**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

1500 Del Norte

Tuesday, May 9, 2017; 2:30-4:30 pm

Attendees (69): Adams, Virgil; Adler, Mary; Alamillo, José; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Sean; Aquino, Bryn; Balén, Julia; Bañuelos, Selenne; Buhl, Geoffrey W; Burriss, Catherine; Cook, Matt; Dean, Michelle; Delaney, Colleen Marie; 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; Lopez-Lopez, Margarita; 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 2:29pm; motion to amend agenda to add Senate resolutions in appreciation of B. Hartung and D. Wakelee; no objections to move to item #3;
2. Approval of the Minutes of April 18, 2017
	1. Minutes approved with no objections.
3. New Business
	1. Proposed resolution SR16-03 (Senate Exec)
		1. Move to waive resolutions 16-03 and 16-04 to second reading;
		2. Voice vote, motion passes;
		3. Read aloud Senate resolution 16-03; Resolution passed by acclamation; hearty ovation.
	2. Proposed resolution SR16-04 (Senate Exec)
		1. Read aloud the Senate resolution; Resolution passed by acclamation; standing ovation.
4. Report from the Provost
	1. D. Wakelee offered thanks to all who were involved in the Sage Research Forum, pleased to see over 500 people here on Saturday;
	2. Announced that, in consultation with deans, the Provost Office has approved 14 new faculty searches in the fall; one of these includes a replacement position for M. McThomas, who accepted a position at UC Irvine;
	3. Announced that candidates are coming for AVP of Faculty Affairs position, please take the opportunity to meet them and provide feedback;
	4. Please attend Commencement, which is our opportunity to support our students, some of whom are first generation graduates; noted that extra gowns are available from the Provost Office if needed;
	5. Reminded that Honors Convocation is this Saturday, gowns also available;
5. Report from the Asst. Provost: Tenure-Track Faculty Composition; Faculty 180 and RTP ePortfolios
	1. B. Hartung introduced her report, as promised this actually goes back to part of D. Wakelee’s report from last time; useful to review this data again, reviewed the ethnicity and gender information, observing that our tenure-track faculty will be predominantly female come this fall; graphs show that our tenure-track faculty are getting more diverse;
	2. Displayed slide looking at instructional faculty only, in terms of tenure density trends; noted that we never know what these numbers look like Fall over Fall, and we won’t know until contracts are signed; in 2014 we had a jump of 8% in lecturer faculty; with current enrollments being fairly flat, assuming a 2% growth; summarized that we are improving our tenure density, but it’s a slow creep upwards, as it takes a lot to move this needle;
	3. Announced that RTP is going paperless, but not immediately; Faculty Affairs spent a lot of time reviewing different products to move the process online; we chose Faculty 180; then later received a call that Interfolio just bought Faculty 180; thanked Neil Fisch and IT for helping navigate through the IT procurement process; summarized that we will be able to launch Faculty 180 for volunteers in the Fall; noted that starting in Fall 2018, all incoming faculty will use this online portal and will be asked to submit their portfolio via this method;
6. Report from Statewide Senators
	1. J. Yudelson recalled his work on the Commission for Extended Education, noting that the topic of supplanting came up (coursework put into Extended-Ed that should part of statewide programs); summarized that administrators heard our concerns; Yudelson may serve as the chair of this committee beginning in the Fall;
	2. S. Aloisio recalled his work on tenure density; recalled data from 1998 where the system tenure density was 80%; the temporary pool was intended for assigned time; by this model CI should have over 200 tenure track faculty, which sounds a bit absurd to say now, but the current situation would have been thought absurd in 1998; added that if we can plan for new buildings and incoming numbers of students, then we can plan for tenure density; recommended that we should be the first campus with such a plan going forward since we have the lowest tenure density in the system;
7. Report from CFA President
	1. J. Griffin recalled that CFA has been fighting to get more money into the CSU budget to support more tenure track faculty; is taking issue with salary increases for administrators and the number of administrators; one thing faculty can do is to go on the CFA website (http://www.calfac.org/) and write a letter, urging senators to send a letter to the governor to let him know that the CSU needs more financial backing; recommended the “equity interrupted”

document on this site; noted that incoming demographics show that as our campuses become more diverse, they are receiving less funding; although this is no one person’s fault, the state has the power to do something to fix this;

