Academic Senate Agenda

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, December 1, 2015, 2:30-4:30

**Attendees:** Leafstedt, Jill; Veldman, Brittnee; Miller, Jason; Flores, Cynthia; Thoms, Brian; Jenkins, Jacob; Wyels, Cindy; Sanchez, Luis; Carswell, Sean; Dean, Michelle; Jensen, Karen A; Mack, Carol; Nevins, Colleen M; Klompien, Kathleen; Jimenez Jimenez, Antonio; Hartung, Beth; Jim Meriwether; McThomas, Mary; Frisch, Scott; Correia, Manuel; Grzegorczyk, Ivona; Francois, Marie E; Colleen Harris-Keith; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Schmidhauser, Tom; Aloisio, Simone; Yudelson, John; Grier, Jeanne; Stephen Clark; Matt Furmanski; Michael Bourgeois; Travis Hunt; Greg Wood; 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; Melissa Soenke; Bryn Aquino; John Lu; Beatrice de Oca; LaSonya Davis-Smith; Sofia Samatar; Vanessa Mendoza; Sean Anderson; Jason Isaacs;

1. Approval of the Agenda
   1. Agenda was approved with no objections.
2. Approval of the Minutes of November 10, 2015
   1. Meeting minutes were approved with no objections.
3. Report from Police Chief (Reid) – *Time Certain 2:45pm*
   1. J. Reid: regarding the first question received from B. de Oca, the last few years we’ve been discussing parking and transportation for our campus; beginning in Spring we’re bringing in a group to study our state of parking and transportation, in concert with the campus master plan; parking in general is very expensive, such as a parking structure, i.e. $15,000 per space; most of this expense is borne on the backs of students; so, we’re looking into what can we do with alternative transportation; please look forward to this visit from our group, as there will be opportunities to engage;
   2. Regarding the second question received from B. Monsma: this is on the scope of the transportation study; lot of competing interest here, deferred maintenance on the levy for example;
   3. Referencing the third question re: Active Shooter materials, J. Grier asked how can we implement the guidance on the video here at CI; J. Reid answered that through my lens we have this information accessible, but that might not capture everything, so I’m interested in hearing your ideas; announced the Emergency Management Resources available on the website; if there’s a feeling that faculty needs to do more, please let him know, as more workshops on prevention and awareness are being offered; J. Grier recalled the question about locking doors from the inside; J. Reid answered that we’d like to see the doors locked at all times, not as convenient as our present state, but we’d like to move towards this; example cited that Bell Tower West has CM locks that are locally controlled, but we’d like to see more of the Sierra Hall model where we can remotely control these doors; no study done on lighting and how this is turned off, but we can request such a study and work with Facilities to examine this; in the meantime with an open door, best scenario is to barricade the door, this is today’s solution;
   4. In regards to the fourth question on receiving email warnings in advance of emergency drills: it’s the understanding of J. Reid that those notices are going out on our drills from N. Gill’s Communication and Marketing Office, but I will follow up to see if there was an execution issue;
   5. A. Jiménez asked what does one do when a student is being aggressive in the classroom, current guidance says to call 911, but how do we do that during the situation; J. Reid offered best advice is to not engage student, cancel this class and dismiss students; C. Wyels asked with reference to the transportation study, could you tell us how you’ll communicate a diversity of perspectives from those coming to campus and their transportation means to the consultants– J. Reid answered to please direct this question to J. Gormley who is the lead on this group study;
4. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
   1. G. Hutchinson congratulated faculty on another successful semester; update on faculty searches, 16 searches this term, currently meeting with DSC chairs, and we’re about half way through with the review of seven candidates; these names have been forwarded to the President, he is calling them with welcome message; G. Hutchinson will meet with other nine search committees tomorrow, then these recommendations in turn will go to the President; we’re limited with time resources right now, but hopeful to have good news to send to you before the end of the semester;
   2. J. Grier asked if any update on Spring searches; G. Hutchinson answered no update on this yet;
   3. G. Hutchinson summarized good Strategic Planning meetings, another one this Friday, where we’ll incorporate feedback from the Qualtrics survey; also, restructuring initiative has been put off until the Spring until the strategic planning is complete;
5. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
   1. J. Yudelson recalled email from statewide senate chair, who communicated that even though 22 of 23 campuses asked for presidential finalists to be available for open search, the Chancellor has decided to keep the Presidential searches as confidential;
6. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
   1. No report
7. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
   1. J. Grier updated Senate on progress of two task forces, with forthcoming open invitations in the Spring; one is on Senate restructuring, so you’ll be seeing a draft based upon the vote that faculty took to have a representative model (“Model B”); we decided to not forward anything else this semester; the other task force item is about a perpetual calendar, something that we would approve for years at a time, and also includes a discussion about a Fall break;
   2. J. Grier will head to Senate chairs meeting in Long Beach tomorrow, one of the items to report there is the status on our presidential search; the committee received a position description to review, we’re editing this now and will deliver to the search firm; this will then be advertised in the future; thanks to all who attended the open forum – link is available online to watch the entire forum, captured a lot of great feedback from the community and our constituents;
