Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, April 19, 2:30-4:30pm

Attendees: Adams, Virgil; Adler, Mary; Alamillo, Jose; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Sean; Andrzejewski, Susan; Aquino, Bryn; Banuelos, Selenne; Barajas, Frank; Barton, Jared; Bieszczad, A.J.; Bleicher, Bob; Buhl, Geoff; Burriss, Catherine; Campbell, Matthew; Chen, Nien-Tsu; Clark, Stephen; Clarke, Tracylee; Cook, Matthew; Correia, Manuel; Davis-Smith, LaSonya; Doll, Catherine; Downey, Dennis; Edwards, Jeannette; Evans Taylor, Genevieve; Flores, Cynthia; Francois, Marie; Garcia, Jorge; Gillespie, Blake; Grier, Jeanne; Griffin, John; Hampton, Philip; Hunt, Travis; Hutchinson, Gayle; Isaacs, Jason; Kelly, Sean; Leafstedt, Jill; Leonard, Kathryn; Lee, Sohui; Linton, Kristen; Lu, Z. John; Matjas, Luke; McThomas, Mary; Meriwether, Jim; Monsma, Brad; Murphy, Paul; Ornelas-Higdon, Julia; Patsch, Kiersten; Perchuk, Alison; Pereira, Monica; Perry, Jennifer; Pinkley, Janet; Popenhagen, Luda; Rodriguez, Donald; Salazar, Christina; Samatar, Sofia; Sanchez, Luis; Schmidhauser, Tom; Smith, Christina; Soenke, Melissa; Soltys, Michael; Sowers, Elizabeth; Stratton, Stephen; Thoms, Brian; Tollefson, Kaia; Veldman, Brittnee; Vose, Kim; Wakelee, Dan; Wallace, Amy; Weis, Chuck; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy; Yudelson, John.

