Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, March 29, 2016, 2:30-4:30

Attendees: Adams, Virgil; Adler, Mary; Alamillo, Jose; Aloisio, Simone; Andrzejewski, Susan; Aquino, Bryn; Banuelos, Selenne; Barton, Jared; Bieszczad, A.J.; Buchanan, Merilyn; Buhl, Geoff; Burriss, Catherine; Campbell, Matthew; Carswell, Sean; Clark, Stephen; Cook, Matthew; Correia, Manuel; de Oca, Beatrice; Dean, Michelle; Delaney, Colleen; Delgado, Jasmine; Doll, Catherine; Downey, Dennis; Edwards, Jeannette; Ernesto, Guerrero; Evans Taylor, Genevieve; Flores, Cynthia; Francois, Marie; Frisch, Scott; Gillespie, Blake; Grier, Jeanne; Griffin, John; Hampton, Philip; Hannans, Jaime; Hartung, Beth; Hoffmann, Debra; Hunt, Travis; Isaacs, Jason; Kelly, Sean; Leafstedt, Jill; Leonard, Kathryn; Liang, Priscilla; Linton, Kristen; Lopez-Lopez, Margarita; Lu, Z. John; Mack, Carol; Matjas, Luke; McThomas, Mary; Meriwether, Jim; Monsma, Brad; Nevins, Colleen M; Ornelas-Higdon, Julia; Perchuk, Alison; Pereira, Monica; Perry, Jennifer; Pinkley, Janet; Rivas, Monica; Rocklin, Neil; Samatar, Sofia; Schmidhauser, Tom; Smith, Christina; Soltys, Michael; Thoms, Brian; Tollefson, Kaia; Veldmann, Brittnee; Vose, Kim; Wakelee, Dan; Weis, Chuck; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy; Yudelson, John;

