



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
Del Norte 1500
Tuesday, October 7, 2014
2:30-4:30

Attendees: Virgil Adams, Mary Adler, Jose Alamillo, Simone Aloisio, Susan Andrzejewski, Julia Balen, Frank Barajas, Michael Berman, AJ Bieszczad, Bob Bleicher, Geoffrey Buhl, Catherine Burriss, Karen Carey, Nien-Tsu (Nancy) Chen, Stephen Clark, Matt Cook, LaSonya Davis-Smith, Nancy Deans, Colleen Delaney, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Cynthia Flores, Marie Francois, Jorge Garcia, John Gormley, Jeanne Grier, Andrea Grove, Phil Hampton, Jaime Hannans, Colleen Harris-Keith, Beth Hartung, Debbi Hoffman, Gayle Hutchinson, Tiina Itkonen, Dax Jacobson, Jacob Jenkins, Karen Jensen, Antonio Jimenez-Jimenez, Gary Kinsey, Kathleen Klompfen, Jill Leafstedt, Priscilla Liang, Jennie Luna, Carol Mack, Chris Mattia, Mary McThomas, Jim Meriwether, Jen Miller, Andrew Morris, Colleen Nevins, Monica Pereira, Jenn Perry, Janet Pinkley, Toni Rice, Christina Salazar, Sofia Samatar, Luis Sanchez, Tom Schmidhauser, Elizabeth Sowers, Stephen Stratton, Genevieve Taylor, Brian Thomas, Ysabel Trinidad, Brittnee Veldman, Dan Wakelee, Amy Wallace, Greg Wood, Cindy Wyels, Alex Yepez, John Yudelson

Called to order at 2:33pm

1. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. No objections. Approved as is.
2. Approval of the Minutes of September 16, 2014
 - a. No amendments. Approved as is.
3. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
 - a. Thanked the group for their letters and cards and flowers at a very important time. From the heart, made her feel as if she's a part of the community. Was able to see her mother before she passed.
 - b. Working with J. Grier and B. Hartung with \$100K the president released. It's foundation money. RFP will be released this afternoon. J. Grier is appointing a faculty panel to work with B. Hartung on criteria for an electronic review: funds for undergraduate research and high-impact practices for learning. Proposals will be due Friday with a week for determinations. 2-page simple, basic ideas. Purpose, what to accomplish, money, how to measure success. A. Grove asked how this includes the international aspect of the mission. G. Hutchinson will broaden it to include all aspects of the mission.

- c. G. Hutchinson met with the Fiscal Policy Committee yesterday and the Provost's Council today. Working with J. Grier on an annual calendar that will begin budget planning in October. Budget guidelines should be out next week. Purpose is to have information for strategic planning in the program. This will roll up from program chair to AVP to Fiscal Policy and Provost Council.
 - d. Wants to work on improving shared governance: consultation and joint decision-making. Many have expressed concern about lack of shared governance and the reality of being informed not included. For Fiscal Policy, it will be a way to weigh in earlier and more frequently in the budget process.
 - e. Resource Planning Task Force met yesterday with co-chairs of Fiscal Policy, discussed shared governance and how to make the budget process more interactive. Feel free to provide input to G. Hutchinson.
 - f. Faculty searches – DSCs have completed and invitations are going out the end of this week (Beth confirmed). Interview days Nov 6-7 and 20-21. This year, there will only be 3 candidates per program due to cost.
 - g. Travel (addressing F. Barajas' question about travel) – history shows there was a time when there was a bit more for travel. Some programs took the 10% hit in travel and others did not. G. Hutchinson will be examining travel and trying to figure out a best practice (consistent) to bring that back. Will need to be budgeted and made a budget priority. Faculty Development is very important, more on that later.
 - h. Tenure track and lecturer ratios (data ran by D. Wakelee) FA13 tenure track 23.78%, lecturer 76.22%; SP13 tenure track 22.36%, lecturer 77.64%; FA14 tenure track 25.36%, 74.64% lecturer.
 - i. Has been working with Jeanne and Senate Exec on Senate and divisional structure. Old academic strategic plan, new draft ready for release. Need to have an inclusive process to revise Academic Affairs strategic plan.
 - j. A. Morris asked for confirmation about a new process regarding candidates not meeting with the same people they used to. G. Hutchinson stated that the process is continuing as it always has. The President will be out of town the later part of November, so for that portion the Provost will be handling the President's duties during that time. A. Morris asked how this can change, because the school of business wants to be consistent. B. Hartung said part of it is just logistics. Determining dates in the summer for Fall, it was apparent that the President would not be available for a Thursday-Friday session in the Fall, but he will in the Spring.
4. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
 - a. S. Aloisio said statewide has not met since last Senate meeting. One item asking for feedback on is student success fees. CSU-wide, but hasn't come up



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

on CI campus yet. Academic Senate wants faculty feedback on student success fee. Let S. Aloisio or J. Yudelson know.

5. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
 - a. Tomorrow, event in front of the library to get together with unions on campus to discuss negotiation process and present letters to the president about concerns regarding not having a contract (100 days past). News from negotiating team is positive. Will be going back to the table with CSU next week. Any questions, send them to CFA chapter board.
 - b. J. Elliott asked what the sticking points are. J. Griffin said wages and workload. CO has proposed 3-2-2% increase. Budget increased by 5%. CFA asking for 4-3-3%. Trying to avoid job actions at all costs.

6. Presentation on CI 2025 (Gormley) Time Certain: 2:50pm (Director of Planning, Design, and Construction)
 - a. Process campus has been doing for a year. Looking at opportunities to leverage revenue-generating opportunities to fund the development of the campus and improve debt that we are carrying through the system with bonds.
 - b. Went over presentation (attached) acute shortage of space and infrastructure needs.
 - c. Short-term projects (1-5 years)
 - ii. Self-funded: student housing, dining commons, Uglen housing, student health center, child care center, parking, photovoltaic cell generation (revenue-generating)
 - iii. Partially-funded: wellness/recreation center phase 1
 - iv. Not self-funded (possible state funded): academic facilities
 - d. Mid-term projects (6-10 years)
 - ii. Self-funded: student housing expansion, student health center expansion, conference center, retail expansion, parking
 - e. Process: 1997 senate bill 623 transferred property to Trustees of the CSU, master plan approved, 1998 Senate Bill 1923 established Site Authority, 2000 specific reuse plan released to guide development of site authority land, 2013 plan (CI 2025) to engage a development advisor approved by the site authority board, Jones Lang LaSalle is Development Advisor started June 2014 on academic track, financial track, wellness/recreation complex (President identified as opportunity through Foundation), and community partnerships. Looking at alternative-delivery processes. "West Hall" (Sierra) took 8 years to break ground once approved. Site Authority board approved this concept last month. Y. Trinidad will be distributing draft reports from Development Advisor.
 - f. J. Elliott asked about 2035, given campus philosophy, do we have the capacity to hold the number of students we want? J. Gormley said the vision plan was

developed with that in mind, and it did. Will have to reassess every 10 years. Currently, there is enough capacity on the campus proper.

- g. M. Cook asked if we are on the agenda for the Board of Trustees. J. Gormley said we are in discussion with the CO. There is a little resistance because it is so unique and large-scale. Merced is 9 months ahead of us, same Advisory company. Going to Regents next month.
- h. S. Aloisio asked why Modoc Hall is not on the plan. J. Gormley said Chaparral Hall is in the same status as Modoc. Any building identified as having existing usage, the move and build out has to be accommodated in the plan.
- i. J. Yudelson pointed out that in 2002, residents were told there would be no students in University Glen. Does the consideration for new housing include student housing? J. Gormley said they doubt they would be specifically building student housing in phase 2A/B due to the distance from the campus. Campus is not saying an absolute no, but they are not planning on it. C. Doll said there will be meetings set up with Uglen residents to talk about CI 2025 to discuss how it will impact them.
- j. J. Gormley pointed out that input is invited and definitely wanted. J. Grier mentioned the link is in the Senate newsletter. Any further questions can be directed to ci2025@csuci.edu

7. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)

- a. Lots of change related to growth, budgeting, planning, structure, etc. There will be “lots of discussions.” Task force on structure meeting tomorrow at 11:30. If still interested, let Jeanne know. Will split into two groups about membership and committees.
- b. Trustee Lillian Kimball will be on campus tomorrow. Subset from Senate Exec will be meeting with her. Any faculty interested in meeting future trustees, let her know.
- c. J. Grier will be at Long Beach this and next week. Will have an update on those meetings at next Senate.