1. Report from the Senate Chair
	1. Reminded that there are opportunities for faculty feedback on several topics, as previously announced, and please check the blog for the ethnic studies and the intellectual property reports;
	2. Displayed data on our visible faculty service roles, will be presenting on this on Monday to Cabinet; requested feedback;
	3. Announced that Senate committee elections are underway, deadline to vote is 5pm this coming Monday;
	4. Noted that there are forthcoming changes in academic preparation, adding that you can substitute “college readiness” for this term; these will come via Early Start programs, high school quantitative reasoning requirements, and developmental education; these will have an aspirational deadline of Fall 2018, but this means the corresponding curriculum deadline is Oct 2017; summarized that our campus is fairly well positioned in some respects – you’ll be hearing the statement “all students need to be in credit-bearing courses”; we’re expecting short-term actions on these, and you’ll find the Academic Preparation FAQ by using that search term at the CO website
	5. Reminded that our bylaws specify that senators must be recognized before speaking; other tips on spirit of debate: issues may be contentious, but how we debate them does not need to be;

8a. Report from the Senate Vice Chair

 - S. Stratton recognized C. Wyels for her service as Senate Chair (applause!)

1. Continuing Business
	1. \*Proposed revision of SP14-18, Policy on Centers and Institutes (CC&I)
		1. S. Anderson thanked committee for clarifying questions on definitions;
		2. VOTE: 51 In Favor – 3 Opposed – 10 Abstain; policy was approved;
	2. \*Proposed revision of SP14-09 Policy on Academic Disqualification (SAPP)
		1. No objections to moving to a vote;
		2. VOTE: 46 In Favor – 5 Opposed – 9 Abstain; policy was approved;
	3. \*Proposed Policy on Priority & Scheduling of Registration (SAPP)
		1. Update that students participating in intercollegiate sports was removed from the priority list; no objections to voting on the policy;
		2. VOTE: 49 In Favor – 4 Opposed – 10 Abstain; policy was approved;
	4. \*Proposed Policy on General Education Course Characteristics (Gen Ed)
		1. Discussion: M. Cook read aloud a statement on behalf of the CIS director, who is in support, noting that our UDIGE currently has no process that identifies and encourages interdisciplinary courses, and this policy will allow for such a process; M. Soltys understands the need to update GE policies, and was grateful for the perspectives provided by G. Buhl, but expressed concern that removing criteria met by COMP 101 may adversely affect Computer Science, which has six full-time lecturers and serves 800 students; S. Kelly commented that after serving on GI 2025 steering committee,
		2. it’s clear that GE needs change, because it is currently problematic for our students; these guidelines aren’t set in stone, and we can come back to them and change them, and let’s also trust G. Buhl and M. Francois to have our students’ interests in mind; T. Hunt added that students feel that COMP 101 is one of the most important courses they take on campus; C. Delaney added that as a former committee member of GE, has concerns about the definition of multiculturalism, seems to be focused on social justice, would like to see a broader definition that includes Anthropology; I. Grzegorczyk added that the definition does not include religion or an expanded definition of multiculturalism and is concerned that Math doesn’t fit anywhere, and would that mean that students have to take additional courses; C. Harris noted that she is on GE for the first time, worked really hard to be aware of how things are programmed, the focus should be how can GE can serve our students, but that the policy shouldn’t pre-program it on behalf of our instructional programs; A. Perchuk thanked GE for their work, in particular G. Buhl and M. Francois, echoed concerns about some of the Mission Centers, observed that the policy is very U.S.