Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, October 20, 2015, 2:30-4:30pm

**Attendees:** Leafstedt, Jill; Veldman, Brittnee; Miller, Jason; Flores, Cynthia; Thoms, Brian; Jenkins, Jacob; Wyels, Cindy; Sanchez, Luis; Carswell, Sean; Dean, Michelle; Berman, Michael; Jensen, Karen A; Monsma, Brad; Mack, Carol; Nevins, Colleen M; Klompien, Kathleen; Jimenez Jimenez, 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; Aloisio, Simone; Yudelson, John; Grier, Jeanne; Wallace, Amy; Stephen Clark; Matt Furmanski; Michael Bourgeois; Travis Hunt; Greg Wood; Lindsey O’Connor; Geoff Buhl; Virgil Adams; Brad Monsma; Catherine Burriss; Jennie Luna; Karen Carey; Merilyn Buchanan; Steve Stratton; Andrew Morris; Monica Pereira; Phil Hampton; Kaia Tollefson; Ruben Alarcon; Alison Perchuk; Dennis Downey; Colleen Delaney; Catherine Doll; Sue Andrzejewski; Elizabeth Sowers; Paul Murphy; Julia Ornelas-Higdon; Christina Smith; Annie White; Chuck Weis; Heather Castillo; Melissa Soenke; Bryn Aquino; John Lu; Matt Cook; Jesse Elliott; Beatrice de Oca; Jared Barton; LaSonya Davis-Smith; Sofia Samatar; Leticia Cazares; Venus Tamayo; Vanessa Mendoza; Kiki Patsch;