1. Approval of the Agenda
   1. Meeting called to order at 2:31pm; agenda is approved with no objections;
2. Approval of the Minutes of March 1, 2016
   1. Meeting minutes from 3/1/16 were approved with no objections;
3. Report from the Provost (D. Wakelee on behalf of G. Hutchinson)
   1. D. Wakelee recalled that Spring faculty searches have been completed, went for 24 searches, learned that one of our Fall hires has withdrawn, ended up with 17 hires;
   2. D. Wakelee noted that G. Hutchinson had started a conversation on structure, but will now be postponed until the Fall;
   3. Today applications close for the Interim Dean of Arts & Sciences; timeline is for an appointment in April;
   4. S. Kelly noted that it’s not displayed on the CI Jobs website; B. Hartung and D. Wakelee agreed to take a look at this;
   5. V. Adams asked if there will be an announcement of who is on the search committee; B. Hartung agreed that there would be;
4. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
   1. S. Aloisio referred to meeting on March 24th, elephant in the room was the pending strike, but also discussion of tenure density issue; ASCSU wants to know where the money went in terms of the employment numbers, last year we were given employment numbers right away, but for unknown reasons are still waiting for this year’s numbers;
   2. S. Aloisio displayed a document entitled “Serving Displaced and Food Insecure Students in the CSU,” highlighting student hunger and homelessness issues (now posted to Senate website);
   3. Noted that our campus received $40K in Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) funding as a base budget, which is likely to continue annually;
   4. Highlighted ASU resolution 3249, displayed webpage for senators, noted that this supports academic freedom in the classroom amid conversations of what should be discussed regarding faculty strikes;
5. Report from CFA President (Griffin)—Time Certain 2:35
   1. J. Griffin provided a handout entitled “Raises for All… Except CSU Faculty,” which highlighted wage increase information and comparative charts showing average tenured/tenure-track faculty salary in CA college systems;
   2. Recalled fact-finding report that came out yesterday, noted that not a single thing in that report was in favor of the Chancellor’s Office (CO), a little shocking that “no bone was thrown” to the CO; amazed that the CO did not offer a better case to the arbitrator; summarized that it’s a one-sided report in favor of faculty;
   3. Chancellor is meeting with Trustees to hopefully come to an agreement; thanked senators for the support they’ve shown; there’s a united front from the other CSUs in support of faculty’s report; J. Griffin will be meeting with Ventura County representatives next Wednesday to ensure a successful strike if there is in fact a strike;
6. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
   1. J. Grier noted numerous transitions on campus;
   2. First, President Rush has asked, by way of the Provost, for senate executive to solicit faculty input regarding nominations and recommendations for Interim Provost at CI; noted that this is a very good step and opportunity for faculty to weigh in regarding nominations and for exec to be making recommendations in the process; however, they are requesting for recommendations to be coming from exec by April 8th, requesting that any input be given to any exec faculty member;
   3. Second, lecturer representatives for AY16-17 announced, adding James Martinez to list of returning members B. Veldman, B. Aquino, J. Yudelson and T. Schmidhauser;
   4. Reminder that nominations for Senate Exec Officers close by April 1st (Senate Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary); if you are interested, all candidates have to provide a nomination statement by April 7th;
7. Continuing Business Items
   1. SP 15-06 Policy on Academic Minors (Curriculum)
      1. J. Grier asked for any comments or discussion;
      2. J. Barton noted that Curriculum Committee researched the sizes of majors and minors, e.g. there are large majors who have large minors due to hidden pre-requisites; we move to amend this policy to remove the upper threshold count on minors as a result; seconded by G. Wood (to eliminate Sub-section B in Policy Text A);
      3. A. Perchuk recalled that some of the minors were so large that we were wondering if we should recommend it as a major to students; question was if it is appropriate to award students a minor when significant course work should award them a major instead;
      4. K. Leonard spoke in favor of the amendment;
      5. M. Soltys also spoke in favor, i.e. their cyber-security minor would be impacted;
      6. J. Rizzoli noted that we shouldn’t cap a minor due to say the math requirements for other majors (e.g. Physics, Computer Science); B. Gillespie added that most of our minors are 20 or so units, doesn’t think we’ll see an explosion of large minors as a result of removing section B;
      7. K. Leonard suggested that then maybe a recommended maximum number instead; A.J. Bieszczad answered that he doesn’t think we should put in a recommendation for a maximum, it should be up to the program to decide; A. Perchuk recalled that a lot of programs seemed to not have a sense of how to shape their minors, we may simply be offering guidelines on what would be an appropriate minor size; G. Buhl doesn’t think that recommendations should be in policy, policy is policy, and soft language should be avoided; M. Soltys agreed that it shouldn’t be up to the person reading the policy to potentially come to different conclusions;
      8. VOTE on recommendation of a maximum size of minor along with justification: 17 YES – 32 NO – 1 ABSTAIN; language to add recommendation was not approved;
      9. J. Barton read what a certificate means vs. a minor; A. Perchuk added that a certificate is open to students who have not matriculated, whereas a minor is not; J. Lu offered maybe another way of getting around this would be a percentage rather than a number of units, because if large majors also have large minors, may not be fair to assign a number;
      10. J. Barton called the question, seconded by G. Wood; J. Grier added that vote proceeds to delete the section referring to a maximum cap on minors;
      11. VOTE on deleting maximum unit cap on minors: 52 YES – 7 NO;
      12. VOTE to approve SP 15-06: 47 YES – 2 NO – 1 ABSTAIN;
      13. SP 15-06 was approved;
   2. SP 15-07 Minimum Characteristics of Majors and Minors (Curriculum)
      1. J. Barton introduced policy noting that it represents a cleaning up to make it consistent with other policies, only unit minimums are stated;
      2. Voice vote to call the question to vote, senators all in favor;
      3. VOTE to approve SP 15-07: 49 YES – 1 ABSTAIN;
      4. SP 15-07 was approved
8. New Business Items
   1. Policy on Double Counting (Curriculum)
      1. J. Barton opened discussion, summarized as “classes that count, ‘count’”, e.g. if there is an overlap between your major and GE, those classes count for both; e.g. if the course counts for UDIGE and another GE, it counts for both; summarized that a course that meets the requirements for two or more programs will count for both;
