



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center
Tuesday, May 5, 2015, 2:30-4:30pm

Attendees: Leafstedt, Jill; Veldman, Brittnee; Miller, Jason; Flores, Cynthia; Thoms, Brian; Jenkins, Jacob; Sanchez, Luis; Carswell, Sean; Dean, Michelle; Berman, Michael; Soltys, Michael; Samatar, Sofia; Jensen, Karen A; Monsma, Brad; Aloisio, Simone; Mack, Carol; Nevins, Colleen M; Klompien, Kathleen; Matjas, Luke; Jiménez Jiménez, Antonio; Jim Meriwether; John Griffin; McThomas, Mary; Frisch, Scott; Correia, Manuel; Grzegorzcyk, Ivona; Francois, Marie E; Jennifer E. Perry; Colleen Harris-Keith; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Schmidhauser, Tom; Yudelson, John; Salazar, Christina; Campbell, Matthew; Grier, Jeanne; Gayle Hutchinson; Cindy Wyels; Wallace, Amy; Stephen Clark; Matt Furmanski; Michael Bourgeois; Matt Cook; Margarita Lopez-Lopez; Vanessa Bahena; Greg Wood; Lindsey O'Connor; Tracylee Clarke; Geoff Buhl; A.J. Bieszczad; Georgina Guzman; Nancy Gill; Virgil Adams; Erin Pehlivan; Sean Kelly; Liz King; Catherine Burriss; Jennie Luna; Karen Carey; Merilyn Buchanan; Selenne Banuelos; Jose Alamillo; Steve Stratton; Andrew Morris; Debi Hoffmann; Irina Costache; Monica Pereira; Jaime Hannans; Phil Hampton; Kaia Tollefson; Ruben Alarcon; Alison Perchuk; Dennis Downey; Mary Adler; Dax Jacobson; Catherine Doll; Julia Balen; Bob Bleicher; Betsy Quintero; Nichole Ipach; Gary Kinsey; Janet Pinkley; Sue Andrzejewski; Beatrice de Oca; Dr. Richard Rush.

1. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Motion by M. Cook, second by C. Wyels, agenda was approved.
2. Approval of the Minutes of April 14, 2015
 - a. Meeting minutes were approved with no objections.
3. Report from the President (Rush)
 - a. President Rush extended thanks for allowing him time to say a few words, began by congratulating everyone on a successful year, i.e. "students are on a high because of the work you do," advised everyone to take some time to reflect on this;
 - b. Reminded everyone to please send Dr. Rush an email specifying any students entering a doctorate program, along with the program and institution;
 - c. CI 2025 update: explained that we are doing this because the state has withdrawn funding for capital construction; that maybe 20 out of the other campuses can take from their operating funds, but we can't; noted that in the next two queues for new buildings we are ranked 17th and 23rd, and that it takes six years from the time of a bond to a new building construction; thus CI 2025 is a method to build the campus without going through the traditional process of state funding; we're looking at ways of getting funding faster – looking to private developers to assist in campus builds; recalled that he continues to get a lot of calls with potential donors to offer funds in support;
 - d. WASC update: expecting to have the draft report in the next 7-10 days; recalled the process that the Strategic Edge team sends President report, he