8. Continuing Business Items
   1. SP 15-02 Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research
      1. J. Miller opened discussion on policy, clarifying last revision based on comments during last senate meeting; No further discussion was had;
      2. VOTE: 41 YES – 2 ABSTAIN; SP 15-02 is approved.
   2. SP 15-03 Academic Master Plan 16-17 (APC)
      1. J. Grier noted that this has the Track Changes feature on per Chancellor Office instructions;
      2. I. Grzegorczyk recalled contacting Curriculum Committee to revise the date on Computer Engineering to 2017; motion by I. Grzegorczyk to do so, seconded by M. Soltys; I. Grzegorczyk recalled presentation today before Senate, will be able to be implemented in 2016, but with review period should be reflected as 2017; C. Wyels asked for clarification on what these dates mean – J. Grier answered that these dates have little to no bearing on when the programs will be offered. To be offered they must be on the AMP and approved by the Board of Trustees; Programs may be offered before or after the date;
      3. VOTE on date change from 2019 to 2017: 32 YES, 7 NO, 7 ABSTAIN; date change to 2017 for Computer Engineering was approved.
      4. M. Soltys commented on the proposed name change from Computer Engineering to Mechatronics; reason is that Chancellor’s Office approved “Computer Engineering” in 2006, but since then the field has had numerous changes, so this name change would be more reflective of the demands of the field; A. Jiménez asked to clarify how impactful this name change will be on resources: I. Grzegorczyk recalled that ten years ago there was no Mechatronics, but now there are uses of this field, particularly in robotics, such as artificial limbs; another example is small robotic bees that will pollenate plants in the current trends of reduced bee populations; also, we do have the lab space in Sierra Hall, and local companies are trying to give us the extra equipment that is needed; further, we now have six instructors in the Computer Science Program, versus the one or two we had in 2007; A. Jiménez asked what about the process, there was a form that was submitted earlier, and these changes sound like much more than a name change, may require another submission in keeping with the process; I. Grzegorczyk recalled a previous name change at the Chancellor Office level, where “systems” was changed to “engineering,” and that this change did not require such a form;
      5. J. Meriwether moved to postpone amendment, seconded by C. Delaney; J. Meriwether voiced concern that more discussion is necessary to flesh this out; read the original form aloud, and pointed out that this change is more substantial than what has been captured;
      6. S. Aloisio spoke out against the motion, didn’t think the change was that significant; K. Leonard also spoke out against the motion, observing that the change was already approved by Curriculum Committee; G. Buhl noted the long form is what was proposed by the program and what is being processed by the committee; I. Grzegorczyk added that the word Mechatronics just means the hardware, analogy that it is broadening the topic rather than changing the topic; M. Soltys further added that it’s a question of today’s job market, and we’re concerned about our student’s readiness; P. Hampton added that he was initially concerned with the name change, but then went back to the short form and confirmed that it aligns with the initial structure and intent;
      7. J. Yudelson moved to call the question, no objections;
      8. VOTE on the postponement of the discussion: 9 YES – 32 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; Discussion will not postpone, continued below:
      9. J. Meriwether observed that as we move and create programs that this is all fruitful discussion, but the issue is not receiving adequate information that faculty get to prepare for such healthy discussion; M. Soltys offered that he can repeat the presentation as many times as is necessary;
      10. VOTE on the name change: 39 YES – 7 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; name change approved from Computer Engineering to Mechatronics Engineering.
      11. M. Francois asked when were items crossed off; G. Buhl answered that happened this Fall, and we requested long forms to be submitted; M. Francois added that so then if J. Balén is on sabbatical and Freedom and Justice Studies was crossed off; D. Downey observed that the MA in Applied Sociology was also crossed out because we were unable to move a long form forward this year; the understanding was that this does not translate into any long term consequences; J. Meriwether added that he did not think there is clarity on this; D. Downey noted he received abundant clarity that it wasn’t going back to the master plan; K. Jensen recalled that she was contacted about kinesiology and nutrition, which have been crossed out here, plus we wanted to clear them out from Google searches; S. Anderson asked if after crossing it out it’s gone forever until a reapplication process; J. Meriwether summarized that what the question is what happens to the proposers of a program that get crossed off, and this answer lies with the Provost Office; G. Hutchinson answered that it doesn’t need to disappear forever, but those programs that don’t exist shouldn’t be published at the Chancellor’s Office – this way students don’t call or come knocking for programs that are not forthcoming; J. Grier noted that this revision to the Academic Planning Process is with Curriculum Committee now, they took the task force recommendation;