8. Intent to Raise Questions (PowerPoint online with previous meeting’s questions and answers)

- a. G. Hutchinson addressed F. Barajas’ question about team teaching and wants to build that into the budget. Will get back on it.
- b. D. Wakelee pointed out that hiring information provided by A. Pavin doesn’t include non-tenure/track faculty numbers.
- c. G. Hutchinson met with the Provost Council about faculty buyout rates and will report back later.
- d. New questions
 - i. J. Pinkley asked about the service level agreement between

Technology & Communication and Card Services in Support of OneCard Issues. It was created in November 2010 and lists Broome Library staff as tier 1 support for the OneCard system. In reality, Broome Library faculty are providing the front line of support for campus printing, resulting in 100s of faculty hours per year being devoted to printer support. The absence of any support for students results in librarians bearing the brunt of inquiries. There seems to be no plans to move from the current operation which is for students to receive printer support from faculty. It is unclear what conversations are taking place related to campus printing and who is being involved in these discussions/decision making. J. Pinkley would like to request clarification on the following:

- When will the service level agreement be revisited? (It has been 4 years since the SLA was implemented and the Broome Library has seen no support for students trying to use a continuously erred and flawed printing system).
 - What steps are being taken to include tier 1 service providers, including library faculty, in campus printing discussions?
 - How are students, the primary end user, able to participate in these discussions and provide feedback?
- ii. S. Aloisio asked about the report from A. Pavin, specifically if Senate Exec can put together a more formalized request of the number of net faculty, administrators, and staff for the entire university, and make that available to the Senate?
 - iii. AJ Bieszczad asked if the process is open, if any faculty can apply from any program, what is the criteria?
 - iv. B. Veldman brought up the President's statement of \$8,000 per stall in a parking structure, where does that number come from?
 - v. J. Elliott asked if there can be a sign or campus map where visitors can see where to park when they arrive on campus.

9. Continuing Business Items

- a. SP 14-01 Student Opinion of Teaching Survey (FAC)
 - ii. P. Hampton provided update- policy considered for both first and second reading last academic year. Became domain of new FAC. Became first reading item at last senate. Committee held two sessions to collect input from faculty. FAC feels strongly that, as written, policy is not something the FAC wants to amend on the Senate floor. Policy would ideally describe a process as opposed to defining the actual nature of the instrument. FAC did not make any changes to the policy. Welcomes having it referred back to the FAC to look at it and craft one that describes a process that would be implemented with the appropriate

consultation. In the process of drafting a new policy, there would be additional brown bags for input.

1. AJ Bieszczad motioned to refer back to committee. Seconded by M. Pereira. Discussion: A. Morris asked if FAC can clarify what they want faculty to do with the addendum. It suggests data faculty have not had in the past. A. Jimenez-Jimenez asked if this is a call for feedback. Chair said no, that will be requested from FAC if referred back to committee.
 2. 42 approved, 5 deny, 2 abstain – SP 14-01 will be referred back to FAC.
- b. SP 14-02 Policy on Mode of Instruction (FAC)
- ii. P. Hampton said FAC held the same two sessions to solicit input on this policy. No specific changes recommended by faculty who attended brown bags. Some concern about the language (section vs course). FAC also had opportunity to view the product of the task force. Policy would fill a gap right now in protections for faculty and give guidance about how online programs could exist for programs. Online task force policy should come out in November. That could come out and be approved through Senate without FAC. FAC recommends the policy being voted up or down.
 1. J. Balen motioned to refer to task force. AJ Bieszczad seconded. Discussion: C. Wyels asked about timeline as the policy is being referred to as a stopgap even though it wasn't written to be that. Task force product should come to Senate. J. Elliott asked if philosophy of protecting faculty will be included in the task force product. M. Cook said yes. Chair said the task force wants to be very comprehensive. G. Wood said it might be beneficial to know the constituents of the task force, i.e. if faculty are being represented. Chair said it consists of herself, D. Jacobsen, N. Deans, J. Leafstedt, J. Meriwether, M. Cook, and S. Clark. Non-faculty members are C. Mattia and G. Berg. D. Wakelee has been invited to every meeting. Chair said the task force was constructed by the Provost and Chair to have people both critical and in favor of online content. J. Meriwether stated that, if the policy is referred back to the task force, it could be some time before it's imposed. Should there be a policy in place prior to the task force product? AJ Bieszczad asked if the task force is consulting with anyone else outside of the members. Chair said the committee is still in process of fine-tuning the product and having brown bags before it will come to Senate Exec. Chair is hopefully meetings

