CSU Channel Islands Possible Senate Models

Introduction

Why Consider Changing our Senate Structure? What could we gain? What could we lose?

Few institutions do not benefit from periodic evaluation of practices; the CI Academic Senate is no different. The structure of the Senate was last considered by a task force after three complete years of Senate operations; a total of 13 years have now passed. A belief that current Senate structure and patterns of behavior are both inefficient and ineffective in terms of providing faculty perspectives in university decision-making prompted the AY14-15 Senate Executive Committee to call for a task force to re-examine the structure of the Academic Senate and to make a recommendation regarding structure and composition.

Issues identified as currently problematic include redundancy of work and discussions as topics are entertained at multiple levels (e.g., at a committee level, then in Senate Exec with no committee perspectives, and finally in Senate), the ongoing challenge of making quorum, a frequent lack of adequate preparation for Senate discussion, the inequitable representation of lecturer faculty, the capacity for the current Senate structure to manage planned growth in tenure-line faculty ranks in the next several years, the burden of expected service that is not meaningful in RTP decisions (as all tenure-line faculty are Senators), a repeated penchant for spending Senate meeting time on matters relevant to only a few or not within the purview of the Senate, and the seeming inability of the Senate to make tough decisions (e.g., in spite of repeated discussion of limited resources, every single Curriculum proposal to come before the Senate in the past several years has passed).

Most importantly, and partly due to these issues, the Academic Senate has arguably become irrelevant to the administration in shaping the future of CSU Channel Islands. Many decisions critical to the direction of the university were not brought to the attention of the Senate until after the decisions were made. The proposed growth rate in FTES (14% in AY14-15 followed by 8% for several years thereafter), the increase in the number of satellite campuses and the programs offered at these campuses, a wholesale transformation of a program's curriculum into an online program, the decision (since postponed) to begin varsity athletics as of F'14– these are examples of issues made with limited faculty representation in a process of deliberation.

Yet, moving to a representative senate structure would introduce potential disadvantages. Currently, all tenure-line faculty have the opportunity to be active in Senate; this may be particularly important for the ability of newly arrived tenure-line faculty to develop a sense of investment in or belonging to the university. All tenure-line faculty currently have the opportunity to address Senate on all issues before Senate, and to raise questions of any nature whatsoever. Finally, there is a sense of belong and community amongst the tenure-line faculty who participate regularly.

Guiding Principles for Considering Existing and Proposed Models

Models proposed within this document as well as those discussed and combined or rejected were considered from a standpoint of how well they satisfied the principles below.

1. The senate structure allows senators have sufficient opportunity to consider perspectives from individual faculty and small groups of faculty when reaching decisions.
2. The senate structure encourages informed deliberation.
3. The senate structure allows the faculty to reach decisions in a timely fashion.
4. The senate structure encourages/ obligates the administration to take faculty decisions into account when making decisions.
5. The senate structure is effective at addressing issues pertaining to faculty.

Spring '15 Engagement of All Faculty

The plan and timeline for soliciting and incorporating suggestions from faculty regarding the work of the Structure Task Force, and for completing that work, follows.

"Possible Senate Models" document sent to faculty with reminder of brown bags scheduled to discuss the models outlined in the document. The plan for the brown bags is to briefly present the models to those participating and to solicit faculty questions and opinions regarding the models.	Feb. 24
Forum 1, 2:30 – 4, MVS Decision Making Center, Smith 1908. Electronic survey soliciting comments opens.	March 3, Tuesday
Forum 2, 12 – 1:30, MVS Decision Making Center, Smith 1908.	March 6, Friday
Electronic survey soliciting comments closes.	March 8, Sunday
TF meeting. Discuss Forum findings. Prepare final assessment of 2 – 3 models (vote if consensus unavailable). Prepare faculty survey.	March 9, Monday
Send survey; announce in Senate. Survey closes April 17.	March 24, Tuesday
TF meeting; discuss survey results; discuss recommendations to Senate.	April 20, Monday
Volunteers write up recommendations; circulate to TF.	By Apr 24, Friday
Final TF meeting; seek consensus re recommendations.	Apr 27, Monday
Send final report to Senate Exec; disband TF.	Apr 28, Tuesday