      12. J. Grier recalled that in the past we’ve been able to look at an internal document; P. Hampton added that what’s concerning is that we’re not able to see a backup plan for our wish list, but before we start pulling stuff off of this list for some clarity, shouldn’t we have a backup plan, due to the implication that if it is crossed off this list that a reapplication is necessary;
      13. M. Francois commented that in the case of Freedom & Justice Studies, it’s an existing minor, has a cluster of faculty championing it, but there is a lead faculty member, but what happens if they don’t get the email, then this illustrates a part of a broken process; C. Harris-Keith suggested that in light of this is it possible to move to change this date; M. Francois moved to adjust the date to 2019 on Freedom and Justice Studies, seconded by S. Stratton;
      14. K. Leonard offered to go program by program to ask them if they want to be displayed on this document or not; S. Aloisio noted that he would feel more comfortable voting on a concrete document; D. Downey reiterated that we were told that there will be no implications on this, so if we decide to go this route then I will immediately move to do the same for MA Applied Sociology; B. Monsma read aloud a response to an in-meeting email sent to J. Balén, who confirmed she was asked about deleting Freedom and Justice studies and agreed to it, but further commented that she is worried that once stricken it will defeat more long-term efforts; J. Meriwether noted that the task force reached the same conclusion, but that the Associate Provost has not responded; G. Hutchinson asked to clarify what the conclusion was – J. Meriwether answered that if they didn’t do a long form this year, that they would have to start from point A, which is counter to what’s being discussed;
      15. G. Hutchinson moved to table this discussion; J. Grier noted that this document came from Academic Planning; G. Hutchinson added that tabling this may help us avoid a greater gap in our understanding; S. Anderson asked if a separate column of “To Be Determined” can be added to the document, so that programs to be determined won’t need to resubmit a short form;
      16. Discussion of the timeline for approving this document and need to vote today in order to deliver to Chancellor’s Office by January; G. Buhl added that he did not believe that we do need to vote on this today, we can send the Chancellor the last Senate approved document from last year;
      17. K. Leonard withdrew her motion; go back to M. Francois’ motion; J. Grier suggested to please include a date in the motion; M. Francois moves to unstrike Freedom & Justice and to add 2019, second by C. Harris-Keith; called to question:
      18. VOTE to amend AMP to unstrike Freedom & Justice and revise date to 2019: 37 YES – 5 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; changes were approved.
      19. D. Downey moved to similarly unstrike MA in Applied Sociology and revise date to 2018, seconded by S. Anderson; No discussion;
      20. VOTE to amend AMP to unstrike MA in Applied Sociology and add 2018 date: 37 YES – 2 NO – 1 ABSTAIN
      21. S. Anderson called to vote, V. Adams second, call to vote on SP 15-03:
      22. VOTE: 42 YES – 1 NO – 1 ABSTAIN; SP 15-03 was approved;
      23. K. Leonard recalled having this conversation previously a total of seven times, this is a problem, let’s not have it again; G. Hutchinson agreed, and added that we are making incremental gains in improving the process; C. Harris-Keith agreed with P. Hampton’s comments for backup documentation as to the status of what happens when items are crossed off and how programs are notified; G. Hutchinson added that it should never take two years to get out of Curriculum, should be able to do it in a semester.
9. New Business Item
   1. Policy on Golden Four General Education Courses (GE)
      1. M. Francois moved to discuss, seconded by S. Stratton;
      2. G. Buhl reviewed what the Golden Four were in the CSU; new E.O. covers transfers, new requirement that native students in the CSU satisfy the Golden Four with a minimum grade of “C” or higher – this is to align with the same requirement that transfer students have; in drafting this members of GE and SAPP thought it would be appropriate to include incentives for native students to do this in the first 60 units here, i.e. “if a student has not satisfied / enrolled in these then they have the status of having 59 units”;
      3. S. Aloisio voiced concern that the science and STEM students are limited to one GE course per semester due to major requirements; C. Harris-Keith noted that she is getting functionally illiterate students in the 300 level courses she teaches, so it’s difficult to not have them take these earlier; S. Carswell noted that he too teaches a lot of these classes, rare that it’s science students, but it is alarming that the seniors I see are at a C or D level; T. Hunt recalled registration priority for student groups such as individuals with disabilities and asked on the implications of this policy on these students; K. Vose suggested that we make sure to include the composition faculty leads on this discussion – J. Grier answered that this is a first reading, so yes we can; I. Grzegorczyk added that it may be advisable that language be added about the processes involved; T. Hunt asked when would this be applicable – G. Buhl answered next academic year;
      4. G. Buhl summarized that there could be two main questions here, do we want our native students to take the Golden Four in the first 60 units; and if so, how can we incentivize it to implement it on the document;
10. Intent to Raise Questions
    1. J. Grier noted all of the last questions came directed to Chief Reid, so he was asked to come today (see Report #3);
    2. New questions for Senate: C. Wyels to John Gormley with respect to the transportation study – is/was the guidance given to the study group developed in consultation with representatives from a diversity of stakeholders on campus (daytime and evening populations; students, staff, faculty, admin, community; residents and commuters, etc.)?

