



Academic Senate Executive Committee

MINUTES

Tuesday, 24 August 2021

ZOOM Meeting Room:

<https://csuci.zoom.us/j/84736873608>

2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.

In attendance:

Richard Yao, Mitch Avila, Dana Baker, Jeannette Edwards, Raquel Baker, Virgil Adams, Jeanne Grier, James Meriwether, Scott Perez, Kaia Tollefson, Ivona Grzegorzczuk, Nancy Deans, Gregory Woods, Monica Pereira, Jason Miller, LaSonya Davis, Jasons Tricorder (17)

1. Meeting Call to Order: 2:37
2. Approval of the Agenda *
 - a) Jim: Motion to Put GE item on Agenda as item 9
 - b) No objection
 - c) Amendment to agenda: no report –remove item 5C
 - d) No objection
 - e) Approved no objections
3. Approval of the Minutes from 4 May 2021*
 - a) Approved No objections
4. New Business
 - a) **VP and Academic Admin Searches (Jim Meriwether, Greg Wood)***
 - Not going on agenda
 - Avila: Policy on Interim Appointments. I do not support provisions in this document that require consultation with Senate Executive Committee and a search committee be formed with 5 faculty. What constitutes consultation. What am I expected to be doing? 5 faculty per search committee is way too many. The way diversity is being handled: I strongly recommend that Senate makes a slate and the MPP running the search makes the decision. That is a best practice.
 - Meriwether: This would benefit from healthy discussion before moving forward. Culled from Long Beach and SJSU.
 - Yao: Have there been specific issues on appointments?
 - Wood: No. We want to put down in writing and spell all out. To my knowledge no specific search has been problematic.
 - Grier: Recent dean level searches and retreat rights people were never scheduled to meet with departments despite policy that asked for this to happen. This policy coalesces 2-3 policies so nothing is left to interpretation.

- Meriwether: Discussion in spring sparked by interim appointments for which there was a large void of policy and process. How we go about interim seems an issue on this campus ranging from appointment to call with applicants and search committee. Maybe there needs to be a range to ensure a more inclusive practice.
- Yao: Supportive of dialogue and happy to send writing to structure or we could discuss today. Let's use this as a starting point to markup, discuss, or consider per your preference.
- Avila: President and I will put exact language in writing and make precise recommendations to structure our conversation.
- Yao: My preference would be to engage as many people from this group on this policy as possible.
- Wood: Incorporate written feedback and create a document and put on next agenda for Exec? Or work out in a smaller group and then bring to a future meeting? A special topics meeting?
- Avila: Expecting to form quite a few committees in Fall 2021, so we may want to move forward ASAP to be able to apply to Vice President search in spring.
- Meriwether: Two weeks from today a meeting, with written feedback from any and all, and those at the meeting could work through written feedback.
- Yao: I will do my best to attend by zoom on 9/7. I will coordinate my feedback.

b) Policy on Emphasis Elevation from EO 1071 Notification (APPC) *

- Not going to agenda
- Wood: Is it OK to put on schedule this fall? Or how do we reply to APPC and give them some direction?
- Grzegorzcyk: Not a priority for fall.
- Avila: I recommend that we not have this policy because we are required to do this by the Chancellor's Office, so I am not sure how the policy impacts the process.
- Grier: This policy is about when a program is not in compliance with Exec order 1071, when an emphasis has more than 50% of major. Elevation of existing programs that have enough units to majors for programs out of compliance because technically out of compliance with 1071 to change master plan and add the major. We do through curricular process as an internal blessing. Makes public the action of creating a major to make sure they are 1071-compliant.
- Avila: I would ask that when this happens that a department do rethink major and add curriculum, but we do want updating of degrees when proposals go forward. I am not confident that we need this. What would happen if this got voted down? We would still have to do it.
- Wood: It's not creating a new curricular pathway that we don't already allow. The policy and AAPC are asking us to bless a process and properly classify without going through the masterplan.
- Grier: This is a limited-life policy only for curriculum currently identified as non-compliant through 1071. Expires end of Spring 2026.
- Grzegorzcyk: Add to agenda as an announcement. We do not need a vote and debate.
- Wood: Sending back to APPC to please implement as a process.

c) Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring * (Research and Sponsored Programs)

- Going on agenda as first-reading item
- Perez: This policy is up for its 5-year review. There are a number of updates to reflect updates to the uniform guidance for federal funding to non-federal entities. There is pending audit scheduled for Spring 2022.
- Grier: If this policy is changed at Senate it has to go back to Policy Clearinghouse.

5. Approval of the Senate Agenda for 30 August 2021*

- No objections
- No additional modifications
- Approved at 3:26 p.m.