      2. B. Monsma asked whether the current policy allows for the 3 units outside of your major; G. Buhl answered that you can double count up to 6 units of UDIGE;
      3. J. Meriwether voiced concern about the last sentence, i.e. not being able to preclude double counting; sited examples of a “bonus minor” just by taking courses within the courses students are already taking in their major; G. Buhl added that he would argue that it’s a design issue within the minor, the second issue is student navigation problem, e.g. if we’re saying that in one situation a course double counts and in another it doesn’t, I think the prohibition as written will help to simplify it for students; B. Gillespie added with a question of why would we have the policy in the first place if we don’t include the prohibition language;
      4. S. Clark added that if double counting is taken to its limit does it water down the academic excellence of the program, his research is that the stricter policies tend to have a better reputation for academic excellence; A. Perchuk suggested that you could phrase it as 3 units must be taken from 3 different disciplinary foci, could you be placing other restrictions – why not say “you can count a class for any two things, up to you as students”; we should be in favor of intentionality;
      5. A. J. Bieszczad noted that some courses have very similar foundations that then grow separately from there, voiced strong support that students should be granted the major if they do the work regardless of the source of the courses;
      6. J. Rizzoli answered that a lot of the high-unit majors rely on double-counting due to Chancellor Office requirements; B. Gillespie recalled that his institution didn’t have majors, imagine that the course we create contains a specific type of content, so the content should be delivered in this package regardless of the source;
      7. K. Leonard commented that she felt the double-counting requirement does not fit the higher education model; i.e. the more requirements we make for students, the longer it takes them to graduate – this policy seems to make it easier for students to graduate; the prestige of an institution is not necessarily geared to policies such as this;
      8. J. Barton moved to make this a second reading item, seconded by B. Gillespie; C. Wyels spoke against moving to the second reading, noting that the beauty of having a first reading is that people can become informed; if there is a time sensitivity to move to a second reading, then so be it, but I see no urgency here;
      9. VOTE to move to second reading item: 10 YES – 39 NO;
      10. S. Clark recalled that we heard earlier the definition of a minor as being distinct from a major, he thought somewhere in the definition of academic excellence the word “rigor” should figure in;
      11. J. Grier closed first reading discussion and recommended that any other feedback be sent Curriculum Committee;
   2. Resolution on Affordable Learning Initiative (Exec)
      1. J. Grier introduced draft resolution as a response to receiving notice from Chancellor’s Office for a $50K grant; a corresponding Senate resolution is a stipulation of this grant;
      2. J. Leafstedt added that the grant is designed to build resources to find effective resources that cost students less money; once granted we would need to find lower cost materials and test them out, then get back to them with the provided results; this initiative would help to get the resources integrated into classrooms more effectively;
      3. G. Wood asked if the grant would allow for the development of new resources; J. Leafstedt answered no, but if you’re interested in development come see me as there may be other monies available;
      4. V. Adams asked where is the money going after this resolution; J. Leafstedt answered will be first funneled to Teaching & Learning team, who are writing the grant; J. Pinkley added that we can send what the stipulations of the grant are, but to please note that they really want the money to go to faculty; Further discussion of money directions, with references to newer project in compliance with California Educational Eligibility Act;
      5. B. Veldman recalled collecting older textbooks and giving them to the Library as not being an acceptable practice – asked if open source textbooks of this sort be accepted by the Library; further discussion on this process between J. Leafstedt and B. Veldman;
      6. M. Adler recalled not being able to find anything on ALS on the website; J. Leafstedt answered that this is the CO initiative to reduce the cost of textbooks – you can look at AB798, but also coolfored.org contains the resources;
   3. Policy on Second Baccalaureate Degree (SAPP)
      1. C. Burriss moved to open discussion, seconded by V. Adams;
      2. C. Smith summarized that this is an effort to get us in compliance, most likely from the executive order itself is where the old language came from; C. Nevins relayed that K. Jensen couldn’t be here, but recommended to cleaning up older language referring to Nursing program;
   4. Policy on Reinstatement (SAPP)
      1. A. Perchuk moved to discuss, seconded by V. Adams;
      2. C. Smith summarized that current reinstatement policy creates a short timeline for students to apply for classes that they need; the highlighted section is the suggested amendment, which allows for more time for all parties;
      3. D. Wakelee added that the current arrangement forces the committee to meet during the summer and winter break; also, students that are struggling academically don’t have much time to gain the classes they need;
      4. K. Vose noted the six month grace period for student loan repayment, asked how this timeline would be impacted under revised policy;
   5. Policy on Evaluation of Temporary Counselor Faculty (FAC)
      1. P. Hampton moved to discuss, seconded by C. Delaney;
      2. P. Hampton recalled that we have on campus “temporary counseling faculty,” and right now they follow SP 12-10 for their evaluations, same status as temporary lecturer; but under this current policy, it’s not really clear what they’re putting in their portfolio to be evaluated;
      3. V. Adams commented that it seems to him that the last step should be Psychology program rather than the first; B. Hartung answered that the first level of evaluation should come from the tenure track faculty, so this has been the practice;
      4. B. Hartung added that we’ve been looking at our current lecturer evaluation policy, but it doesn’t work well with folks providing student professional services;
9. Intent to Raise Questions
   1. J. Grier summarized answers to questions received from 3-1-16, please see Senate website for additional information;
   2. S. Kelly provided feedback on “Learning through Experience,” referenced email sent to D. Daniels, wants to invite interested parties to Senate to fully answer these complicated questions; in sum, the proposed budget is $250K for this initiative, a large investment that warrants faculty input, including how this initiative responds to the mission of the university;
   3. G. Wood referenced previous J. Gormley answer stating “we have adequate faculty office space,” then offered a two-part follow up question of 1) how many faculty offices do we have? and 2) how many faculty (full and part time) do we employ?