1. Approval of the Agenda
	1. J. Meriwether: motion to amend the agenda with new business item: Resolution to end state support for IGER; second by M. Cook;
	2. VOTE to approve motion to amend agenda to add item 9(c) = 36 YES, 3 NO; motion is approved to amend agenda.
2. Approval of the Minutes of September 8, 2015 & September 29, 2015
	1. Minutes from 9-8-15 approved with no objections; minutes from 9-29-15 approved with no objections.
3. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
	1. G. Hutchinson announced that we begin our faculty searches next week, 16 searches underway this Fall, with congratulations to DSC’s on working hard to accomplish this, also thanks to the SCC and Faculty Affairs; candidate pool looks extremely strong; also have 8 more searches planned this Spring, which will help us reach 100% of our hiring target;
	2. Recalled over the summer that W. Cordero and J. Grier conferred on the DAA Strategic Planning Steering Committee, and the draft of Strategic Plan will be ready for your viewing soon; there will be town hall meetings to solicit feedback, online survey will also be circulated; stay tuned in a week or two to get your feedback; hopeful to bring this draft to Provost Council, Cabinet, student government, Senate and Senate Exec;
	3. Recalled last year asking Senate if we are organized in an optimal way that we would dovetail with our Strategic Plan; in doing so, I have a list of principles to be aware of to think about the structure of our division:
		1. Advance the Division’s strategic plan and the University Strategic Priorities.
		2. Align academic programs in order to promote intellectual synergies and interdisciplinary pursuits.
		3. Align academic programs in ways that make them more agile and responsive to student needs and changing environments.
		4. Determine academic homes for essential areas/programs such as but not limited to mission centers, graduate studies and undergraduate studies.
		5. Communicate a more clearly defined organizational structure with external constituencies in effort to develop meaningful partnerships and encourage philanthropy.
	4. Program meeting this morning with program chairs in regards to travel funds, a good conversation on professional development funds; some action came out of this meeting this morning, put together a task force to propose guiding principles for the dissemination of these funds, give recommendations for practices that should halt; recommendations of sustainable practices in the future, i.e. we didn’t track things as well as we should have in our beginnings, so this will be a focus moving forward; with these data we can report to you of how we accomplish this;
	5. I. Grzegorczyk recalled in the past we work bottom up rather than top down, asked to please comment on how this new process differs; G. Hutchinson answered the thinking is that it’s better to form something with the intent that it will be ripped apart in order to make it better; I. Grzegorczyk expressed concern about what happens to this work when our new president arrives;
4. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
	1. S. Aloisio summarized their interim statewide meeting via teleconference (statewide meets once a month, once in person and once via teleconference); highlighted that what we’re looking at this year are resources for undergraduate research and what the data is for how undergraduate research is being conducted; some discussion of adequate space being provided for said undergraduate research;
	2. J. Yudelson highlighted the resolution that originated from statewide about presidential searches; factors were whether or not this should be a transparent search or a closed search, whether there should be forums to invite candidates to campus, etc.; as of about a week ago, 12 campuses have already passed resolutions asking for transparency in the search; 10 other campuses are also considering similar resolutions; today we’re asking for a waiver of a first reading because the searches are coming up soon;
	3. S. Alosio reminded senators that if you hear anything like “we have to do it this way because the Chancellor’s Office says we have to,” please come to us and you can ask questions, we’ll help to find the root of the issue, it’s our job, regardless of the nature of the comments you’ve received; J. Yudelson affirmed that they are resources for questions of this nature;
5. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
	1. J. Griffin noted his shirt saying “I don’t want to strike, but I will” – affirmed that we have an authorization for a strike vote underway; good news is at least with our local chapter if you vote, they will take you off the mailing list; right now we are at the fact-finding stage of mediation, where a determination is made on what facts are the most reasonable that is published on the report; then a cool off period of 10 days where the CO team and CFA team will have intense conversations; in sum, if we can show that we are united on a 5% increase, then they may come to terms with us; if not, we are able to strike and will strike if need be;
	2. Recently returned from Sacramento, where we met with reps from all campuses, at lot more activity going on in other campuses, such as rallies taking place in Long Beach; we talked with legislators and worked hard to obtain the 10% that the Chancellor received, which was due in part to the hard work from our CFA;
	3. I. Grzegorczyk asked what our percentage increase was last year – J. Griffin answered that there wasn’t any, and years ago the percentage was 1.6% the last time an increase was made;
	4. C. Weis asked what the basics were regarding strike logistics; J. Griffin summarized that a strike is basically economic warfare, where a lot of things can happen – could be a one-day strike, there could be rolling strikes, there’s a lot of options;
6. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
	1. J. Grier announced that advisory committee (ACTCSP) from our campus has been fully staffed, will also keep you informed on the trustees part; J. Grier is joined by S. Aloisio and C. Wyels, Ria Fidler is HR assistant and staff representative, Gary Cushing is alumni representative, Bill Kearney, David Rodriguez and Pastor Broderick Huggins are community members, Dr. Leroy Morishita is CSU East Bay President, Monique Reyna is CI Student Government President, and Ysabel Trinidad is VP for Business & Financial Affairs and was the administrator appointed by the Chancellor’s Office; all of the above are joined by the trustee members of Lillian Kimbell, Larry Norton, Lou Monville, and Chancellor Dr. Timothy White;
	2. On Nov. 12th there will be an open forum, encouraged senators to attend to voice your feedback;
	3. The Academic Senate Structure Task Force has met and will arrange a brown bag in a few weeks, please stay tuned for forthcoming announcements.
7. Intent to Raise Questions
	1. K. Tollefson commented that in view of recent tragedies at K-12 schools, tried to find more info on our website, but couldn’t find any clear cut information on how can we be better prepared for emergency situations; question is how can we become better at knowing what to do in the event of a high-level threat emergency on campus? What opportunities might there be for us to practice recommended behaviors in the event of various kinds of emergencies, specifically including a terror threat?
	2. B. de Oca: commented that we could consider other ways of reducing the demand for parking, such as additional information on increased bicycle use;
	3. J. Elliot question about food waste on campus, possible reason that businesses don’t donate the food is because businesses may be liable for any foodborne illness claims; other side is if businesses get caught over-producing food; my question is what methods are in place to mitigate the amount of food that is thrown away;
	4. J. Grier reviewed answers to previous Intent to Raise Questions from 9-8-15; J. Grier answered J. Elliot’s previous question that when we do a call for faculty volunteers, that from these names the Senate Executive Committee makes recommendations to the corresponding vice presidents.
8. Continuing Business Items
	1. None
9. New Business Items
	1. Resolution: Presidential Search at CI
		1. Motion by A. Perchuk to discuss, second by K. Leonard;