Models under Consideration

Notes
- These models are to be considered as broad ideas. Details will be considered by an AY15-16 Structure Task Force II (STFII). Appendix B lists some items that will be passed to STFII for consideration.
- The models proposed differ primarily on three points: 1) how many and which faculty participate as voting senators; 2) who else besides faculty can be senators; and 3) who else besides faculty senators are voting senators.
- Numbers of senators and ex-officio members offered in Models B and C are approximations to give an idea of what the senate may look like with these structures. If either of these models are preferred by faculty, the STFII will develop the details.
- "Faculty" is to be understood as tenure-line faculty, lecturer faculty, librarian faculty, counselors, and coaches – all unit 3 employees under the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- Ex-Officio means a person is of a position that includes them on the committee. A person may be ex-officio voting or ex-officio non-voting.
- We assume that all non-senators (faculty, staff, admin, students) will continue to be welcome to attend Senate meetings.

Model A: Faculty Senate of the Tenure-Line Whole (tenure-line faculty, limited FT lecturer representation, one student)

Constituents	Number	Notes/Explanation
Tenure-line faculty	All	
Lecturer faculty	5	FT lecturers eligible, elected by all lecturers
Students	1	Student government president or designee. Voting.
Staff	0	
Administrators	0	
Total	Number of tenure-line faculty + 6	

Model A is the current CI model.

Model B: Representative Faculty Senate (mostly faculty, 1 student, non-voting administrators)

Constituents	Number	Notes/Explanation
Tenure-line faculty and/or Lecturer faculty	*Up to 44 + 4n*	Tenure line and lecturer faculty are equally eligible for faculty senator roles. Areas for representation may be at the School (4x) or program area (?x). May also include at-large senate seats
Students	*1 – 5*	1 on Senate Exec; potentially one additional student on each of four standing committees. Voting.
Staff	*0*	
Administrators	*2 - 4*	President or designee; Provost, potentially up to two others. Non-voting
Total	*At least 47*	

Model B assumes four standing committees as proposed in Appendix B. Details regarding rounds of voting (elect four Senate Officers; elect disciplinary area representatives; elect at-large representatives) will be passed on to AY15-16 Structure Task Force II.

Model B results from combining two models discussed while deferring decisions about size of represented units (e.g. programs or larger blocks) to STFII. Faculty are encouraged to weigh in regarding represented units: some STFI members felt anything larger than "program" was unacceptable.

Model C: Representative University Senate (faculty, student, administrators, staff)

Constituents	Number	Notes/Explanation
Tenure-line faculty	*16-32*	2 - 4 representatives of each of 6 constituent groups as currently identified in Standing Committees; 4 – 6 at-large representatives, May consider program or school representation as well.
Lecturer faculty	*4-6*	Representative vote
Students	*2-4*	Should be from student government
Staff	*2-4*	Elected by staff. Voting.
Administrators	*6*	President? Provost? VPs? Select AVPs? Voting.
Total	*30-52*	

Model C is proposed as a means of putting all the decision makers at the table when considering significant university decisions. The AY14-15 Structure Task Force asks that this model be considered as **contingent**: We expect that any proposal written to change current Senate bylaws to this type of model would be written so that the change would only go into effect if the administration disbands the President Planning and Policy Committee (as redundant) and/or puts the Senate Chair on the Cabinet and Provost's Council.

Models B and C assume four standing committees as proposed in Appendix B. Details regarding rounds of voting (elect four Senate Officers; elect disciplinary area representatives; elect at-large representatives) will be passed on to AY15-16 Structure Task Force II.

Analysis of Proposed Models in Terms of Guiding Principles

This analysis anticipates most likely scenarios, given current campus culture, proposed growth, expected changes in personnel, etc.

