**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

1500 Del Norte

Tuesday, April 18, 2017; 2:30-4:30 pm

Attendees (72): Adams, Virgil; Adler, Mary; Alamillo, José; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Sean; Anderson, Stacey; Andrzejewski, Sue; Aquino, Bryn; Balén, Julia; Banuelos, Selenne; Buhl, Geoffrey W; Burriss, Catherine; Castillo, Heather; Cook, Matt; Dean, Michelle; Delaney, Colleen Marie; Dilly, Geoff; Downey, Dennis J.; Evans Taylor, Genevieve; Flores, Cynthia; Francois, Marie; Gillespie, Blake; Grier, Jeanne; Griffin, John; Grzegorczyk, Ivona; Hampton, Phil; Hannans, Jaime A; Harris, Colleen; Hoffman, Debi; Kelly, Sean Q; Kenny Feister, Megan; Leafstedt, Jill; Lee, Sohui; Liu, KuanFen; Martinez, James; Matjas, Luke; Meriwether, Jim; Murphy, Paul; Nevins, Colleen M; Ornelas-Higdon, Julia; Patsch, Kiki; Pereira, Monica; Perchuk, Alison; Pilarczyk, Pawel; Pinkley, Janet; Quintero, Elizabeth; Rodriguez, Don; Sanchez, Luis; Schmidhauser, Tom; Smith, Christina; Soltys, Michael; Soper, Rachel; Sowers, Elizabeth; Stratton, Stephen; Thoms, Brian; Trimble-O’Connor, Lindsey; Veldman, Brittnee; Weis, Chuck; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy; Yudelson, John;

