Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, April 14, 2015, 2:30-4:30pm

**Attendees:** Leafstedt, Jill; Veldman, Brittnee; Miller, Jason; Flores, Cynthia; Thoms, Brian; Jenkins, Jacob; Sanchez, Luis; Carswell, Sean; Dean, Michelle; Berman, Michael; Soltys, Michael; Samatar, Sofia; Jensen, Karen A; Monsma, Brad; Aloisio, Simone; Mack, Carol; Nevins, Colleen M; Klompien, Kathleen; Matjas, Luke; Jiménez Jiménez, Antonio; Hartung, Beth; Jim Meriwether; John Griffin; McThomas, Mary; Frisch, Scott; Correia, Manuel; Grzegorczyk, Ivona; Francois, Marie E; Jennifer E. Perry; Colleen Harris-Keith; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Schmidhauser, Tom; Yudelson, John; Salazar, Christina; Campbell, Matthew; Grier, Jeanne; Gayle Hutchinson; Cindy Wyels; Wallace, Amy; Stephen Clark; Matt Furmanski; Michael Bourgeois; Margarita Lopez-Lopez; Vanessa Bahena; Greg Wood; Lindsey O’Connor; Tracylee Clarke; Geoff Buhl; A.J. Bieszczad; Georgina Guzman; Nancy Gill; Virgil Adams; Erin Pehlivan; Brad Monsma; Sean Kelly; Liz King; Catherine Burriss; Jennie Luna; Karen Carey; Merilyn Buchanan; Selenne Banuelos; Jose Alamillo; Steve Stratton; Andrew Morris; Debi Hoffmann; Irina Costache; Monica Pereira; Jaime Hannans; Phil Hampton; Kaia Tollefson; Ruben Alarcon; Alison Perchuk; Dennis Downey; Mary Adler; Dax Jacobson; Catherine Doll; Julia Balen; Bob Bleicher; Betsy Quintero; Nichole Ipach; Gary Kinsey; Janet Pinkley; Sue Andrzejewski; Beatrice de Oca; Elizabeth Sowers; Paul Murphy.

1. Approval of the Agenda
	1. Agenda approved with no objections
2. Approval of the Minutes of March 24, 2015
	1. Meeting minutes are approved with no objections
3. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
	1. G. Hutchinson: extended congratulations on WASC visit, please also thank Amy Wallace for her leadership (applause); the WASC review team confirmed CI accomplishments, highlighted improvements, as well as recognized us for living our mission – outstanding attendance of faculty and staff at open meetings; current update is that it will be 3 weeks before we have draft report, submitted only to President Rush; we won’t know final outcome on accreditation until June 18th (hunch that this will be approved, but won’t know if 7 year or 10 year accreditation)
	2. Town hall meeting for budget, asked each VP for presentations, 4 faculty hires approved for next Fall; Referred to WASC letter, stating that new enrollment growth will be calculated based on student-faculty ratios; this allocation comes off the top of overall budget, would not dip into divisional requests; this year had failed searches in public admin and nursing, so those will proceed with priority next year;
	3. D. Wakelee: about a year ago announced Course Match, which is a CSU program to share course enrollment system-wide; this memo provides clarification on the AB386 mandate to offer online courses across campuses – i.e. when there are open seats in fully online sections, this option will be made available (full memo is available at this link: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedMemos/AA-2015-03.pdf>);
	4. G. Hutchinson reviewed PowerPoint slide relating to the consideration of intercollegiate athletics at CI: D. Rodriguez and C. Doll will be meeting with Strategic Edge; forthcoming online survey will prompt 4 or 5 questions; D. Rodriguez: they’ve come up with 3 potential models, myself and C. Doll will be weighing in on best option; G. Hutchinson – let’s make sure that resources are available in advance;
4. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
	1. S. Alosio: J. Yudelson talked last time about resolution, which is first reading item at Statewide Senate; reviewed Excel graphs, suggested that we would need to hire 10 for next year and 11-12 next year (would need around 15 searches to meet this next year); I. Grzegorczyk asked for clarification if these graphs represent CI or system-wide – S. Aloisio answered that these represent CI; added that a 10% growth rate is reasonable.
5. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
	1. N. Deans on behalf of J. Griffin: 1.6% salary increase should have been included in everyone’s check, for the few that didn’t, they’re still working on it;
	2. N. Deans summarized productive discussions on salary equity (please see CFA website for link) – thank you to G. Wood and F. Barajas for their hard work;
6. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
	1. Senate structure survey was sent – seeking additional feedback to provide guidance to Structure Task Force II
	2. Senate Chairs meeting at Sonoma State (Course Match, residency, GE) faculty governance as relates to MPP searches – some of this info can be discussed at the chairs meeting, putting CI ahead of many other campuses;
	3. G. Wood posed question to D. Wakelee re: what impact residency has on course-matching; D. Wakelee answered that there is a limit of one course match per term, and that campuses are required to offer those courses that you might take as a resident.