1. Consent Calendar
	1. Policy on Sponsored Projects Administration (from PPPC)
		1. Consent received to be approved as SP 15-12
	2. Policy on Pre-Approval of Institutional Grants Proposal (from PPPC)
		1. Consent received to be approved as SP 15-13
2. Approval of the Agenda
	1. Motion by S. Clark to amend agenda to add SR 15-04 Commendation and Appreciation for President Richard R. Rush; J. Grier reads Senate Resolution 15-04 aloud to all senators and President Rush in appreciation of his 15 years of service;
3. Approval of the Minutes of March 29, 2016
	1. Meeting minutes from 3/29/16 were approved with no objections.
4. Report from the President (Rush)
	1. R. Rush thanked senators, a privilege to address senators in this body; referenced the faculty accomplishment book; recalled interviewing most and appointing each faculty member; to close the circle of his years of service, asked each one of us to be excellent at what we do, and to not settle to be a common university, let us strive to be a great university; recalled in the early years that we had nothing and had to find the resources to do what we do now; noted that the act of creation isn’t even close to being over, think 61 FTEs for next semester; CI is a place to be proud of, nothing’s perfect, but you need to take justifiable pride for those accomplishments; our ability to be civil, and to show students that a civil society can exist, and this will set us apart; President Rush’s request is to be facilitators of student success, not just gatekeepers – take them from where they are to where they aspire to be; we will celebrate diversity and not just tolerate it;
	2. Pres. Rush further asked that faculty keep taking these risks, to push the envelope in your disciplines, we don’t know what the future is but we know that more jobs will exist in the future; remarked that we did not come here to say that “we’re from the government and we’re here to tell you what you need,” on the contrary, we’re here to listen, and let’s keep listening because there are needs;
	3. Noted that Pres. Erika Beck will be his successor, asked that we listen to her and to ask what she needs for CI to be successful; with this participation in helping her, then our community will come together in success;
	4. Noted that D. Wakelee has agreed to serve as Interim Provost, and to please also help him too, listen to his needs and how he could use our help in being the bridge going forward; observed that it’s a lot for a university to change their president, provost and dean all at the same time; advised us to be in good cheer, and to stay mindful of our mission pillars;
	5. Noted that in his 15 years, two programs stood out as receiving overwhelming interest from the community, Nursing and Engineering; impressed on senators if they will pass Engineering on the floor to give him the recommendation, the community will follow with their support;
	6. Pres. Rush once again thanked everyone for the privilege to be with all of us; recalled that especially in the early years that faculty were risking your careers at the words of one guy, noted that he will never forget it, and that we will continue to have his admiration;
5. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
	1. G. Hutchinson noted that we will have a new interim dean in May, and congratulated D. Wakelee on his new post as interim provost in AY1617; commented that there are opportunities for others to apply and earn one of these administration spots;
	2. Displayed slide reflecting new faculty members coming to us in the fall; grand total is 138, recalled that 51 total new tenure track faculty have been able to come to CI; reviewed the diversity metrics, bringing this to senators’ attention, we’ve been working hard on this but should also continue to work on this in the future; noted that we still have attrition to deal with, but noted slide demonstrating incremental improvements;
	3. Noted that comparative to other campuses we have the highest percentage this year in hiring; B. Hartung added that next year we’re welcoming in 17 new hires;
6. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
	1. S. Aloisio recalled their interim meeting, with lots of business on the statewide agenda; but nothing terribly urgent and given our full Academic Senate agenda today, you can go to our website for details; J. Grier suggested that we can put a link for this in the next newsletter;
7. Report from CFA President (Griffin)—time certain 2:45pm
	1. J. Griffin: stemming from our spirit of co-operation, the vote on the CSU+CFA agreement will be open this Friday, April 22nd; recalled that labor movements have been realizing some tremendous successes, noting the recent Supreme Court decision preserving the rights for faculty members to organize as they have in the past; also noted the big victory in California for our state minimum wage increase measure;
	2. Recalled National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) favorable decisions as well, has been ruling in favor of faculty to retain the rights to collectively bargain as we have in the past;
8. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
	1. J. Grier noted that we have nominations and voting open, please see announcements;
	2. Further congratulated D. Wakelee on his new post;
	3. Reminded senators on the deliberative process that we enjoy and should uphold;
9. Continuing Business Items
	1. SP 15-08 Policy on Double Counting (Curriculum)
		1. J. Barton moved to amend the policy, seconded by G. Wood; submitted amended document to Senate, amendments were read aloud;