1. Approval of the Agenda
   1. Meeting called to order at 2:30pm;
2. Approval of the Minutes of Mar. 28, 2017
   1. C. Wyels noted that we have a time certain at 3:30pm, along with a full agenda today; no objections to approving agenda or minutes;
3. Report from the Provost
   1. B. Hartung, in D. Wakelee’s stead, gave presentation on data indicating trends in faculty hiring: highlighted that we have 19 new colleagues joining us in the Fall (applause); noted that only two of our searches this year failed, in Health Science and English; further highlighted demographic slides, with credit to Anna Tovar for graphics; summarized that in 2014, 17 new tenure track faculty joined CI, in 2015, 14, in 2016, 17, and this coming year, 19; more information about what our demographics by rank data will look like are forthcoming in the Fall; identified trend that CI is becoming a university that is majority female within tenure track faculty; this matches national trends with women completing more terminal degrees; CI is paying closer attention to diversity, and progress is being made in this area; with regard to tenure density, CI is the lowest in the CSU, and it is dropping systemwide; CSU student tuition is going up, but it’s unclear yet what it will mean for the campus; Currently CI has 134 tenure track faculty and 319 lecturers, for a total of 453 faculty; the plan for next year is to recruit 13 or 14 positions, some of which are replacements;
   2. Announced that The March for Science is coming this Saturday, and CFA is sponsoring a shuttle; encouraged attendance in an effort to highlight the support for science amid observed cuts to this discipline;
4. Report from Statewide Senator
   1. S. Aloisio noted that Statewide Senate has not met since last Senate meeting; reminded that J. Yudelson is on Faculty Affairs Committee for Statewide, while Simone serves on Academic Affairs; regarding the tenure density topic, suggested that another helpful metric is data for the number of students per tenure track faculty, which would give indications of capacity versus number of units; noted that all CSU campuses get the same amount of money per student; commented that CI has the biggest gap due to our own prioritization;
   2. J. Yudelson noted that the topic of intellectual property will be discussed via teleconference this Friday; will also report on the upcoming report from Tenure Density Task Force; summarized that if half of CSU’s lecturer faculty became tenure track, it would boost tenure density to 65%;
5. Report from CFA President
   1. J. Griffin noted that the CFA-sponsored shuttle has 15 spots for the March for Science this Saturday for the Santa Barbara event;
   2. Announced that the CFA Executive Board has approved a $2000 donation to the CI Food Pantry, which will carry them through the end of the term (applause); encouraged all to consider donating non-perishable items;
   3. Recalled that CFA participated in the Lobby Day, to confer with state representatives; referred to AB1464 that speaks directly to the issue of tenure track density; the bill mentions a lofty goal of 75% tenure track density on May 9th CFA will have a luncheon to show solidarity and support for one another;
6. Report from the Senate Chair
   1. C. Wyels recalled that the Chancellor’s Office (CO) has solicited feedback regarding a proposed intellectual property policy, GE policy, and the Ethnic Studies Report – please see the Senate Blog, and send emailed feedback to D. Wakelee by the end of finals week;
   2. Faculty Visible Service Loads (via PowerPoint): noted that we are grateful to lecturers who serve, but they are not obligated; however, tenure track faculty have a 3-WTU obligation to serve; highlighted some of the issues that have been problematic, in terms of new faculty and junior faculty service levels; many are also engaged in faculty searches; when combined with Senate committees, University committees and task forces, faculty have high workloads: assistant professors average 2.6 committees each; associate professors average 3.1 committees, while full professors average 3.8 committees each; requested offline feedback (e.g. during Office Hour, to Senate Exec member, etc.) as to whether continued tracking is important, whether we need to reduce commitments, and if so where, and how collectively to understand the relative importance of roles;
   3. Senate Officer Elections: congratulations to S. Stratton who will serve as Vice Chair, and K. Tollefson will be the new Secretary; thanks extended for willingness to take on work of leading faculty in our primary shared governance role; noted that bylaws state that only nominations may be voted on, and only those accepted by the April 1st deadline; discussion today on amendments to the bylaws, in New Business section 8(d);
   4. Guidelines for Debate:
      1. *Bylaws-mandated guidelines*: Senators must be recognized before beginning to speak; senators may speak only twice to the same motion on the same day, and may speak no more than five minutes; debate of a motion must be relevant to the motion; [ad hominen](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ad+hominem) statements are forbidden;
      2. *Spirit of debate*: Clarity and brevity critical – these strengthen your argument and demonstrate respect for your colleagues; providing evidence for your claims is good practice and helps those with less background on a matter understand your argument as well; value of first and second readings is that ideally senators read prior to first reading, listen and ask questions during first reading, inform themselves more as necessary during the three-week interim, then debate and vote during second reading;
      3. *Full agenda*: clarity and brevity even more critical for all the policies on agenda to receive the consideration the proposers wish;
   5. Coffee/ Office Hour: Tuesday, Apr. 25th 2:30-3:30pm in the SUB patio;
7. Continuing Business
   1. \*Proposed Academic Renewal Policy (SAPP)
      1. Background: P. Murphy introduced this second reading, recalling that one of the things that came up is that five years have to go by; this policy addresses traumatic situations and give students a second chance if necessary;
      2. Discussion: S. Anderson commented that he was not convinced policy was needed, as students can already withdraw from classes; E. Guerrero replied that the idea was to align this to the existing Executive Order, highlighting the clause that it is “not intended to improve the GPA beyond what is necessary to graduate”;
      3. C. Wyels requested a call for a vote; M. Francois moved, V. Adams seconded;
      4. VOTE, no objection to a show of hands; majority in favor, policy was approved;
   2. \*Proposed Cross-Listing Policy (Curriculum)
      1. Background: B. Gillespie spoke to the policy and need for the policy in response to problems coordinating cross-listed courses;
      2. Amendment: L. Trimble-O’Connor proposed that the applicability section be changed to replace interdisciplinary with cross-listed courses; B. Gillespie agreed; I. Grzegorczyk commented that both are relevant; C. Burriss made a motion for the word change as L. Trimble-O’Connor stated; S. Aloisio seconded; C. Wyels asked for any objections to that motion; no objections, motion was approved;
      3. Discussion resumed with questions as follows: 1) S. Anderson asked about section 9 & 10—what if one program wishes to pull out, does the course have to go back through the curricular process again; 2) S. Anderson also asked about program review given that programs have different review cycles; J. Balén clarified that this proposal confirms only two program areas, moving forward, S. Stratton confirmed; 3) A. Perchuk reiterated her concern for limiting cross-listings to only two courses; T. Hunt (student representative) agreed with this concern, feels it could take something away from classes; J. Balén noted that while collaboration is wonderful, some courses are more primarily focused in one area than another, and the proposal does not address this; C. Harris responded that multiple listings create concerns about depth of disciplinary knowledge in the courses; A. Perchuk responded that these are curricular design issues that could be addressed in response to the course proposal by the committee; B. Gillespie responded to the questions in the order listed above: 1) Yes, it would have to go back through the curriculum process; 2) Yes, different program review scales present a problem, but some sort of process needs to be in place for evaluation; needs a time scale to activate the process; 3) programs can require courses outside the major, which can be a way to bring in interdisciplinary content through other means; M. Francois added on behalf of people on the committee who are not faculty—multiple listings on courses are a lot of work for analysts and staff and create considerable burden; C. Harris moved to vote; G. Buhl seconded;
      4. VOTE: 32 in Favor – 15 Opposed – 5 Abstain; policy was approved;
8. New Business
   1. \*Proposed revision of SP14-18, Policy on Centers and Institutes (CC&I)
      1. Motion called to discuss, M. Francois so moved, C. Burriss seconded;
      2. Background: C. Nevins noted that all CC&I committee members are present at Senate; referred to proposed revisions starting on Page 8, proposing a change to III(c), and also on Page 9 regarding the reporting deadline changing to October 15th of each year; revisions remove duplication of work;