7. Continuing Business Items
	1. SP 14-13 Biology Pest Control Adviser Certificate Program (APC) Time Certain 2:45)
		1. J. Grier: document submitted incorporates changes from last meeting, now up for a second reading and vote; P. Hampton: what was changed that aligns curriculum with test; A. Denton: State Dept of Regulation puts tests online, a four-part exam, this aligns with our curriculum structure (aligns with Section A / B / G) – none of the other CSUs have these options; B. Veldmann asked what are the lab options – answer from A. Denton: one soil class and one plant pathology class;
		2. VOTE: 39 YES – 3 NO – 5 ABSTAIN; SP 14-13 is approved
	2. SP 14-14 Policy for On-Line Teaching and Learning (Exec)
		1. W. Wagner asked about distinction between hybrid and online classes, commented that from what he can tell it treats hybrid courses the same as online classes; concern is that for say, a class with 40% online is treated as same for 80%; C. Harris Keith answered that it may have to do with state law reference as far as how these percentages are assigned; J. Grier clarified that this is actually a reference to SP 12-08, which is not on the table; W. Wagner asked if the program chair determines this; J. Grier answered no; N. Deans had the understanding as a committee member that this policy reflects only online;
		2. I. Grzegorczyk recalled previous math chair meetings, where consensus was that all exams must be proctored – cheating can occur if courses go online; suggested that there should be a chapter on how student grades are assessed and that tests should be proctored; J. Leafstedt answered that this can be determined by the program, suggested to please see the Academic Integrity section;
		3. J. Yudelson applauded the efforts of the committee; recalled that last week Statewide Senate voted unanimously that part-time / temporary faculty would have the same academic freedom rights as permanent faculty; suggested to please consider this when voting to recognize that they should have say into their workplace freedom, which at this time does not allow a vote in some cases to temporary faculty;
		4. D. Downey asked for further clarification on Modes of Instruction, in that does the document intend to apply to all three modalities; D. Jacobson answered yes and added that it is up to the program to choose;
		5. M. Adler asked why was “shall” changed to “should”; J. Leafstedt answered that this was to conform within the parameters of the CBA, especially Article 12;
		6. J. Leafstedt moves to amend SP 14-14, the intention was to avoid language in conflict with CBA, second by M. Cook;
		7. B. Hartung noted that this has to do with careful consideration, since the CBA governs what we do, does not have to be specifically stated within the policy;
		8. A. Jiménez asked if this will be in addition to or as a substitution – answer from J. Leafstedt as a substitution;
		9. Discussion between S. Samatar, G. Buhl, G. Hutchinson about instructor / faculty protections; G. Hutchinson noted that protections are for all Unit 3; G. Wood clarified that the WTU entitlement applies to a subset;
		10. J. Balen – amendment to the motion to strike “do everything possible” to just “chairs shall ensure”; G. Buhl seconds to amend the motion; J. Leafstedt accepts friendly amendment on behalf of the committee;
		11. J. Yudelson would the committee consider “do not negatively impact” rather than “work against”; C. Burriss feels that “work against” and “negatively impact” are different; M. Cook denies friendly amendment on behalf of the committee;
		12. VOTE on Motion to approve substitution of phrase from “Faculty…” to “within the framework of the CBA”: 39 YES – 8 NO – 3 ABSTAIN;
		13. J. Balen asked about the section noting the use of outside contractors, does not cover programs for which we have no faculty; J. Grier asked J. Balen if she had any suggestions; M. Adler asked when a mode of instruction is changed, what happens then; J. Grier answered that we’ll be working with the CurrComm to provide a new form; J. Balen suggests “Where no program yet exists, Senate approval is required”
		14. W. Wagner moved to add the wording under COURSE section to be fully online or not but did not have wording for the motion to suggest; D. Downey understood from the document that a program can still change the mode of instruction, which may make this suggestion a moot point; J. Meriwether moved to close debate on SP 14-14, second by M. Cook;
		15. VOTE to close debate on SP 14-14: 31 YES – 13 NO – 1 ABSTAIN
		16. G. Wood recalled Robert’s Rules states that Senate must now immediately vote on the policy itself;
		17. VOTE on SP 14-14: 40 YES – 10 NO – 1 ABSTAIN
	3. SR 14-01 Academic Freedom Resolution (Executive)
		1. J. Grier: coming to us as a second reading item, open to comments or discussion;
		2. VOTE: 41 YES – 1 NO – 2 ABSTAIN
8. New Business Items
