Academic Senate

MEETING MINUTES

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, March 1, 2016, 2:30-4:30

Attendees: Adams, Virgil; Adler, Mary; Aloisio, Simone; Andrzejewski, Susan; Aquino, Bryn; Awad, Ahmed; Banuelos, Selenne; Barton, Jared; Berman, Michael; Bieszczad, A.J.; Bourgeois, Michael; Buhl, Geoff; Burriss, Catherine; Carswell, Sean; Cazares, Leticia; Clark, Stephen; Clarke, Tracylee; Cook, Matthew; Davis-Smith, LaSonya; de Oca, Beatrice; Dean, Michelle; Delaney, Colleen; Delgado, Jasmine; Downey, Dennis; Elliott, Jesse; Edwards, Jeannette; Evans Taylor, Genevieve; Flores, Cynthia; Francois, Marie; Grier, Jeanne; Guzman, Georgina; Hampton, Philip; Harris-Keith, Colleen; Hartung, Beth; Hoffmann, Debra; Huang, Nian-Sheng; Hunt, Travis; Hutchinson, Gayle; Isaacs, Jason; Kelly, Sean; Leonard, Kathryn; Lee, Sohui; Linton, Kristen; Mack, Carol; Meriwether, Jim; Monsma, Brad; Murphy, Paul; Ornelas-Higdon, Julia; Patsch, Kiersten; Perchuk, Alison; Pereira, Monica; Popenhagen, Luda; Rivas, Monica; Samatar, Sofia; Schmidhauser, Tom; Smith, Christina; Soenke, Melissa; Soltys, Michael; Tamayo, Venus; Thoms, Brian; Tollefson, Kaia; Veldmann, Brittnee; Vose, Kim; Wagner, Billy; Wakelee, Dan; Weis, Chuck; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy; Yudelson, John;

