



ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

GENERAL SENATE MEETING

OCTOBER 24, 2017
PEACHMAN LECTURE HALL

The meeting was called to order by Tom Nordenholz at 11:00 am, by welcoming all the academic senate members for the second General Senate Meeting for the year 2017-2018.

Guests: Sue Opp (Provost)

The meeting started off with the Agenda specified with a start time for each item.

Announcements

- **Committees:** Alex Parker (vice-president of the senate executive committee) is handling all the committees including the academic senate standing committees and university wide administrative committees. The standing committees are mostly staffed and the faculty should be hearing from Alex Parker with request to serve on some university wide committees.
- **Online Courses:** All the online course modalities including the ones for existing online courses, need to be approved by Jan 1, 2018. The faculty are requested to visit either curriculum committee website or policy site to obtain further details about the online course policy.
- **RTP Department Guidelines:** All the academic departments are requested to start working on the guidelines for their RTP. It is expected that RTP guidelines be established before the three school model will be active on our campus.
- **Scholars Talk:** Tamara Burbach, a faculty from the MT department will be presenting her work from the recent book published on Nov 2nd, 2017.

The next General Senate Meeting is scheduled on November 16.

Open Floor

One of the faculty members requested for an update on the *Final Examination Policy*. The academic senate chair will follow-up on the approval of the policy.

The cruise faculty suggested that they need to obtain support from the administration to accommodate one-cruise. The curriculum needs to be changed accordingly due to increase in the number of students.

Faculty Review of Academic Administrators Policy

The academic senate chair clearly noted the fact that most (if not all) CSU campuses have a policy well established to conduct periodic review of the academic administrators.

The senate polling conducted in Fall 2016 clearly indicated that *“faculty are not satisfied with shared governance on our campus”* and *“they do not feel well supported by the administration in most of their endeavors at our campus”*.

There had been previous efforts in establishing this policy in Spring 2016 and Spring 2014. The executive committee will continue the efforts to establish a policy before our campus gets three new academic deans for all the three schools.

Summary of the policy:

- Review administrators who supervise faculty and/or have significant influence over curricular and other academic issues
- Three year review cycle
- The academic administrators are expected to submit a statement (something on the lines of self-study) since most faculty are unaware of all the things that administrators work on.
- The academic senate creates a survey (or a suitable instrument), to be filled out anonymously by all faculty.
- The senate executive committee without having any of their own input will summarize the results and then submit it to the President.

Discussion

Who should get reviewed and who should review them?

- Provost (All faculty)
- School Deans (faculty within the school)
- Library Dean (Library faculty)
- Captain of Golden Bear Training Ship (All cruise faculty)
- Chief Engineer (All cruise faculty)
- Athletic Director (All athletic faculty)

Since our campus is small, some faculty were hesitant of the restriction on the voting privileges. For example, if the Library Dean is being evaluated only by the faculty in Library (i.e. only two faculty) it may not be completely a fair process and the responses can easily be tagged on-to the faculty. Evaluation of more academic administrators (including Director of International Studies, AVP etc.) have been brought up by some faculty. The evaluation was meant to review the administrators who directly

supervise faculty and conducting the evaluation for too many academic administrators was deemed to be inappropriate in terms of effort and time.

What should be a suitable survey instrument?

- What qualities/attributes do we want to evaluate?
- Should the survey be numerical, qualitative or both?
- Should the survey be tailored to individual academic administrator?
- Should the evaluation instrument be a part of the policy?
- Should an adhoc committee constituting the faculty be formed to create the survey?

The academic senate chair suggested that comparison of the policy from at-least five CSU campuses would be a better place to start. Some faculty indicated that WASC may offer us some questions to evaluate the academic administrators.