      3. Discussion: M. Francois observed the reporting deadline change to October on Page 9; given that the annual composition of the committee is new in October, suggested that it could be due at the end of the academic year; S. Anderson noted that centers/ institutes are normally fiscally neutral or fiscally positive, but often need initial startup funding to achieve these targets – asked if the committee would consider adding “after the first year” to allow for such transition, suggested that “all centers and institutes” should be subject to this;
   2. \*Proposed revision of SP14-09 Policy on Academic Disqualification (SAPP)
      1. Motion called to discuss, G. Buhl so moved, D. Hoffman seconded;
      2. Background: P. Murphy summarized that currently our policy on campus uses the language of “will be disqualified” automatically if certain criteria are not met; this proposal adds flexibility by changing the language to “may be subject to,” due to freshmen and transfers that may have trouble adjusting to college;
   3. \*Proposed Policy on Priority & Scheduling of Registration (SAPP)
      1. Motion called to discuss, G. Buhl so moved, M. Cook seconded;
      2. Background: P. Murphy introduced policy, noting that we don’t currently have a policy in place for this; currently there are two groups of priority, some of which are required by external agencies, such as individuals with disabilities and foster youths; SAPP discussed and purposefully left in “intercollegiate sports” so that Senate would have the opportunity to discuss, even though CI does not currently have intercollegiate sports;
      3. Discussion: S. Clark asked for the rationale behind intercollegiate student priority, and also noted the NCAA is not the only sports association; M. Cook observed that it might be inherently unfair to exclude registration for others, wondering if Enrollment Management has or will provide any feedback to SAPP, potentially to pilot this first; T. Hunt asked why student athletes would have priority registration while student leaders do not;
   4. \*Proposed Senate Bylaws revision, Senate Officer elections (Senate Exec)
      1. M. Cook moved to discuss; S. Aloisio moved to waive the first reading, J. Yudelson seconded; C. Wyels reminded that according to bylaws, a motion to waive a first reading is debatable but not amendable; requires a two-thirds majority; S. Aloisio added that the motion is needed to get this business taken care of before the close of this academic year;
      2. VOTE on motion to waive first reading and move to second reading: 40 in Favor – 7 Opposed; motion to move to a second reading passes;
      3. C. Wyels added that revisions to the bylaws also require a two-thirds majority;
      4. Discussion: A. Perchuk asked to consider if there are broader structural problems that got us to this stateat play; recalled given that there were several calls with no nominations, why would we expect that building in additional calls would be advisablemay not be fruitful; S. Stratton recalled that we as Senate Officers Exec were unsure ourselveswas similarly concerned, which was the rationale behind the addedand added the clause that Exec would appoint a willing person if no nominations are made; C. Wyels summarized this clause, noting that it would limit the pool of candidates to current members of Senate Exec; C. Harris asked why the Vice Chair doesn’t assume the position; C. Wyels clarified that this occurs when the Chair position has been vacated, not when no chair is nominated; M. Adler added that Senate Exec considered this issue, and came to the decision that the Vice Chair shouldn’t be bumped up into a starting position that he didn’t self-nominate for; C. Burriss commented that this hasn’t happened before, and probably several factors contributing, but this is part of the awareness and intensification of urgency in this process; J. Grier added that this amendment offers a short term fix, and Senate may consider a longer term solution such as extending the terms for the chair beyond one year; further discussion and clarifications on the stated process, management and timeline;
      5. B. Gillespie motioned to vote, L. Sanchez seconded;
      6. VOTE on bylaw amendments: 38 in Favor – 10 Opposed, motion passes;
   5. \*Proposed Policy on General Education Course Characteristics (Gen Ed)
      1. Motion called to discuss,, A. Perchuk so moved, C. Nevins seconded;
      2. Background: G. Buhl discussed the GE program review process, including the self-study results and feedback from external reviewers, whose report was provided to the Continuous Improvement Committee; three points relevant to the current policy: a) state law Title V says that you have to have 12 units of Arts & Humanities units – currently our multicultural requirements live in Area C, and right now there are many courses in that area that are not Arts & Humanities, so our current system is not aligned with state law; b) EO 1100 gives sub category designations, and C2 (Humanities), B3 and B4 are out of alignment on our campus; c) includes changes to Area E to allow GE credit for some of the innovations at CI, such as international courses; articulation officers B. Buller and J. Rizzoli identified areas that did not have secondary designation aligning with our mission centers, so this aligns with our mission centers as well;
      3. S. Aloisio asked why additional graduation requirements aren’t in GE; added that he liked the approach, but that it could be two policies, one for lower division and one for upper division; observed that Area E doesn’t appear to be as aligned with CO recommendations, concerned that this category could lead to having any class associated with any description; M. Francois added that if you look at EO 1100 our policy is much closer aligned; J. Rizzoli respectfully disagreed and felt that Area E is aligned with CO guidelines; J. Alamillo noted that in C3-B the new language is more inclusive and does not omit sexuality, wanted to add indigenous status to this to recognize Native American heritage; A. Perchuk added that when she teaches a class on Islamic History, it is about multiculturalism and internationalism, the question is where this would fit into a GE structure, and there may be other classes out there that might be adrift; asked about whether the language that “each of these courses will involve students in critical thinking and collaborative work” would require faculty to have students perform collaborative work when it may not be appropriate from a pedagogical standpoint;
   6. \*Proposed Policy on General Education Course Requiremetns (Gen Ed)
      1. Background: G. Buhl summarized comments received from external reviewers, noting that there is not a consistent standard for all of our GE courses, and beyond meeting category description, we have not imposed any other requirements on programs in offering GE courses; reviewers thought that this contributed to the unwieldy number of GE courses; as such, the GE committee has outlined requirements, such as having two full time faculty members be available to teach, that GE learning outcomes are provided; further noted that the two-thirds of students who transfer in receive only 9 units of upper division GE, a significant portion being interdisciplinary; current policy opens up the upper division GE to select from any of the mission pillars, noting that this was a recommendation from the committee; J. Rizzoli added that this has been overdue; A. Perchuk asked if we will be supporting lecturer faculty as they get to be GE certified and how we enforce writing intensive courses, especially for low enrollment programs; C. Burriss observed in item number 9 that this wording might be problematic, because there are several programs that do not have chairs; also the removal of upper division GE courses from major requirements would also be problematic; C. Wyels reminded that GE can receive amendments and feedback during this first reading;
9. Extended Announcements (up to 5 min. each) – Time Certain, 3:30pm
   1. \*Insight 2017: Brittany Grice and Pilar Pacheco
      1. B. Grice summarized that Insight was started last year in response to students involved with SCAN, thus creating an intentional platform; P. Pacheco added that this event directly ties to our mission statement, i.e. to learn about communities and their larger civic responsibilities; in doing so we hope to empower students to use this knowledge for a more just and equitable world; displayed and played the video at the following link: <http://courses.lunajimenezseminars.com/courses/transformational-communication>
   2. \*Potential changes to bus service to campus: Ray Porras
      1. Presentation by R. Porras: summarized that he and his team have been identifying ways to reduce cost while expanding our service; noted that existing service is 30 minutes from MetroLink and one hour from Oxnard station; data show ridership decreases on Saturdays, so large buses are in use with many vacant seats; displayed ways of adjusting bus availability and schedules to provide greater service to campus, in particular to those housed on campus during weekends; they will be taking two large buses out of service during these non-peak times, resulting in a one-time cost reduction of over $100K; please contact R. Porras with additional feedback; V. Adams asked if this will affect summer school schedules – reply from R. Porras was that he wasn’t sure, but to please send this feedback to him, and that way he and his team can advocate with VCTC;
10. Reports from Senate Committees (*As Needed*)