1. Approval of the Academic Senate Agenda
	1. Quorum reached at 2:35pm; agenda approved with no objections;
2. Approval of the Minutes of February 9, 2016
	1. Meeting minutes from 2/9/16 were approved with no objections;
3. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
	1. G. Hutchinson updated senators on faculty searches, nine candidates have been interviewed thus far for the six faculty searches currently underway;
	2. Restructure Committee has met, and we’re looking at organizational and divisional restructuring;
	3. Update on the search committee to assist with the internal appointment of an Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences, which will be determined by March 11, 2016; details on the composition of the search committee will be announced at that time; in compliance with proposed and current Senate policy, the Chair of the Academic Senate will ask for faculty volunteers to serve on the search committee; once the search committee is determined, a call for interested and qualified faculty to apply for the position of Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences will be posted; applicants will be asked to submit a cover letter addressing their qualifications and why they wish to serve as Interim Dean along with a current vita; finalists will be asked to make an oral presentation at an open forum for faculty, staff and students within Arts and Sciences; the Interim Dean may apply for the permanent Dean position when it becomes available; all Arts and Sciences faculty, staff and students will have the opportunity to submit feedback about each candidate after the open forum and online; a web link will be forthcoming; as the final step in the process, the search committee submits its recommendation(s) to the Provost who will make the final decision; every effort will be made to appoint the Interim Dean by May 1st;
4. Finally, G. Hutchinson made the announcement that Alex McNeil has passed away; A. McNeil served as the first vice president of academic affairs at CI; for anyone who wishes to make a donation to CI on his behalf, please contact K. Tollefson;
5. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
	1. S. Aloisio noted the ASCSU has not met since the last time we had senate; next Wednesday morning the Presidential search results from CI and Chico will be announced;
6. Report from CFA President (Griffin)—Time Certain 2:35p
	1. J. Griffin introduced his InfoGraphic, displayed presentation on “Faculty Salaries,” which showed base salary figures and CI’s rank as second to last among CSUs; system-wide median of earnings is $46K, compared with earnings of administrators at $106K; what we’re asking for in CFA negotiations is a 5% increase, which would help to reduce this gap;
7. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
	1. J. Grier noted that the Presidential search committee has forwarded three names to the Board of Trustees (BoT) as our recommendations for the new CI President; the three candidates are meeting with the BoT on March 7th, and the new President will be announced on March 9th; summarized that it’s been difficult for us in the sense that the candidates did not come to campus, but feelings of being pleased because CI faculty voices were heard very clearly;
	2. C. Burriss asked how will we be notified; J. Grier answered that the BoT meeting will be live-streamed and a global email announcement could easily come thereafter;
	3. A.J. Bieszczad asked when will the new president arrive for work – answer from J. Grier is between end of May or beginning of June; There will be an effort to bring the new President to campus soon after the announcement.
8. Continuing Business Items
	1. SP 15-05 Policy on Conducting MPP Searches
		1. J. Grier asked if we have any further discussion on this policy; no further discussion noted;
		2. VOTE: 39 YES – 1 NO – 8 ABSTAIN; SP 15-05 is approved.
9. New Business Items
	1. Constitution of the Academic Senate Revision (Exec)
		1. A. Perchuk moved to discuss, seconded by G. Wood;
		2. S. Aloisio highlighted changing the membership of senate in the constitution to include a possibility for a representative senate model; however, if there is a will of this body to not move forward, it would be good to know this now;
		3. J. Elliott moved to postpone indefinitely, seconded by S. Aloisio;
		4. M. Cook asked to clarify if we can vote on the changing of the constitution without ever addressing the reorganization of the senate; S. Aloisio answered yes; M. Cook followed by asking why don’t we want to move forward on this now; S. Aloisio answered because we’ll have to write 2 or 3 sets of by-laws; at our next meeting we would then propose the changes to by-laws; D. Hoffman asked for similar clarification; A.J. added that if we don’t change it, we’re saying we don’t care and we won’t think about it, which may not be wise because at some point we’ll have to deal with it; the right thing is to approve the change to provide the latitude for an option, as it will be more difficult in five years when we have 300+ faculty members;
		5. J. Elliott commented that he doesn’t think we’re ready, due to still developing new programs like Mechatronics and Philosophy, also felt that we haven’t had many problems meeting quorum, or suggested that we could possibly eliminate quorum; added that there may be problems with a representative model in terms of who gets to represent and who doesn’t, stated that STEM is underrepresented; J. Elliott also expressed his frustration that he cannot get elected to committees he’d like to serve.
		6. V. Adams recalled that from the beginning one of the key things about being here is to have a voice; representative model may focus too much power into a smaller group; we talk about interdisciplinary as part of what we do, but at least here in this venue we get to see each other and hear our voices and expressed that he liked seeing new faculty in this social environment; spoke against the representative model because felt that it will make our voices quieter, not louder; extended appreciation for the work done by J. Grier and S. Aloisio;
		7. K. Vose observed that it seems that any of the proposed models would increase the representation of lecturer faculty, a group historically underrepresented, so she would be in favor of the change;
		8. C. Harris-Keith agreed that at least here we have a chance to grab people to help out with the work, rather than the same representatives over and over; expressed concern at her previous institution the same people were elected to serve.
		9. C. Wyels spoke against the motion to table, adding that the decision to change the constitution doesn’t need to be tied to quorum; what she is hearing is V. Adams’ passion for community, and other desirable traits unique to CI; but in a representative model our senators would be elected, and they have a corresponding responsibility to attend senate meetings and be well-read on the subject matter, in a way that we don’t practice now; commented that we’ll have a more functional decisionmaking body under a representative model;
		10. K. Leonard asked senators by show of hands how many people were hired in the last two years; then observed that this significant number of people would not be in senate today if we were under a representative model; commented that she comes to senate not because she necessarily enjoys it, but because she feels that it is our responsibility under shared governance and she likes seeing people; she added it likely if elected to be a senator, some weeks she would still not come prepared with policies read prior to the meeting.
		11. J. Barton moved to call the question, seconded by M. Cook;
		12. VOTE to end discussion so that we can vote on the motion to postpone indefinitely; 42 YES – 5 NO – 1 ABSTAIN; successful vote to move to voting on indefinitely postponing revisions to constitution;
		13. VOTE 32 YES – 17 NO; revisions to Academic Senate Constitution are postponed indefinitely
	2. Policy on Minors (Curriculum)
		1. J. Barton moved to discuss, seconded by A. Perchuk;
		2. J. Barton recalled that original policy on minors is confusing, the word “program” takes on numerous meanings, which has since been cleaned up; other major edits corresponded to unit limitations; further, language was added to prevent programs from requiring students to get a minor;
		3. S. Clark asked questions on part D, re: no major can declare a minor, he noted that he’s seen this implemented to the benefit of students, adding that it’s very common across the country to see this especially in low unit majors; further discussion between J. Barton and S. Clark on the merits of Part D; J. Barton noted that the committee had considered this viewpoint and decided in favor of the proposal as presented;
		4. J. Grier summarized that this could be an amendment at a second reading;
		5. M. Pereira observed that in terms of having students take more classes it could be a financial burden to them; students should be able to customize their 120 units and could use concentrations;
		6. J. Meriwether asked if we currently have a minimum number of upper division units; J. Barton answered that this is forthcoming in the next document;
		7. M. Bourgeois asked what about the definition of schools, such as the School of Education;
		8. B. Monsma recalled discussions with Alex McNeil about structuring minors in order to allow for true interdisciplinary work;
		9. J. Grier indicated any other comments should go to the Curriculum Committee;
	3. Minimum Characteristics of Majors and Minors (Curriculum)
		1. J. Barton moved to open discussion, seconded by C. Harris-Keith;
		2. J. Barton highlighted the box in minimum unit requirements, which contradicts the other policy from SP 01-03; suggested that if we approve the changes to one, we should reflect it in the other;
		3. G. Buhl recalled advocating for the six units because it would be able to fit minors that fit GE pathways; P. Hampton further added that he wanted it to speak to making it more stringent than requirements outlined by the Chancellor’s Office; by reducing the number of upper division units, more students would be able to get the minor than currently do, while still keeping a higher number of total units;
10. Intent to Raise Questions
	1. G. Hutchinson answered Question #1 from G. Wood: the old strategic plan is dated 2011-16, this previous plan wasn’t attached to a web link, and she’ll make a web archive for these; first there was a mission specific to Academic Affairs, the new one answers the University mission; in the old plan we had a mission for the DAA, and a statement that we were in support of environmental sustainability and STEM; old plan states what our mission values were, then a statement of where we are in two years and in five years; the new plan is focused on driving the university’s strategic plan, and goals related to student success; these goals are outlined and are measurable, making it easier for us to determine internal plans to more specifically align with the new strategic plans; new plan also sets diversity benchmarks into university goals and curricula; Archival plans will be posted to the Provost’s website.
	2. Question #2 included in Provost report, Question #3 is included in the current PowerPoint document;
	3. D. Daniels reviewed the slides relating to his quorum research, noting that quorum has been met in all meetings through the last four academic years; noted that on two occasions the quorum was met approximately twenty minutes into the meeting, but was still meet; further reviewed tables that displayed starting and ending times for all meetings AY12-13 through AY15-16;
	4. New Questions below:
	5. K. Leonard asked if we can please have a clear explanation of processes and allowable procedures for paying students for things other than employment (stipends, prizes, gifts, honoraria, gifts); B. Hartung those discussions are starting in business and finance;
	6. J. Meriwether noted that yesterday he discovered that CI 2025 initiative received an award, yet he was on the steering committee with J. Grier and didn’t know about this, question is how did we go from a meeting in November with Post-It notes to winning a national award in February; rephrased the question to ask how were faculty involved and asked to come to the committee, yet we know nothing about this award or the selection process involved;
	7. J. Meriwether also asked who is the faculty representative on the “nuts and bolts” side of what D. Downey has previously referred to [J. Meriwether will send specific language for this via email]
	8. C. Harris-Keith referenced a recent study that one in four students are not food secure; one student wanted to take on a food bank on campus, with additional support from Ventura County – T. Hunt answered that we received approval for a food bank, and he can check with Monique Reyna (President, Student Government) for additional information; J. Grier asked C. Harris-Keith if she then retracts her question – answer was yes and will work with T. Hunt on this going forward;
	9. J. Elliott recalled the new Philosophy program being submitted, asked where in the 2017-19 date range indicated on the Academic Master Plan (AMP) it may fall – J. Grier answered that the dates themselves don’t matter, unless it is not implemented at the end of the date range, at which time it must be taken off the AMP;
	10. B. Aquino asked if student IDs can be automatically integrated into PeopleSoft; clarifying questions followed, such as if this is for picture IDs and what an example might be – answer was yes, picture IDs are preferred, and example would be for when someone is taking exam (to verify identity / match picture of student with name of student taking the exam);
	11. J. Yudelson heard information relating to once the new residence halls are done, that the parking lot adjacent to the far end, along with the parking lot behind Sage Hall will then be converted to only allow for residences; the question is, what happens to faculty parking spaces?