		2. VOTE on amendment: 56 YES – 1 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; amendment to SP 15-08 is approved;
		3. J. Grier asked if there is further discussion; A. Perchuk spoke against policy, questions how it would work, i.e. can we constrain the classes that students can take; J. Barton answered that students still need to take classes from each sub-set; A. Perchuk added the fear is that we may lose control of our curriculum; J. Barton noted that going forward if someone in the process of completing something ends up completing something else, then credit will still be given; A. Perchuk summarized so the intent is to provide flexibility, so you don’t have to put a new class in every time;
		4. S. Clark asked if should the fact that many CSU campuses have limits on double counting, and #2 if there is no limit, at what point does the overlap compromise the distinctiveness of a major being different from the minor; J. Barton answered that the fact that there is a significant overlap is evidence of how arbitrary this is, and some have concern that we’re giving them an “extra degree”… but very little evidence that there is an economic benefit that is translated when one gets a minor in “topic B,” not terribly concerned over what other CSUs are doing or not doing;
		5. G. Buhl spoke in favor of policy, due to better navigability for the students; noted that in our curriculum we currently have only one thing that says we can’t double count, the UDIGE requirement… there are a large number of petitions that we have to sign because students are currently confused, as they are currently seeing multiple examples of how courses have lots of criteria if certain classes will double count or not;
		6. VOTE on approval of SP 15-08: 50 YES – 9 NO – 1 ABSTAIN; SP 15-08 is so approved;
	2. SR 15-03 Resolution on Affordable Learning Initiative (Exec)
		1. J. Barton called the question; no objections, proceed to voting;
		2. VOTE on SR 15-03: 54 YES – 2 NO – 4 ABSTAIN; SR 15-03 is so approved;
	3. SP 15-09 Policy on Second Baccalaureate Degree (SAPP)
		1. J. Grier in calling for discussion, noted that this is policy as amended and includes Purpose section;
		2. M. Adler asked if the committee knows who this applies to, as she was told by Records that they’re not granting second baccalaureate degrees; H. Dung answered that only program that we’re granting right now is Nursing; C. Smith noted that Nursing asked us to include the current language contained within this policy;
		3. VOTE on SP 15-09: 51 YES – 2 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; SP 15-09 is so approved;
	4. SP 15-10 Policy on Reinstatement (SAPP)
		1. C. Smith introduced policy, noting that additional language was added to clarify for students, and highlighted section represents the additions from the previous policy;
		2. VOTE on SP 15-10: 60 YES – 1 ABSTAIN; SP 15-10 is so approved;
	5. SP 15-11 Policy on Evaluation of Temporary Counselor Faculty (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton introduced policy, noting that the current evaluation process follows lecturer evaluations, which is not appropriate for our temporary counselor faculty; referenced a two-stage review, and that a committee formed with Psychology and director from CAPS; recalled that there was also consideration of rankings, which could conceivably be an amendment;
		2. VOTE on SP 15-11: 53 YES – 2 NO – 5 ABSTAIN; SP 15-11 is so approved.
10. New Business Items
	1. Resolution in Support of the Academic Senate Chair as a Member of the President’s Cabinet (Exec)
		1. S. Aloisio motion to discuss, J. Meriwether seconds; S. Aloisio summarized that this resolution is asking our new president to make this happen, where faculty representation is included in Cabinet; noted that Cabinet is the main decision making body, where we do not currently have faculty representation;
		2. A.J. Bieszczad asked about release time implications; J. Meriwether answered that in the scope of this resolution it wouldn’t change the status or position of the chair, release time would be beyond this resolution; the intent is to have a two-way street; S. Aloisio added that this is a resolution expressing the will of the Senate, we can’t set policy for the President’s council, we’re just saying that we want a faculty member part of the Cabinet;
		3. M. Cook recalled that under half of CSUs have chairs sitting on Cabinet, is there anything that distinguishes them from us? S. Aloisio answered that we’re not really an outlier, nothing really common within this set;
	2. Policy on Perpetual Academic Calendar with Fall Break (Exec)
		1. J. Yudelson moved to introduce, K. Leonard seconds;
		2. J. Yudelson recalled previous discussion going to a perpetual calendar, and also a fall break to grant the three days off ahead of Thanksgiving;
		3. G. Wood added that this does away with the “hanging Monday,” so this would never come back; J. Grier clarified it doesn’t come back through the year 2030;
		4. J. Meriwether asked what the advantages are, heard that some students aren’t coming to classes anyway, but what are other advantages; C. Burriss replied that most other K-12 schools grant this same entire week off, and is more convenient for those of us with young children, especially since our spring break hasn’t coincided with local schools;
		5. J. Meriwether clarified that the perpetual side he agrees with, but downside is that it pushes up against the holidays more;