-centered, concerned that this excludes courses that include history of global cultures; A. Jimenez spoke in favor of the policy, as it supports the mission centers, which were created to support the mission, and it’s important that we infuse and charge the curriculum with the mission via this policy; José Alamillo added that he doesn’t see how multiculturalism takes away from social justice or vice versa, and the statewide Ethnic Studies report echoes this language—noted that at the last council meeting they mention that a lot of institutions are moving in this direction, we should follow suit; C. Burriss spoke in favor, feels it goes a long way towards creating flexible and transparent systems that students can understand; G. Buhl observed that although B4 is changing, it does not mean that in GE the current B4 do not have a place, and that COMP 101 does have a place in GE, but our current structure is not in line with the EO, which needs to be fixed; he offered thanks to S. Anderson, adding that it is not a perfect policy, but this is the committee’s best effort to better integrate with our mission and with the EO and applicable laws; M. Soltys commented that it’s not a question of resources for COMP alone, wants to ensure that CI has the mechanisms in place to keep this going strong and to support national trends, so as not to lose the students who benefit from COMP101; J. Rizzoli noted that POLS 150 will now be in Area D starting AY17-18; B. Bleicher observed that Area E was concerning, some courses go through changes over time; M. Francois replied that our old Area E had a different definition, what is now Area E is the full definition as provided in the EO; the old category is included in the broader category and in the current language, so it broadens but doesn’t diminish; S. Anderson observed bullet on CCE, page 10, seems like if someone is getting credit there would be no choice but to proceed with the service learning component – reply from G. Buhl that this is straight from Senate policy; I. Grzegorczyk recalled previous debates on computer literacy, this was added as a result aka “shall be a course taken by CI students,” worried that the consequence is that they come later to math or other classes and don’t have computer skills, also notes that the language lists financial literacy not not computer literacy; seems that this policy may need additional work based on concerns;
		3. I. Grzegorczyk moved to return to committee; Debate on this motion:
			1. S. Kelly cautioned that if we send this back to committee, we are essentially saying that we want to put this off another year; agreed that there may be issues, yes, but does not think we want to kill this policy; I. Grzegorczyk asked how does postponing this adversely affect us; S. Anderson replied that in effect it is killing this for a year, because we have to set our curriculum before then; J. Grier observed that this policy is not set to begin until Fall 2019, so time would be allowed to plan for a transition; G. Buhl summarized that GE applied significant modifications in response to faculty comments, adding that comments that are new as of today of course have yet to be implemented; B. Bleicher added that it does sound like there’s enough word-smithing in the room to indicate that it’s not quite done;
			2. M. Cook called the question, i.e. ending debate on the motion to return to committee;
			3. VOTE to end debate on motion (need a two-thirds majority): 54 In Favor – 7 Opposed – 1 Abstain;
			4. We now vote on the motion to return this to committee (effectively killing it for a year);
			5. VOTE on the motion to return to committee: 19 In Favor – 43 Opposed; motion fails; debate will be continued;
		4. S. Aloisio suggested to offer an amendment in Cat-E; after the words “financial literacy” would like to add “technological literacy” to address M. Soltys’ feedback; accepted as a friendly amendment by GE Committee members; A. Perchuk suggested to add “for courses in languages other than English”; S. Anderson suggested a friendly amendment on page 10 to strike three words (“Whether…or not”), in category CE, such that it now reads “service learning is required”;
		5. Motion to call the question, seconded; G. Wood noted that calling the question is not debatable, this motion requires two-thirds majority for approval, and, if achieved, we would vote immediately on the policy;
		6. VOTE to call the question: 52 In Favor – 10 Opposed. Motion passes.
		7. VOTE on the proposal itself: 47 In Favor – 14 Opposed – 1 Abstain; proposal is approved.
	5. \*Proposed Policy on General Education Course Requirements (Gen Ed)
