award of Tenure)
- Resolution In Support of Administering Student Evaluations of Faculty Online
- Senate Reports

Meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Submitted by: Terri Lisagor, Secretary of the Faculty and Heidi Wolfbauer, Recording Secretary