		6. C. Wyels echoed concern about the pushing up against the holidays, and further that students will do a “brain dump” in the middle of the semester; reminded that this is a first reading, and added that there was no representation from STEM on the committee and other programs that have labs, would encourage some thoughts on those with lab classes; S. Banuelos added that there are students that have to travel and would appreciate this fall break; B. Gillespie referenced comments about lab classes, and recalled that we have to cancel a lot of chemistry labs due to Thursday sections;
		7. J. Lu asked what do the students think and directed question to ASI representative T. Hunt; T. Hunt answered that the feelings are split among students, some don’t care, some really want the break to see families;
		8. D. Wakelee clarified the break question is a decision, but added that it is important that we develop some kind of perpetual calendar so that it doesn’t keep coming up as an item for review in senate and that we solve the hanging Monday issue; H. Dang added that if we can give them dates ahead of time, we can offer more transparency – noted that this will have no impact on staff;
		9. J. Grier observed that in all of these sections we have five days for grading, above the CO minimum requirement of 2 days; further discussion from P. Hampton on missing Mondays; J. Yudelson suggested that if it would be helpful we could contact the other CSUs that have been on a perpetual calendar without issue; L. Davis-Smith added that it may be an issue in Nursing program as well, Mondays in particular; J. Grier replied that this is a general calendar issue rather than a perpetual calendar issue; J. Barton recalled data that about 18% are more than one county away than Ventura county and has been constant over the last decade;
		10. G. Wood asked if the students were included in the survey; J. Grier answered Yes; C. Burriss noted that there are not five grading days on all of them; J. Grier clarified as correct; C. Burriss added that because of the Veteran’s Day, there are only 13 Mondays; J. Grier clarified correct, as noted on “E” example;
		11. B. Aquino asked what happens if we don’t approve a fall break; J. Grier answered that we could still pass a perpetual calendar without a break, as this was a circulated option with the survey;
	3. Resolution on E-portfolios (FAC)
		1. A. Perchuk moved to discuss, P. Hampton seconded;
		2. P. Hampton noted that this is designed to streamline the process; as we grow as a campus it becomes more challenging to transport hard copy portfolios; this policy does not specify the means, but charges that we move toward e-portfolio;
		3. J. Yudelson noted that when we’re talking about moving to an electronic format, let’s encourage to contact someone from CFA; B. Hartung recalled that in the new CBA it does address this and enables any campus to implement an electronic folio mechanisms, but we would also welcome CFA representatives; further noted this would not be for this coming fall, we would need a full year;
		4. K. Tollefson shared that she had the opportunity to participate in the pilot of this, and it was a fabulous experience; couldn’t have been easier, strong support of this, pales in comparison to hard copy; K. Carey noted that did not share this experience; B. Hartung appreciated this feedback, and as a result will likely chose a different portal than TaskStream; A. Wallace shared that the process was easy for her, in the end still had to write a separate letter; agreed that a more full-service portal would be beneficial; B. Bleicher recalled that as a reviewer it was easy to do;
		5. S. Anderson noted that this is a resolution that allows us to do the e-portfolios, great feedback, but a bit too detailed as this resolution is about simply allowing for e-portfolios;
		6. M. Adler recalled that she found the access hours too restrictive as only 8am-5pm, a 24-hour electronic access would be preferable;
		7. G. Wood asked if someone could comment to the electronic security of these documents, and also that there be some kind of record of the people that have viewed the document; A.J. Bieszczad asked who will decide on what the tool will be; J. Grier clarified resolution language referring to FAC joint efforts;
	4. RTP Policy Revision (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton introduced policy, summarizing that it is a clean-up of earlier references, opt-out clauses specified how you get in, how you get out, plus a handy definition clause at the top; recalled that we did take input through brown bag sessions or via email; announced that S. Anderson and P. Hampton will receive any additional feedback provided;
	5. Mechatronics major (Curriculum)
		1. J. Barton moved to discuss, K. Tollefson seconded;
		2. M. Soltys summarized that this field is basically about the software that animates mechanical devices; recalled that we consulted with CSU Chico, and also in line with University of Utah; commented that it’s been a hot area of engineering over the last 20 years; cited example of a typical application would be remote medical surgery, i.e. movements of a surgeon could be transmitted electronically; recognizing Dr. Rush’s statements earlier, there are extensive demands for engineering in the county; also the Navy and Lockheed-Martin are highly interested in engineering; noted that majority of resources are existing here at CI, labs are in place, embedded systems in Sierra Hall; agreed that we will have to hire one new faculty per year to complete our resource needs; currently the program has 133 units, but have a request for permission from Chancellor’s Office to make an exception for this, as this is the minimum units we can have;