* General Education (Gen Ed) – no report
* Curriculum (CC) – no report
* Faculty Affairs (FAC) – no report
* Fiscal Policies – (FP) no report
* Committee on Committees (CoC)– C. Delaney recalled that the list of nominations have gone out, asked current committee chairs to check committee lists for any openings that need to be filled; D. Hoffman noted that she has now been granted additional Blackboard permissions to facilitate nominations;
* Professional Leave – no report
* Mini-Grant Review – C. Harris noted that we will be seeing the mini-grant application announcement in a few days;
* Centers & Institutes (CC&I) – C. Nevins noted that there was a recent call for an open CIS directorship, and these emails can be directed to her;
* Student Academic Policies & Procedures (SAPP) – no report

1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
   1. None
2. Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQ)
   1. None
3. Announcements (no more than 2 min. each)
   1. Food Pantry Donation Request (P. Pacheco)
   2. H. Castillo – Arts Under The Stars coming on May 5th at 7:30pm at El Dorado Park;
   3. J. Balén – “Facts Matter” will be held next Tuesday;
   4. J. Yudelson – offered thanks to D. Daniels for his admin support and note taking during Senate;
4. Adjourn
   1. Meeting adjourned at 4:22pm.

\*Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the [Senate webpage](http://senate.csuci.edu/meetingdates.htm))