		1. Discussion: A. Perchuk made four observations: first, there is nothing in the EO that precludes upper division courses having an Area A designation; second, the idea of a waiver is problematic, what if a waiver is not granted, in particular for courses integral for a major’s survival; third, has concerns about the section referring to lecturer training; fourth, her historical course enrollment is low, no more than 20 students, but if it were not for GE she wouldn’t be able to have offered to have these classes at all; J. Rizzoli noted that EO says 12 units, this policy includes Area E, which is not included in EO; J. Griffin repeated the concern that for lecturer faculty, this policy appears to indicate a requirement, which could lead to grievance from CFA if compensations are not made; I. Grzegorczyk posed two questions: first, that it looks like science and math courses do not fit very well in these categories as defined, does this mean these disciplines should not have upper division courses; second, asked what it means that someone is GE-certified to teach a course, who decides and how are faculty to account for a GE certification in a timely manner such as late lecturer hires;
		2. I. Grzegorczyk made a friendly amendment to strike the first sentence to remove the language about “GE certification”; S. Aloisio objected to this; C. Wyels noted that this is now a motion that needs a second, J. Yudelson seconded;
			1. Discussion on the motion: S. Aloisio added questions about the timing of having two qualified faculty members to teach the course (when the course is offered, when it goes into the catalog, etc.), doesn’t think it’s good for our campus, would like to strike entire point number 14; G. Buhl indicated his agreement with striking GE certified, although each program would need to provide faculty qualified to teach the course;
			2. I. Grzegorczyk noted her original intention was to strike the whole sentence, and at this point withdrew her amendment;
		3. S. Aloisio moved to strike all of item 14; GE committee accepted this as a friendly amendment; Item 14 was removed.
		4. L. Trimble-O’Connor referred to a moratorium on new UDGIE classes, can’t find this anywhere in this policy, asked if a yes vote on this mean a stop to UDIGE classes; B. Bleicher recalled that Liberal Studies has been trying for the last three years to get a waiver; they have built in courses that currently satisfy GE, potential for a waiver not to be approved would be problematic;
		5. A. Perchuk proposed a change to section 2 language: to strike all but the first sentence, and change the first sentence from “General Education courses are expected” to “It is recommended that GE courses satisfy the following set of requirements”; GE Committee accepted this as a friendly amendment; J. Grier commented then why do we need a policy for this, with these changes in place it seems more like a resolution, because a policy is supposed to dictate what we need to do; C. Harris observed that we are already not complying with any GE standards, and with these amendments we continue on the path;
		6. S. Aloisio moved to strike point 12 (“General Education courses must be offered every year”), explaining that that it’s a burden financially and we don’t offer GE courses every year;
			1. Seconded. Discussion on the motion: M. Francois observed that if a student fails a course in one year, and then they’re not able to take it again, it’s a barrier to the student, this was a point made by the external reviewers as well, that we’re standing in the way of student rights; C. Burriss thought that the policy was designed to make things easier for students and in light of GI 2025 goals, is satisfied from the perspective of a small program;
			2. VOTE on motion to strike item 12 within the policy: 18 In Favor – 28 Opposed – 5 Abstain; Item 12 remains;
		7. S. Aloisio motion to strike item 11 (“Upper-division courses may not exceed more than 25 percent of the total number of General Education courses”), explained that the 25% is arbitrary;
			1. Seconded. Discussion on the motion: G. Buhl replied that if you look at the 23 campuses, the average is 19%... in our campus currently, it’s over 60%, which is too high and was also mentioned by outside reviewers; J. Grier asked, would it be possible if a program would need to add a UDIGE that they would also need to propose three undergrad courses to achieve a 25% balance? I. Grzegorczyk replied that the campus may not be able to add a course from a small program; C. Harris the current problem is that everyone is adding upper division courses, if everything can be done in GE asked, how are we addressing the lower division;
			2. VOTE on motion to strike item 11 within the policy: 23 In Favor – 26 Opposed – 1 Abstain; Item 11 remains;
		8. S. Kelly called the question to vote on the policy, seconded by A. Perchuk;
			1. VOTE on calling the question, which would close discussion on the policy (need two-thirds): 28 In Favor – 16 Opposed – 4 Abstain; Debate continues.
		9. J. Rizzoli that in order to make the policy fully consistent with the EO, suggested B through D change from B through E, on two places in the background; GE Committee accepted as friendly amendment;