- checks for factual errors, sends back to committee, then they review, then final comes back to us (ETA sometime in June); 18th of June President Rush will be in Berkeley to discuss with Commissioner; may be asking select CI folks to come with him depending on what is written; recalled that each WASC review has been different; will require a mid-term report;
- e. New Faculty Positions Memo: recalled that last Fall when priorities were organized, G. Hutchinson pushed for new faculty positions; received \$700K for Sierra Hall, and this is what will be reallocated towards tenure-track faculty hires. Faculty heard about state \$4B surplus, but Prop 98 may eat a lot of this, would likely go to K-14 schools; Gov. plans under Prop 2 to put into a rainy-day fund; Jackie Erwin is a tremendous advocate for CI, came out of Thousand Oaks with Cal Lutheran in her back yard, but we are her number one priority; Tony Atkins, speaker of the house, has come to our board meetings; summarized that we are fortunate to have a cadre of four statewide legislators to advocate for CI;
 - f. Recalled that he continues to receive many personal notes from students, read an example to Senate, which thanked CI faculty and staff for an enriching educational experience.
4. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
- a. G. Hutchinson relayed to Senate that building a new strategic plan for Division of Academic Affairs; four applicants are in this stage of the search for an interim AVP for the School of Ed, asked J. Grier to help with short list of faculty for the review process, then will interview and choose interim AVP shortly thereafter;
 - b. Academic Master Plan process update: noted that the time to fix this is now, put together task force to work on this over the summer; noted personnel of J. Grier, G. Buhl, J. Meriwether, and B. Gillespie; we are to identify the biggest challenges with AMP, improve the curricular and approval process, and also to use the queue to help us with our academic planning;
 - c. New Faculty Hire Memo: noted that each year hereafter, Cabinet is looking at backing this up with the funding necessary; last time we had about 100 FTES, which yields about 4 new hires – plan is to use this ratio for approximately 16 new hires; with position management, we can determine replacement positions, i.e. who is in what positions and what positions are available when people retire or move on;
 - d. Recalled the President's previous statement that we are getting an additional \$700K that will be reallocated to tenure-track faculty hires; recalled that early on in our history we had a robust hiring trend, but economic downturn quelled this; however, this year we successfully hired 14 and they will join us in the Fall;
 - e. Noted that we are seeing increase in percentage of tenure track hiring, which relates to Senate Resolution on the floor today, which she is in favor of;

- displayed PowerPoint slide, which highlighted Straw Budget, showing the 16.0 fixed cost of 55% increase in tenure track; noted that this is the first time ever we are getting funding support for promotions and sabbaticals (\$286K);
- f. I. Grzegorzczuk asked a question relating to the math and why faculty are “so cheap”; G. Hutchinson answered that she will revisit this and get back to us soon; summarized that basically APDP reporting mechanism different from Cabinet Recommendation slide, but using this metric we are making good progress toward the 55%;
5. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
 - a. No report.
 6. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
 - a. J. Griffin highlighted PowerPoint slide on Equity Agreements system wide; observed that CI is lowest by far in relation to Bakersfield, Fresno, Sonoma, San Jose;
 - b. Announcement: the All Union Lunch is tomorrow, chance for CFA to extend thanks to everyone for their hard work, we’ll be sponsoring snacks during finals week, something in the morning and afternoon;
 - c. Additional announcement, that email is forthcoming for social event at Hollywood Bowl;
 7. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
 - a. J. Grier reported that election results are in, will be distributed soon, and to be on the lookout for forthcoming announcements;
 - b. Announced that the call will come soon for volunteers for University Committees;
 - c. Structure Task Force update: received survey results, working on a report that will come out before the end of the semester; will also send invites for STF-II;
 - d. Academic Calendar update: we were notified that our Spring-16 calendar is out of compliance due to leap year (HR and payroll dates); as such, we can’t start anything before Jan 17, 2016, i.e. moves everything back a week; commented to Senate that if people feel strongly about this, it can be a senate policy in the Fall; further noted that we do have an AMP committee, who are currently looking at implementing a Fall break, and potentially creating a perpetual calendar;
 - e. I. Grzegorzczuk asked about Cesar Chavez holiday and for additional background on why we have it; J. Grier answered that it is mandated by the state, and also that it must fall on the calendar date regardless of the day of the week.
 8. Continuing Business Items
 - a. SP 14-15 Policy on Composition of MPP Searches (FAC)
 - i. P. Hampton introduced second reading, noting that committee presented a friendly amendment to move a section from Purpose to Policy;