will happen in November. J. Elliott wants to speak against the motion because if policy is voted down, task force will be doing its work anyways, and if policy is voted up, faculty will have the protections they wanted originally. G. Buhl spoke against the motion due to the task force not having their policy ready for Fall 2015 scheduling. A. Jimenez-Jimenez spoke in agreement with J. Elliott and G. Buhl. Upcoming policy may be more comprehensive and may take more time to approve, so this would allow protection in the meantime. J. Yudelson spoke in favor of the motion. Doesn't think this specific policy addresses issues dealing with people who may have entitlements endangered because they may not really know how to teach online and, if a class is voted for being online, the lecturer may not have a vote into how the course is taught (depending on program by-laws). Faculty may end up "feeling" like they have to teach the course online because the program decided it should be offered online. Would like to see more discussions of a policy and a more encompassing policy that is transparent with more input rather than a stopgap policy that may endanger lecturer entitlements. P. Hampton clarified the President would still have to sign off on this, so it would probably not affect Spring courses.

2. 28 approve, 20 deny, 2 abstain – SP 14-02 will be referred back to the task force.

10. New Business Items

a. Statistics and Data Analytics Minor

- ii. Motion to open: C. Burriss. T. Ikonen seconded. J. Garcia to speak on it. Described purpose of minor. Currently do statistics with old tools in a conservative way. Big data emerging, need to address it. This minor has the capabilities of offering students alternatives of analyzing data. Sent to curriculum committee. They sent it back. Made modifications. Sent back. More modifications. Curriculum committee finally approved. Amendment to add ESRM 328 as an elective.

iii. First reading item.

- iv. D. Downey asked if Math consulted with programs around campus who already teach statistics courses. J. Garcia said yes (Math and ESRM). AJ Bieszczad brought up a concern about the minor avoiding programming, though they will be utilizing software for data analysis. Because of the scope, it would be better to include more programs because not all programs can do programming, and students will not be trained properly. J. Garcia said MATH 409 is a new course being proposed that

will address some of AJ Bieszczad's concerns. AJ Bieszczad reiterated that there is an overlap between Math and Computer Science and they should work together to address these similarities. A. Jimenez-Jimenez spoke for it and likes that we are providing a new minor for undergraduates and pointed out that we need more BA and BS programs as well. Supports a product like this. L. Sanchez spoke for data analysis as being interdisciplinary and there needs to be more added to make it more beneficial. J. Elliott pointed out that getting W. Wagner's input would be a great resource. C. Flores spoke for it positively because, as an undergraduate, had an internship that required the skills this minor will provide, which she didn't have at the time, so it will give graduates real-life skills for their future jobs. J. Garcia will take comments and input back to the team.

10. Reports from Standing Committees (*As Needed*)

Faculty Affairs Committee – no additional report, but will take SP 14-01

Fiscal Policies – new co-chairs S. Frisch and S. Kelly

Student Academic Policies and Procedures – T. Itkonen said something will be coming to senate exec before the next meeting. Draft on disqualification.

Curriculum Committee – did not meet today. Will meet next week.

General Education – courses due the 15th. New document that helps submit GE courses (walk-through). Hanging on curriculum committee webpage. Update to EO 1065 about GE in the CSU – component is a minimum grade in the golden four A1,2,3,B4.

Currently C- as higher. Campuses are able to require higher levels if desired. Once EO is finalized, GE committee will draft policy and will solicit input.

Committee on Committees – no report until February

Committee on Centers and Institutes – no report

Professional Leave Committee – no report

Mini-Grant Review Committee – no report

11. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

a. A. Jimenez-Jimenez reported that there are many proposals for UNIV 392 courses (7 for 7 different countries). Also includes a proposal to take students to CERN. Process in reviewing.

b. S. Aloisio reported that IRA committee met today. \$290,000 to allocate. \$490,000 in requests. Majority are travel. Going to have to say no to a lot of good proposals.

12. Announcements (Chair can put in the Senate newsletter if sent ahead of time)

a. S. Samatar mentioned October 30 is the deadline for CME proposals.

b. M. Francois said more slots available for ISLAS workshops midnight Thursday night.



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

- c. J. Leafstedt said open house in FIT studio on October 22nd.
- d. D. Hoffman – campus reading celebration next Thursday 6pm grand salon.
- e. J. Elliott UNIV 392 application for Australia.
- f. Philosophy minor in catalog 2015.

13. Adjourn at 4:25 motioned by P. Hampton