		10. A. Jimenez spoke on item 10, would like to add language specifically to UNIV 392 courses, which vary from one to three credits, this is important in regard to duration and cost of these trips; would like to add “any exception must be approved by the GE committee”; GE Committee accepted friendly amendment;
		11. L. O’Connor spoke on item 11, clarifying who it applied to; M. Francois replied that this is talking about all programs, the chief recommendation was to not accept any new GE courses next year; L. O’Connor clarified that the moratorium is happening regardless, answer is Yes;
		12. Request to check for quorum made; Senate Exec officers confirmed that quorum was still met;
		13. Motion on the floor to call the question (seconded):
			1. VOTE on calling the question, which would close discussion on the policy (need two-thirds): objection by B. Bleicher and others who had hands raised for discussion and were not called upon before question was called;
			2. 30 In Favor – 12 Opposed; motion to move to vote approved;
		14. VOTE on policy: 24 In Favor – 11 Opposed – 4 Abstain; policy was approved;
2. Fiscal Policies Report
	1. C. Burriss displayed PowerPoint; summarized that we now have historical staffing in the budget request; moving to a global one-campus approach to budgeting; President Beck is in support of this long range planning and downstream actions; recommendations by FP: changes to FPC composition (requiring revision of Senate bylaws); r longer term limits, a 3-year term for FPC; that prior chair serve as ex-officio for the following year; that a support staff member be appointed (a program-level analyst);
3. Reports from Senate Committees (*As Needed*)
* General Education (Gen Ed) – *No report*
* Curriculum – *No report*
* Faculty Affairs (FAC) – *No report*
* Fiscal Policies – *as reported in item 10.*
* Committee on Committees – *No report*
* Professional Leave – *No report*
* Mini-Grant Review – *No report*
* Centers & Institutes (CC&I) – *No report*
* Student Academic Policies & Procedures (SAPP) – *No report*
1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
	1. None
2. Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQ)
	1. J. Balén asked if we can somehow look into how to better share information on campus;
	2. B. Aquino: Can the finals schedule be reconsidered so that the finals for M/W and T/Th 7.30a courses occur on a day the course typically meets and in the vicinity of the same time, as is the case for all other courses?  Currently T/Th 7.30a finals are scheduled for Friday 3.30p and M/W for Friday 8a.  As we grow and need to fully utilize longer class days, this will begin to affect more and more students and faculty and may pose significant issues for both students who work and faculty with multiple commitments (especially those who also teach elsewhere);
3. Announcements (no more than 2 min. each)
	1. Policy on Systemwide Smoke and Tobacco Free Environment; EO1108 (Paul Murphy)
		1. Tabled due to time constraints;
4. Presentation: potential campus solar energy project (Erik Blaine and John Gormley)
	1. Moved up to item 11; J. Gormley announced that the system is working on a new EO making all campuses smoke free, coming in September; aiming to do this on the Monday after the second week; is here today to talk about solar energy on campus; there are multiple state laws with guidelines on green energy; CI has been looking at this over the last decade, because we own a co-generation plant, there was an existing agreement when this campus was still a hospital; the cost of solar has since significantly decreased; the PPA agreement terminates next April, at that point the worst case scenario is our power plant shuts down and we buy from the grid in some percentage; we have a challenge for solar with our sloped mission style roofing, so we’ve been looking at carports and other paved surfaces, we use 1-3 Megawatts at peak demand; we have the potential in North part of campus to potentially produce 8-10 Megawatts of energy; CSU system has an MEA that prequalifies solar vendors, who will bid on this; CI wants to include battery storage, to store the excess energy created; we are assessing energy demands now versus 5-10 years in the future;
5. Additional announcements:
	1. D. Wakelee read aloud that the School of Business has received accreditation;
	2. C. Burriss announced that PA production for the Fall will be holding auditions this week;
6. Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

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