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

- ii. VOTE: 44 – YES; 1 – NO; 7 – ABSTAIN; SP 14-15 approved.
- b. SP 14-16 Policy on Faculty Directors of Mission Centers (FAC)
 - i. P. Hampton introduced second reading, noting that the intent of this policy is as a placeholder until Centers develop their own by-laws;
 - ii. I. Grzegorzcyk asked a question regarding Page 2, had a problem with third line in “Policy Text” on who can serve as a director, needs to serve at least one term, etc. – asked if this would limit the applicant pool; P. Hampton answered that policy was vetted with current Center directors, focusing on uniform guidelines and consistency, plus the value of working within the Center before becoming its director; A. Jimenez added that he thought it made sense to get someone with experience that knows the ins and outs – noted to I. Grzegorzcyk’s point that the language may be a little vague, but that the intent was to encourage applicants with intimate knowledge of Centers operations; J. Balen seconded summary from A. Jimenez – wouldn’t necessarily require that anyone be tenured, but doesn’t hurt to have research background; I. Grzegorzcyk thanked everyone for clarification, wanted it to potentially include junior faculty members;
 - iii. VOTE: 49 – YES; 5 – NO; 5 – ABSTAIN; SP 14-16 approved.
- c. SP 14-17 Policy on Unit Load Limitation (SAPP)
 - i. S. Carswell motioned to amend the policy with minor additions under the definition section, seconded by J. Balen; friendly amendment accepted, added by S. Clark;
 - ii. VOTE on amendment: 54 – YES; 3 – NO; amendment included.
 - iii. V. Adams observed that advisor can approve if student wants to override the unit load limitation, but policy language does not mention the program chair, asked if the chair could be added; I. Grzegorzcyk made the motion to add “chair,” second by M. Cook;
 - iv. VOTE on amendment: All in Favor;
 - v. C Harris Keith added that students can currently take more than this unit limitation if going to their advisor anyway, which is always a good idea to seek advisement; J. Meriwether agreed that it’s a good thing for students to have a conversation when under academic probation; but is against this policy, as it is trying to fix something that isn’t broken;
 - vi. V. Adams asked if “or chair” could be added to Line 4;
 - vii. C. Wyels cited studies that program chairs are already overloaded with signature responsibility;
 - viii. VOTE on Amendment: 45 YES – 5 NO – 5 ABSTAIN; amendment included.
 - ix. S. Carswell summarized that there were two primary reasons why this policy was put forth: 1) program chairs are being overloaded, and 2) so



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

- many students are being sent to Advising, who are unable keep up with the demand right before registration;
- x. VOTE on this Policy: 31 YES – 21 NO – 5 ABSTAIN; SP 14-17 approved.
- d. SP 14-18 Policy on Centers and Institutes (CCI)
 - i. P. Hampton introduced second reading, noting that this policy became necessary due to the E.O.; this policy integrated existing policy with additional language from the E.O.;
 - ii. VOTE: 46 YES – 1 NO – 6 ABSTAIN; SP 14-18 approved.
 - e. SP 14-01 Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (FAC)
 - i. P. Hampton introduced second reading, was appreciative of all the input from last Senate meeting; committee felt that RTP needed consistency; shortened the number of questions in the instrument, now reflects max of 3 open-ended questions; all lecturers have a vote; FAC believed that we do need normed data to encourage faculty to create a high response rate by whatever means that don't lead to grade inflation;
 - ii. J. Elliott asked how this applied to Extended Univ.; P. Hampton answered that it would follow our current policy; V. Adams noted that in 2017, Extended Univ. is moving to this same instrument;
 - iii. A. Jimenez added that he understands the need for normed data, but reflected on team-taught, service-learning, international courses – by using this instrument, we may be missing this information and may not be helpful for affected faculty members; the instrument could do both, as far as assessing the faculty member while also providing a means to improve their teaching; P. Hampton answered that this may pose a large burden to have unique instruments for each program, plus there is a variety of other means available to faculty (e.g. Qualtrics, Blackboard) at their disposal;
 - iv. M. Adler observed Section 1-F, where there may be an internal contradiction, recommended to please revert to how original second sentence was authored; C Harris Keith and P. Hampton took as friendly amendment, made changes without a vote;
 - v. J. Yudelson observed that one of the issues for providing incentives is that it may skew the results (used an example of say, handing out Hershey's chocolate beforehand); B. Veldmann suggested that if we're not having this standardized, then what is the institutional support to make sure this is on a level playing field; C. Harris Keith answered that the reason this was put into the policy was to ensure a lecturer vote, as some programs do not allow lecturer votes at all;
 - vi. A. Jimenez asked why wait for another four-year cycle if it doesn't pass; added that he would hate to see all the work done to develop an