		3. S. Kelly recalled that everything he knows about mechatronics he learned from G. Wood, noting that G. Wood says that in order to run this you need an electrical engineer and a mechanical engineer in place, how do we stand with this; M. Soltys referenced the request for additional faculty; A.J. Bieszczad reminded that he has a PhD in Electrical Engineering;
		4. S. Kelly asked if it would make sense that we come right out with the 3 positions in the first year, because we know what happens in California and would caution against a piece meal approach; M. Soltys noted that it’s difficult to hire academics in this field, you can make a lot of money in this field, so they tend toward private industry; further noted that he’d also like to move away from dependency on state monies, community has been clamoring for this, let’s tap their resources, which will also take time;
		5. S. Stratton observed no mention of the resources needed at the Library to support such a program; further discussion;
		6. C. Delaney asked if this program could work without a lab tech, as there are other programs that are also in need of staff support; M. Soltys answered yes, we’ve been doing the bulk of this work between faculty members;
		7. A. Perchuk asked out of the total need for engineering, how many of these are specific to Mechatronics; also, what will be looking at in terms of costs to have a leading program; M. Soltys the short answer is that the nature of this discipline is that it is interdisciplinary, and as such students will get a good taste of general engineering topics;
	6. Astronomy minor (Curriculum)
		1. S. Stratton moved to discuss, A. Perchuk seconded;
		2. B. Gillespie observed that the proposer isn’t here; G. Wood offered to introduce proposal, recalling that we run all these astronomy classes in Physics, so to facilitate minors, there are two parallel paths, one with a math-emphasis and one with a STEM emphasis;
		3. P. Hampton asked what the vision is for the number of students taking this, asking if it is realistic of five per year; G. Wood recalled that we had a medical imaging minor that’s doing well, so 5 in the first year looks to be realistic; A.J. spoke in favor as this would be good for the Physics program, to expand student enrollment;
		4. S. Aloisio asked if there are existing faculty to teach the new courses, and are they tenure track or lecturers; G. Wood and S. Aloisio agreed that this could be a question for next time;
		5. J. Grier reminded to please send additional questions to G. Wood;
	7. Art history minor (Curriculum)
		1. J. Barton moved to discuss, G. Wood seconded;
		2. A. Perchuk summarized request to have a minor in Art that serves studio Art students, and this would allow such students to pursue a minor in art history;
		3. J. Meriwether observed that this talks about double counting; A. Perchuk agreed, recalling that the draft was written two years ago; added that this will help them if they want to teach K-12 or museums / art gallery careers; we wrote in the preclusion for double counting because we wanted this to be a significant curriculum effort;
		4. J. Meriwether noted that we can’t approve this as written because it conflicts with the approved Double Counting Policy; A. Perchuk commented that as a result of this that she is happy to work on this ahead of the next Senate meeting;
		5. J. Barton clarified that the only language that must be removed from this is the double counting, i.e. the bolded section between pages 4-5;
		6. S. Aloisio asked, similar to before, are there new courses and are there existing instructors to do it; A. Perchuk answered that there are no new courses, and that we have existing tenure-track faculty to teach them;
	8. Creative writing minor (Curriculum)
		1. A. Perchuk moved to discuss, seconded by G. Wood;
		2. B. Monsma introduced proposed minor, summarizing that the minor encourages a deeper engagement with creative writing; further noted that all classes are currently on the books;
	9. Healthcare interpretation certificate (Curriculum)
		1. G. wood moved to discuss, J. Barton seconded;
		2. S. Clark introduced proposed certificate, observing that in the field of interpretation there are a lot of courses in legal courtroom interpretation; this certificate would be a new outlet e.g., Spanish majors to apply their interpretation skills; added that this would be oral versus written;
		3. A. Perchuk asked to clarify that a certificate is open to non-matriculated students; S. Clark answered yes, and as such would also be offered through Extended University.
11. Intent to Raise Questions
* Please see website and included Senate materials

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

 Faculty Affairs Committee

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Fiscal Policies

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Student Academic Policies and Procedures

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Curriculum Committee

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 General Education

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Committee on Committees

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Committee on Centers and Institutes

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Professional Leave Committee

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

 Mini-Grant Review Committee

* Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

13. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

- Reports tabled until next meeting due to time constraints

14. Announcements

- Will be included in current or next Senate newsletter;

15. Adjourn – motion to adjourn by S. Anderson, second by G. Wood. Meeting adjourned at 4:34pm.