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

Faculty Affairs Committee

* P. Hampton: announced holding a Brown Bag next Tuesday on chair review policy;

Fiscal Policies

* C. Burriss recalled a productive meeting the Friday before spring break, we are in the process of drafting recommendations for the budgeting process;

Student Academic Policies and Procedures

* A. Perchuk noted that they’ll have additional business before the close of Senate business for the year

Curriculum Committee

* B. Gillespie announced that they are developing an electronic system for entering new proposals

General Education

* G. Buhl announced to please feel free to provide comments if you would like to read the General Education program;

Committee on Committees

* C. Delaney announced Senate Exec nominations will run until this Friday; statements are due by April 6th for Exec nomination statement; April 12th is the voting opening, but the timing may be difficult with the pending faculty strike; revised SRT instrument voting opens next week; Senate committees will called for towards the end of the month

Committee on Centers and Institutes

* No report

Professional Leave Committee

* No report

Mini-Grant Review Committee

- J. Perry noted their review of UNIV 498 proposals, and also RSCA proposals as previously mentioned by S. Aloisio;

11. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

S. Samatar announced that the next time you see C. Teranishi-Martinez, please congratulate her as the new Director for the Center on Multicultural Engagement; J. Grier asked if an announcement had been circulated via global email; S. Samatar wasn’t confident that it had;

12. Announcements

D. Wakelee announced that on April 12th at 1pm here in MVS, Chris Mallon will join us on campus – recalled that she was here in December, and if you are thinking about new program development, it’s really helpful to get that perspective when you send something off for review; you may have a happier result after receiving her guidance;

M. Adler announced the call for applications for the faculty retreat coming out this week;

C. Burriss noted that it’s spring production time, announced a multi-media concert called “Motown@CI” with shows starting this Friday April 1st, and a total of six shows running this weekend and next weekend;

C. Wyels referred to two documents for announcements: first announcement was for “The Trek Beyond the PhD,” featuring African-American women in STEM – please join us April 29th 1-4:15pm; second announcement referenced a graph displayed for campus climate, entitled “Diversity & Inclusion: Climate Discussion / Lunch & Learn,” referencing total student enrollment and tenure-line faculty demographics – please note that first 50 to RSVP for the event will get a free lunch, please join us Friday April 29th 11:30am-1pm;

J. Grier noted that you should have received an invitation to meet new President Beck on April 4th in Grand Salon;

J. Grier further announced the call for nominations for Interim Provost, please send them by April 5th;

13. Adjourn

G. Wood motioned to adjourn, multiple seconds; meeting adjourned at 4:18pm;