		2. S. Aloisio summarized that this resolution crystalizes a unified message for transparency in presidential searches; for our search the list will become public once we have the finalists; negatives are that according to our search firm that 75% of candidates would not apply if knowing that the search will be open at any time;
		3. Motion to waive first reading by J. Yudelson; C. Wyels made the argument to deny this first reading request, people may need time to absorb and discuss; let’s say we deny this motion, it will still become a second reading item before the first search is underway, so not seeing the urgency here; S. Aloisio added that the argument in favor of moving to a second reading is that it will set up a vote so that the bulk of the 23 resolutions are decided on in advance of the Board of Trustees meeting;
		4. I. Grzegorczyk commented that we previously discussed that some people would not apply, so if this becomes public knowledge than we may limit our applicant pool;
		5. V. Adams was curious to know out of the resolutions that have passed at other campuses if any of them coincided with ones that have presidential searches going on; S. Aloisio answered yes, thought of San Jose and Sonoma as examples;
		6. VOTE: 36 YES, 3 ABSTAIN – Resolution may proceed to second reading as SR 15-01;
		7. C. Harris-Keith asked in terms of finalists, is there any urgency; S. Aloisio answered that in order for it to become public at this stage, all of the finalists have to agree to it being open, which is possible but has yet to happen; I. Grzegorczyk added that it would be nice to see the prospective candidates, especially when they come to campus;
		8. J. Yudelson recalled that the message received from President Rush is that he believes in transparency, it would be nice to know that the incoming president believes in this concept and that they would be support of a resolution such as this; this will be a strong message that transparency is important for shared government;
		9. J. Grier clarified that our passing this resolution will not change the process;
		10. K. Tollefson added that our need for transparency is clear, doesn’t know from an executive standpoint what is at stake when they throw their hat into a pool like this, so what are we asking people to do; S. Aloisio answered that the argument from the Chancellor is that if another president was looking and it was known, it would undercut their ability to raise funds and the credibility of their position; G. Hutchinson recalled incidences where people lost their job, due to when someone is traced back to looking elsewhere and may be accused of not being loyal to their existing university; K. Tollefson commented if that’s true than we may be over-simplifying this issue; K. Leonard asked if we had to blast it on our website… this happens to other faculty as well, sometimes they are found out and sometimes they are not;
		11. A. Perchuk followed up with a question to Provost: what would be your take on the compromise position that we’ve put forward, as with this resolution that only the top 3 or 4 finalists would come public versus the entire pool; G. Hutchinson answered that in her opinion the risk is still the same, i.e. the idea of confidentiality may bring a larger pool, but the loss then is that you don’t have the candidates coming to campus to visit;
		12. M. Pereira noted that presidents can come from anywhere, they don’t have to be faculty members, could come from business and other places in the private sector;
		13. C. Weis recalled that he’s been on both sides of searches, as a superintendent for districts and on the other side of as a candidate; noted that his experience is that if the search is open it will increase the percentage of older candidates, while the percentage of younger candidates will diminish;
		14. G. Buhl stated that he does not want his president to be afraid of the risks;
		15. S. Samatar observed that if the risks were that great then we wouldn’t be seeing it as such an accepted practice already;
		16. J. Grier called for a vote on accepting the resolution and to be distributed’
		17. VOTE: 29 YES – 11 NO – 3 ABSTAIN; SR 15-01 Resolution on Presidential Search at CI is approved.
	2. Policy on Principal Investigator
		1. K. Leonard moved to open discussion, second by C. Harris-Keith;
		2. J. Miller introduced this policy as a revision to existing policy, summarizing that there was a variety of revisions to language, but a notable major change involved giving PI status to a lecturer;
		3. A. Perchuk asked a question regarding Page 3, recalling that most grants are awarded to the individual, and that they don’t run through RSP; when she saw on Page 3 that the PI could not accept grants, it raised a question with her; further discussion between J. Miller and A. Perchuk, leading to a post-meeting appointment;
		4. K. Leonard asked if we can talk more about the lecturer responsibilities; J. Miller answered that the only people authorized to be a PI are faculty and MPP, if not then this would need approval;
		5. I. Grzegorczyk asked who the VPs are; J. Miller answered that they are the directors of each of the divisions, i.e. Student Affairs, Academic Affairs (Provost), etc.;
		6. A. Perchuk asked if emeritus and volunteer faculty have to abide by these guidelines; J. Miller answered yes, because emeritus faculty have all of the rights and privileges of regular faculty; we don’t have any volunteer faculty;
		7. G. Hutchinson recalled that FERP status was also mentioned, thought specific language pertaining to FERP status would be worthwhile; J. Miller agreed;
		8. I. Grzegorczyk what about money that is awarded due to participation in conferences or competitions; J. Miller answered that such awards are outside of the scope of this policy;
		9. B. Veldmann commented that if we are agreeing to this policy, then why not open it up for any and all grants, why single out any group;
	3. Resolution: End State Support for IGER
		1. K. Leonard moved to discuss, second by M. Cook;
		2. J. Meriwether opened by saying he didn’t think this to be controversial; recalled about seven years ago we created an institute for global economic research, which was supposed to be self-sustaining, and this language was reiterated a number of times; was originally supported by foundation funds, now in general funds for the last four years or so; noted that in the by-laws it was not designed to be supported by student funds; this doesn’t mean that it can’t exist, it just shouldn’t be supported by state funds; we are now at the time where we’re making budget decisions that will force cuts, and this may be one of them;
		3. K. Leonard asked what is the amount of money we’re talking about; J. Meriwether answered that this is a question that came up last year, i.e. is state money going to this, plus how is it doing with raising its own funds to support itself;
		4. K. Leonard asked for a ballpark estimate – J. Meriwether answered that salary alone would be $100K, when adding benefits it would be closer to $200K; K. Leonard asked what about a report that would detail these expenses; J. Meriwether deferred to the Committee on Centers and Institutes;
		5. J. Zong asked if we considered inviting IGER representatives here at a Senate meeting; J. Meriwether answered no, because right now we are just wanting to decide that state funds should not be used as a means of support;
		6. C. Harris-Keith asked if the center is supposed to be running self-sustained and is not, what are the objections;
		7. J. Barton moved to make this a second reading item; K. Leonard commented that she would oppose this because today is the first we’re seeing it as a group and it may be misinterpreted as a harsh decision;
		8. C. Wyels agreed that it doesn’t seem to be a rush, so is speaking against this as a second reading item;
		9. J. Barton noted the timeframe on how long the IGER document has existed and has been posted, which should have been ample time for those seeking an education on the topic;
		10. Vote called to waive the first reading for this resolution
		11. VOTE: 11 YES – 29 NO – 1 ABSTAIN; a first reading shall proceed for this resolution;
		12. I. Grzegorczyk commented that she would like to hear from the IGER director of why they are not yet self-sufficient;