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

 Faculty Affairs Committee

* P. Hampton noted that they are working on revisions to RTP policy and evaluation of chairs policy; reminded senators to please take a look at our SRT instrument survey as well

 Fiscal Policies

* K. Leonard stated that all of the proposals for new monies are in; announced that on Friday March 18th from 8:30am-12pm is a budget forum where the divisions will give their presentations;

 Student Academic Policies and Procedures

* C. Smith reminded senators to be on the lookout for a reinstatement policy

 Curriculum Committee

 General Education

* G. Buhl announced plan to construct guidelines on writing effectiveness for upper division courses; would be happy to solicit any input from faculty, please contact him

 Committee on Committees

* J. Grier stated that there is a current election for Center Directors run by the

 Committee on Centers and Institutes

* No report

 Professional Leave Committee

* No report

 Mini-Grant Review Committee

* M. Cook stated that proposals are done, awards are out; currently working on SRSC grants; further announced that UNIV 498 proposals are due by March 11th
1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
* No report
1. Announcements
	1. K. Leonard announced that CIS coffee is back, we hope to see you in the Chives Courtyard next Tuesday 2:30-4pm;
	2. S. Samatar announced that this Thursday afternoon we have SAFE training, and to please search emails from K. Gundelfinger for additional information;
	3. M. Bourgeois reminded that NSSE survey is underway, adding that if you’ve worked with seniors to please encourage them to complete the survey; last Friday we gave a data and donuts, but we’ll postpone the data reporting portion until after faculty recruitment; stay tuned for forthcoming announcements;
	4. K. Tollefson announced the proposal deadline (due tonight) for the 8th Annual Conference for Social Justice in Education; theme “Where the Boys & Girls (& Women & Men) Aren’t”; for more information you can do a search on the CI website for “Social Justice”;
	5. T. Hunt announced that Gamma Beta Phi is hosting the Relay for Life event in the North Quad, 3pm-12midnight on April 1, 2016;
	6. A. Perchuk noted that we have several galleries each semester, and please come and join us for one Thursday evening in Napa Hall, show up at 6pm and grab some pizza;
2. Adjourn
	1. Motion to adjourn meeting by C. Harris-Keith, seconded by A. Perchuk, meeting adjourned at 4:02pm.