Criteria/Model	A	B	C
opportunity to consider perspectives from individual faculty and small groups of faculty	All who wish to participate have opportunity to do so. Individual/ minority viewpoints may not be heard due to time constraints, particularly as faculty numbers grow. Lecturers' viewpoints under-represented. Some faculty members feel an obligation to attend Senate to have "face time" on campus, rather than seeing Senate as an opportunity for meaningful service. Many faculty do not attend, or seldom attend, leading to them not listen to discussions or other viewpoints.	Viewpoints held by non-senator individuals/ minorities could, if holder(s) unable to convince a senator, fail to be considered by the senate. These models could still allow for certain issues/topics to be put to a vote of the entire faculty.	
encourages informed deliberation	Senators not always informed. Part-time nature of senate participation leads to senators not hearing discussions.	Provides mechanism for rewarding informed, collaborative representation (both in terms of during Senate discussion and in terms of soliciting ideas/ opinions from those represented) or for not re-electing senators who fail to work at informing themselves.	
allows the faculty to reach decisions in a timely fashion	History of challenges in making and keeping quorum; when quorum not met or is lost, no business can be done. Not all senators arrive prepared/ informed. At times, no members from a committee are present at the senate meetings. Committee chairs are not present at Senate Exec meeting, leading to redundancy or work.	Senators choose to run for election; should be relatively easy to make a much higher quorum percentage. Senators serve on standing committees and attend senate. Standing committee chairs members of Senate Exec.	As there will be representations from all major constituencies on campus, the discussions will be *inclusive* from the outset, and ultimately a *time-saver*. Representatives should consult with those they're representing before a decision can be taken, so decision-making process could be protracted.

encourages/ obligates the administration to take faculty decisions into account	Administrators attend senate on mostly a voluntary basis. Historically, many from academic affairs do attend and listen to faculty perspective, but some do not.	Presumption of informed, responsible representation could make conclusions carry more weight when administration making decisions. Similar to A in many respects.	Presence of voting administrators can increase communication on the front end of discussions. Admin feel a part of the discussion and will share more openly and gives rationale for decisions up front and not behind closed doors Encourages; doesn't obligate. (No possible structure will "obligate" given CSU policy.) Creates one policy making body for the university with majority faculty voice and leadership. Could lead to dilution of faculty-centered perspective.
effective at addressing issues pertaining to faculty	Any faculty member may raise an issue he/ she believes pertains to faculty.	Presumption of effectiveness in address faculty issues	Creates one policy-making body for the university with majority faculty voice and leadership. May have an increase in university business not often seen at senate
Senate service meaningful/ senators take responsibility seriously	As all tenure-track faculty are senators, citing this service in RTP documents is not meaningful. A majority of senators (over half) do not take the responsibility seriously (as indicated by not showing up).	Service more meaningful. Representatives would stand for election; expectation is that individuals would only do so when intending to take the responsibility seriously. Time of those not so interested would be freed up for things they find more meaningful.	

Appendix A: Charge of the AY14-15 Task Force; Modified Charge

(Original) Charge to the Task Force on Senate Structure: Membership and Committees:

This task force shall consist of all interested Senate members who volunteer to serve. It is charged with making a recommendation about whether the Senate should become a representative body in 2015-16, and, if the recommendation is to become a representative body, how the body would be constituted. This would include, but not be limited to, the size of the Senate, the nature of the representation (that is, would senators be elected at-large, or would there be representation by academic program, lecturer representation, staff representation), and the term of office for senators. The task force shall make a recommendation on what matters shall require a vote of the tenure-track and/or temporary faculty, rather than of the Senate. Additionally, the task force is charged with making a recommendation for senate and advisory committees needed and committee descriptions and tasks, along with membership recommendations and length of terms.

Modified Continuing Charge:

- Investigate the specific questions inherent in the original charge.
- Prepare a summary of considerations and 2 – 3 recommended models to distribute to all faculty; solicit faculty input regarding choice of models through an open vote of all faculty after brown bag discussion forums.
- Forward model with majority of votes and make a recommendation regarding senate and advisory committee structure. AY15-16 "Structure Task Force II" will develop specifics regarding representative constituents (if needed), committee descriptions and tasks, membership recommendations and lengths of terms, and prepare a proposal for a vote of the Senate.

Appendix B: Items for AY15-16 Structure Task Force II to Consider

- Voting (how/ when done; who votes)
- Role of administrators, staff, and students (voting/ non-voting)
- Representation (by area, by department, any/ none at-large); lecturer representation
- Frequency of meetings
- Scope of topics that senate should deliberate?
- If representative, senators speak on behalf of their constituents. Expectations for conferring formally with the group that elected them?
- If representative with non-faculty voting senators, what issues do only faculty senators vote on?
- What are the representative bodies?
- Means of ending senator terms early—procedurally
- What issues get brought to the whole faculty (RTP, constitution, course evaluation?)
- Recommendation that Senate Chair be a member of the cabinet and Provost's Council

Voting Proposal that may be attached to any senate model: All faculty (tenure-line & full-time lecturer) will have voting privileges for policies and resolutions that come before the senate. Voting will take place outside of scheduled senate meetings using an electronic voting system. The senators and senate officers that participate during scheduled meetings will hold votes to recommend a yes or no vote on policies/resolutions. Senators can also develop pro/con statements about policies if they choose to. A summary of the discussion surrounding policies/resolutions and any pro/con statements will be provided to faculty before holding the electronic vote.
Note: This proposal is provided for reference. It was put forward by two members of STFI and discussed in meetings twice; it did not obtain consensus from STFI.