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

 Faculty Affairs Committee

* S. Andrzejewski reported that they have met and are currently reviewing survey results, investigating if we should revise SRT instrument;

 Fiscal Policies

* C. Burriss reported as co-chair that they’ve been active and focusing on information and requests that were made last year; progress with meetings with Provost Council; all members are invited to sit on Strategic Resource Planning Committee meetings as well, will help with pursuing the charge, optimistic on translating this and communicating it to Senate as we move forward;

 Student Academic Policies and Procedures

* A. Perchuk announced that they are meeting regularly but no current report;

 Curriculum Committee

* J. Barton thanked senators for their submissions; reminded that if you get an email from Blake or Janet it should be viewed the same as if it was coming from him;

 General Education

* G. Buhl also expressed thanks for the submissions; if for some reason you want to still submit, we can work something out, let me know;

 Committee on Committees

* No report

 Committee on Centers and Institutes

* C. Nevins announced that they’ll be completing these reports in early November

 Professional Leave Committee

* No report

 Mini-Grant Review Committee

* J. Miller reported first the request for proposals for mini-grants for next year has been posted on the web, we have budget of $93K for about 15 proposals, will also email this out next week; we have a new online portal to accept applications, so that’s the technical reason for the delay; due Nov. 20th for mini-grant applications; Second, Chancellor White is working hard to raise the level of conversation on research, in regards to Research Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) funds, call for proposals is going on, here we have $53K for awards, these proposals will be more open ended, but we’ll have to measure the impact on our campus;
* L. O’Connor asked if these funds get swept after this year; J. Miller answered that we have permission to cross the fiscal year, so in this case we have the approval to spend until August 31st; technically because they are Chancellor funds they don’t get swept, but the intent is to use funds by then or they will go away; further discussion between A. Jimenez and J. Miller regarding the reporting part of it;
1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
	1. CIS announcements from K. Leonard: presentation of Black Lives Matter on Oct. 21st in the Student Union from 12noon – 1:30pm; also ESRM Career Development Day on Oct. 22nd from 10am-2pm at the Broome Library;
2. Announcements
	1. H. Castillo announced Call for Research for Arts Under The Stars production; take your student’s research ideas to turn into a multi-media presentation; program is mobile-downloaded; theme this year is Revolution, in line with the two CIS priorities;

J. Griffin announced CFA gun violence prevention, watch for that coming mid-November; also co-sponsoring event with Maria Echaveste on Oct. 27th, who is a former U.S. Wage & Hour Division officer;

* 1. J. Elliot seeking faculty volunteers to discuss their religious beliefs in an open forum with students, not so much of a debate but as a discussion; Nov. 17th
	2. J. Yudelson there will be a march on the Chancellor’s Office on Nov. 17th, CFA will have a bus to take at least 30 people;
	3. J. Leafstedt online celebration of National Writing Day, open on Facebook until tonight at midnight;
	4. L. O’Connor made faculty search coordinating committee announcements, candidates will come on campus at 9am in Broome Library on Oct. 29th, with lunch in Malibu; search committee wants to encourage that you make an effort to reach out to candidates on Thursday, consider campus tours, meet with students, etc.;
	5. G. Hutchinson recalled last year meeting with the chairs of the DSCs and we sat down to take a look at the rankings, the president will not be involved, but myself and the deans will take a look and will make a recommendation to the president; J. Jenkins recommended that we should also take them on a tour of the surrounding area, versus just inside hotel and campus buildings;
1. Adjourn – J. Grier called for a motion for meeting adjournment, so moved by J. Yudelson, seconded by K. Leonard, meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.