6. Discussion Items

a) Honorary PhD (Kaia Tollefson)

- CSUCI Nomination Process for Honorary Doctorate:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/83wohbjkhti8pcf/Honorary%20Degree%20Process.docx?dl=0>
- 2021 School Year Steps:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/6d9mj41e010eeeo/CSUCI%20Honorary%20Doctorate%20Nomination%20Process%20and%20Timeline%202021-2022.docx?dl=0>
- Nominee names in consideration are confidential.
- Our campus president can submit 2 names to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The committee will provide a slate.

b) Policy on Pay Increases Update (Jim Meriwether, Mitch Avila, Dana Baker)

- Update from Avila
 - 2018-2020: 34 promotions, 19 no additional pay consideration above 9%. This number opens up equity and policy questions. Criteria? Merit? Inversion? Gender? Ethnicity?
- Avila: I need to have public criteria by which decisions are made so we can point to and to have a practice where it is automatically considered as part of routine of promotion. From Senate Exec I want 1. Policy completed by October so the first paycheck someone could get with new raise is provided in a timely fashion. 2. Help with the messaging on this: I need structure, policy, and equity.
- Senate meetings: 8/31, 9/28, 10/26, 11/30
- D. Baker: This is a managerial issue. It goes mostly to market merit question not inversion/compression issues. The other part requires sustained study.
- Meriwether: If there is an inequity with salaries on campus, guideline provide an opportunity to fix that, and that's what we want to do.
- Wood: 10/26 second reading as there is nothing ready to go on 8/31 unless we only need one reading.
- Grier: Some came in at a time when we were not able to negotiate our entering salary. This issue of salary goes a lot farther back to look at inversion and inequities that have happened over time.
- Grzegorzcyk: We have to be careful what we wish for. This is not the tool to even out raises. CFA negotiated a tool for this. I think raises must be associated with merit.

Ability to negotiate salary at special events, promotion, or offer from other institution. I oppose this policy if this is only equity-based consideration for raises.

- D. Baker: Could we separate people who didn't know they could ask for a salary increase last year?
- Avila: Two-part process possible. Equity study for faculty and staff and look at inequities in terms of hiring this year and put up a request through budgeting process to help fund. I would like to see a policy for people who were just promoted and began new roles last week. I would ask we try to get it through on a single reading.
- Yao: We have not budgeted for over 9%. Discussions on this need to be talked about in reference to a budget line. As would the results of an equity study.
- Meriwether: It's wise to say this needs to come in the form of a budget line for institutionalization.
- Deans: Lecturers need to be included in this conversation. Lecturers also ask Chairs for support and Dean approves or does not.
- Wood: A policy is being developed. An equity study will occur to include lecturers. Someone should announce in Senate if that study will occur. A budget request will go in in relation to equity findings.
- Yao: It would be nice to have clear criteria for evaluation.
- Deans: Cohort of faculty hired this year were told they could negotiate salary at promotion. We are not following past practices and reneging on a verbal agreement between the Dean and the faculty member that was hired.
- Wood: At hire and at faculty orientation.
- Yao: The past practice should not have happened. How do we navigate that going forward?
- Avila: Policy will include who is eligible, decision-making criteria, process for notification, scope, maximum amount, what we are taking into account. I am in favor of not having people apply. I'll make sure I could get feedback before next Senate Exec.
- Wood: This bit is just for tenure track. This policy is at least equity.
- Avila: There is nothing in the CBA around merit.

7. Report from the President

a) Enrollment Update

- 3.5% decrease in FTES last year, covered with reserves
- Fall 2020: 30% decline from 19 to 20 for first-time full-time cohort
- Fall 2021: 6576 students – 5% decrease. FTES took a big hit.
- 627—first-time full-time, students this year, 2% FTES decrease.
- Transfers down 10% in head count. Community colleges are also down in enrollment.
- GI 2025: Retention numbers Fall 2019—83% 1-year retention, 72% 2-year retention
- Down in unit load: 13.0
- Getting within 5% of target is the goal.
- Academic masterplan to control strategic management.
- Promoting retention work: Program chairs look at retention rate, DFW, are we

offering classes when students need them? Disenrollment policy. Academic excellence, programs, high-impact practices. What are most popular majors for students from Moorpark and Ventura?

- D. Baker: I need better tools when students come to me and want to apply.
- Grzegorzczuk: Messaging needs to better emphasize academic excellence and student success.
- Demographics shifts are a reality—Who do we also need to be targeting to come to Channel Islands? In addition to fixing administrative barriers.
- Davis: It may also be helpful to look at students not admitted. Transfers from not CC may not get proper credits.
- D. Baker: SFR hurts high-impact practice implementation.

8. Report from the Provost

- a) Looking forward to continued robust enrollment and retention conversation.
- b) CFA verification of testing agreement. Campus opted in. Communication to faculty being discussed. Tomorrow requirement about testing and verification goes into effect.

(Note: Senate executive business cannot continue past scheduled end time without motion)

9. Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

**Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the [Senate webpage](#))*