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

Faculty Affairs Committee

* P. Hampton announced that there will be a forthcoming survey to give us feedback by Dec. 14th on our SRT instrument, please take the time to complete it;

Fiscal Policies

* M. Francois looking forward to continuing work with Provost’s Council, performing a historical audit so we know what to look for;

Student Academic Policies and Procedures

* S. Carswell recalled many projects in the works, such as a second BA policy and revising the reinstatement policy;

Curriculum Committee

* No report

General Education

* No report

Committee on Committees

* No report

Committee on Centers and Institutes

* P. Hampton noted the completed reviews on Centers and Institutes

Professional Leave Committee

* No report

Mini-Grant Review Committee

- J. Miller recalled that mini-grant deadline has passed, but not too late, since we are reviewing proposals in the order received;

11. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

- J. Grier reminded that Senate newsletter is available to help circulate additional reports or announcements;

12. Announcements

- C. Harris-Keith announced that the library is in 24-hour mode;

- J. Yudelson asked Senate to please consider donating sick hours for Angela Chapman, a colleague who is having health problems – contact Diane Enos in Human Resources;

- G. Hutchinson announced that additional website links have been made available to help you find information on budget and development and strategic planning;

13. Adjourn

- Motion by C. Harris-Keith to adjourn, second by G. Wood; meeting is adjourned at 4:33pm.