	1. Policy on Composition of MPP Searches (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton: policy became necessary as a result of dual policies existing between the PPPC (FA.31.012) and the Academic Senate (SP 09-11); integrated policy developed with A. Pavin, AVP of HR; major change is to mandate faculty and student representation on Level III and IV MPP searches and to outline a process for securing such input during non-academic sessions (summers); will make a friendly amendment during the second reading of this item to move the last paragraph under Purpose to the end of the Policy section; P. Hampton moved, C. Delaney second;
	2. Policy on Faculty Directors of Mission Centers (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton noted that currently no policy exists for selection of Mission Center Director, also that in such cases where a Center has its own by-laws it would supersede this policy; M. Cook asked if a friendly amendment would be considered; P. Hampton answered yes;
	3. Policy on Unit Load Limitation (SAPP)
		1. S. Carswell noted that for students taking higher-unit remedial classes, students can’t get/ maintain full-time status, which impacts housing & financial aid; V. Adams noted that the existing policy limits these units for a reason to prevent students from overloading; G. Buhl observed that this issue may be a “math problem” and may be due to 5-unit remedial course in mathematics;
		2. A. Jiménez asked if this is only for the academic advisors or does this also include major advisors;
	4. Policy on Centers and Institutes (CCI)
		1. P. Hampton: noted that CCI was asked to address E.O. AA-2014-18 that required CSU campuses to outline the requirements to create a center and the process by which it may be suspended or dissolved; this policy integrates two previous Academic Senate policies (09-01 & 04-25) and aligns them to the EO;
	5. Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton introduced this policy by clarifying that the SET is an instrument and not a policy; it was established to outline how an instrument shall be selected and approved; in the past, the SET instrument was voted on the floor of Academic Senate as a policy; FAC feels that SET instruments are not policies and that they should not be voted on by the Academic Senate; this policy establishes a mechanism for regular review of the SET instrument by the FAC with a vote on the SET instrument being made by the faculty as a whole;
		2. A. Jiménez asked for clarification on how many questions are allotted; also felt that we may be missing an opportunity to create instruments that speak more directly to the courses that we offer here, such as International, team-taught, etc. – this may be too general and may not capture the data that would help instructors improve their teaching;
		3. J. Meriwether asked what is meant by simple majority; also asked for the rationale of soliciting a survey from students in the 12th week of classes; J. Yudelson answered that in 2008-9 there was a negotiation that prevents students from receiving their grade;
		4. M. Adler suggested that for Number 4a to please indicate the number of students completing the instrument and the percentage, currently can’t determine this;
		5. S. Clark suggested what about limiting the number of questions, in the interest of increasing the rate of returns; J. Balen argued that students are not qualified to evaluate teaching, although they can evaluate their experience; B. Veldmann observed that this might not be an actual analytical tool if there are multiple ways of soliciting this information;
	6. TT Hiring Resolution (Exec)
		1. S. Aloisio: this is a short resolution, asks for 10% increase in tenure track faculty to be included in the CI 2025 plan;
	7. MA in Psychology (Curr)
		1. B. de Oca moved to discuss, V. Adams seconded; V. Adams introduced the MA in Psychology by stating that the Psychology program would like to thank Senate for expediting the review and first reading opportunity; added that there are no other graduate programs in Psychology in Ventura Cty;
		2. I. Grzegorczyk asked how small is small for your program? V. Adams answered that they’re targeting no more than 10 students in the first year, no more than 20 students on campus in the following years;
		3. J. Meriwether asked to please clarify resources and possible additional faculty hires;
		4. A. Jiménez observed that we still have low faculty-to-student ratios for undergraduate level courses, expressed concern about the resources allocated for this;
		5. C. Wyels asked if this was housed stateside or extended U? V. Adams answered stateside; C. Wyels recalled data showing 870 majors in program, yet other data studies show that 10% of these will enter graduate programs;
		6. J. Leafstedt recalled starting out our meeting with concerns in terms of number of tenure track hiring, yet this MA would command significant other resources; asked Senate if we are looking to pass the academic content of this and then place in AMP for when resources become available – may get stuck in a “black-hole”;
		7. M. Soltys observed that if the psychology program thinks they can do it with the resources they have, then why should other restrictions be placed?
9. Due to time constraints, remaining agenda items tabled – J. Grier suggested that any questions or other feedback be emailed to her;
10. Meeting adjourned at 4:31pm