Senate Committee Structure Proposal:
Overview: Four standing committees that somewhat mirror State-wide Academic Senate (may need new committee names) plus one that reflects the uniqueness of CI's mission.
Subcommittees of the five over-arching committees as indicated in the table.

Executive	Faculty Affairs	Academic Planning and Policy	Fiscal & Other Resources	Mission Council
Enrollment Management	Hiring Planning/ Coordinating	Curriculum	Enrollment Management	CIS
Strategic Planning	Faculty Development	Student-Oriented stuff (SAPP)	Univ Budget	CME
Elections	RTP Policy	Enrollment Management?	Hiring Planning/ Coordinating	CCE
Constitution and Bylaws	Professional Leaves	GE	Long-Range Planning	CIA
Advisory Committees	Mini-Grants	Transfer Articulation	Sustainability	

Centers Oversight		AMP		
		Academic Assessment		

Recommendations regarding this structure:
- Chairs of the standing committees are senate exec members
- Chairs of the standing committees are elected to chair for one-year terms—with possible reassigned time
- Perhaps use a chair, chair elect (chair-in-training) system
- All senators will be on at least one committee (send preferences, exec appoints)
- Senators should be elected for 2- or 3-year terms
- Only (large) committee charge/scope would appear in by-laws.
- Subcommittees within the standing committees would be tasked for various duties as needed and as indicated by the list of items below each heading—subcommittees are not listed in the bylaws
- Other campus-wide committees and advisory boards would continue to seek faculty appointments from senate executive

Note: This proposal had unanimous approval from the F'15 STFI subgroup tasked to work on senate committee structures. STFI as a whole did not consider this proposal.

Appendix C: Resources Available to the AY14-15 Structure Task Force

All print/ electronic resources referred to below are available to all senators via the CI Learn Academic Senate page and can be made available for those who do not have access.

1. Documents provided from the CI AY04-05 Task Force that last considered whether CI should move to a representative senate structure
2. Articles in the literature about effective governance structures
3. Information collected from other CSUs about their governance structures and satisfaction therewith
4. Discussions within Task Force and Task Force subgroups; conversations with colleagues at CI and elsewhere

Appendix D: Process followed by AY14-15 Structure Task Force

F'14	Receive charge from Senate Exec; call for volunteers. Two subgroups formed, one charged with investigating models and developing ideas for re-structuring the senate body, the other charged with investigating models and developing ideas for restructuring the senate committees. Results: Consensus within one subgroup re committees (ready to propose to faculty, see Appendix B).
Dec. '14	Outline of work for S'15 circulated; timeline for S'15 established.
Jan. '15	Investigations/ analysis of other models, opportunities to propose own models. (Work initially to be completed by Feb. 2; extended to Feb. 5.)
Feb. 2	First S'15 meeting. Unable to discuss models yet; focused on broad advantages and disadvantages of senate-of-the-whole and representative senate models.
Feb. 9	Second S'15 meeting. Discussed satisfaction with and concerns regarding current structure. Discussed models that had been investigated/ proposed.
By Feb. 16	Task force members to flesh out potential model for which they are advocates or which they believe should move forward for consideration
Feb. 16	Third S'15 meeting. Review models proposed and framing document. Determine whether any additional info needed.
By Feb. 19	Volunteers compile proposed models into framing document, incorporating changes suggested in meeting and by email.
Feb. 20	Document sent for review by Task Force
Feb. 23	Task Force feedback incorporated
Feb. 24	Document sent to faculty.

Appendix E: AY14-15 Structure Task Force Membership

	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Simone Aloisio	x	x
AJ Biesczad	x	
Amy Denton	x	x
Jesse Elliott	x	
Jeanne Grier	x	x
Jacob Jenkins	x	x
Nancy Mozingo	x	
Luda Popenhagen	x	x
Cindy Wyels	x	x