- instrument, then it waits four years even with minor tweaks; P. Hampton answered that if we're looking at minor tweaks, could leave these to a friendly amendment; B. Monsma observed / reminded that this should not be viewed as a full measure of teaching effectiveness;
- vii. J. Meriwether commented that he was trying to figure out intent of 1-B and 1-C, not clear whether B is indicating whether there will be a vote, asked what is triggering a majority faculty request; C. Harris Keith answered that the "does the faculty wish to review" line asks for a simple yes or no; J. Meriwether added that this makes sense but that is not what is written; P. Hampton recalled intent was that B is linked to C, that simple majority is linked to the review; friendly amendment would be to combine B and C into a single bullet;
 - viii. I. Grzegorzczuk made the motion in reference to E, to add language of "for another academic year" instead of "four year cycle," second by J. Elliott; P. Hampton cautioned that this amendment alone does not allow us to stop, i.e. could keep going year after year with a lack of consistency, and would need to add more language on what happens after that; C. Harris Keith noted that we don't want a new instrument every year;
 - ix. VOTE on amendment: 26 – YES; 15 – NO; 7 – ABSTAIN; amendment included;
 - x. J. Balen observed in background section, second paragraph, not sure that interpretations are covered; P. Hampton answered that if you look to Part 4, Reporting, it clearly states how you should interpret SRTs, i.e. as one part of the big picture;
 - xi. VOTE on Policy: 34 YES – 14 NO – 3 ABSTAIN; SP 14-01 approved.
- f. SR 14-02 TT Hiring Resolution (Exec)
 - i. Amy Wallace asked if there is a standard method on how this 10% is to be calculated, since we have multiple ways of taking about tenure track; G. Hutchinson answered that when we did the calculation, we did include attrition, would be happy to share calculation methods;
 - ii. VOTE: 42 – YES; 1 – NO; 6 – ABSTAIN; SR 14-02 approved.
 - g. SP 14-19 MA in Psychology (Curr)
 - i. V. Adams introduced second reading, with apologies to Provost and Asst. Provost, noting that they were supportive of our application process, but that no other specific offers of support were voiced; noted that changes from last time were to remove 2 tenure lines;
 - ii. A. Jimenez asked what this would mean in terms of implementation, expressed concern about the amount of resources going to a small number of people; further Discussion between V. Adams and A.

Jimenez on the reach of this program to students who may be geographically bound, versus addressing more critical needs;

- iii. I. Grzegorzcyk felt that once you have a graduate program, it in turn helps the undergrad program via TAs;
- iv. A. Jimenez cautioned that if we start using the argument of high enrollment, it will create a divide between large and small programs; could be problematic to not create equitable solution;
- v. M. Cook recalled Provost's direction of Academic Planning, not sure if we'll be able to determine the full implications of resources without their assistance; V. Adams summarized that the intent is to provide a program for students who have nowhere else to go in Ventura County; B. de Oca observed that students are spending \$50,000 or more on a Master's program elsewhere, but this would be a more cost effective solution;
- vi. VOTE: 30 – YES; 17 – NO; 1 – ABSTAIN; SP 14-19 approved.

9. New Business Items

- a. None to report

10. Intent to Raise Questions

- a. J. Grier updated Senate that we are making progress on last question from B. de Oca, don't have answer yet, but currently with Procurement for further guidance;

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

Faculty Affairs Committee

- No report

Fiscal Policies

- No official report; S. Frisch recalled being on this committee for 9 years, expressed frustration in being mired in the minutia of the Division budget, hoping that we can do more looking into the University budget in the future;

Student Academic Policies and Procedures

- No report

Curriculum Committee

- No report

General Education

- No report

Committee on Committees

- No report

Committee on Centers and Institutes

- No report

Professional Leave Committee

- No report

Mini-Grant Review Committee

- No report



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

11. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

- a. D. Downey announced Celebration of Service, 11am – 12noon is the poster session, keynote and award ceremony 12 – 1:30;
- b. J. Meriwether summarized that administrative reviews are complete, report will be filed with Provost; G. Hutchinson commented that she will be notifying administrators of the contents of their review first before making available, but then will make them more available than just a “walk-by”;
- c. J. Balen announced that S. Samatar will be new CME Director;

12. Announcements

- M. Cook: the book has now been selected for our Campus Reading Celebration, “We Are All Completely Beside Ourselves,” a novel by Karen Joy Fowler; Ms. Fowler will join us October 29th for our 13th annual celebration;
- S. Carswell is holding writing workshops, available to anyone;
- V. Adams send me your songs for Spring 2015, then I’ll send them back to you;
- J. Miller: SAGE conference is this Saturday in the Broome Library, both oral and poster presentations; media info available online (please see SAGE website for additional details);
- D. Wakelee reminded everyone that if you haven’t already submitted your textbook orders, we will need this info as soon as possible in order to make these materials accessibility compliant.

13. Adjourn

- Motion to adjourn made by I. Grzegorzcyk, second by G. Wood, meeting adjourned at 4:20pm.