**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING MINUTES**

**March 27, 2018**

**2:30pm – 4:30pm**

**Grand Salon**

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting
4. Report from the Provost
5. Report from Statewide Senators
6. Report from CFA President
7. Report from the Senate Chair
8. Continuing Business
9. New Business
10. Report from Senate Committees (as needed)
11. Reports from other committees/centers on campus
12. Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQ)
13. Announcements (no more than 2 minutes)
14. Adjournment

**Attendance**

Virgil Adams, Jose Alamillo, Simone Aloisio, Mary Avila,Theresa Avila, Susan Andrzejewski, Dana Baker, Raquel Baker, Maria Ballesteros-Sola, Selenne Banuelos, Catherine Burris, Sean Carswell, Nicholas Centino, Stephen Clark, Thomas Clobes, Matt Cook, Beatrice de Oca, Michelle Dean, Jasmine Delgado, Miguel Delgado Hellester, Talya Drescher, Jesse Elliott, Cynthia Flores, Jose Garcia, Blake Gillespie, Javier Gonzalez, Ivona Grezegorczyk, Georgina Guzman, Collen Harris, , Jason Isaacs, Tiina Itkonen, Jacob Jenkins, Lynette Landry, Chelsea Lincoln, KuanFen Liu, Margarita Lopez Lopez, Carol Mack, Luke Matjas, Kara Naidoo, Colleen Nevins, Alison Perchuk, Monica Pereira, Jennifer Perry, Pawel Pilarczyk, Janet Pinkley, Jacqueline Reynoso, Christina Salazar, Cynthia Sherman, Melissa Soenke, Michael Soltys, Rachel Soper, Steve Stratton, Brian Thoms, Kaia Tollefson, Brittnee Veldman, Kim Vose, Chuck Weis, Annie White, Gregory Wood, Cynthia Wyels, John Yudelson [*Guests of Senate included: Kassidee Sattler, Blake Buller, Janet Rizzoli, Jim Meriwether, Toni Deboni, Monica Rivas, Ed Lebioda, Charles Osiris, Mary Adler]*

**Approval of Agenda and Minutes of the previous meeting**

The agenda was approved unanimously. The minutes from the February 27, 2018 of the Academic Senate were approved unanimously.

**Report from the Provost**

Welcome back from spring break.

There have been some suggestions on campus about how we continue to have conversations. Working with the Senate Executive Committee to gather people to form a community and a dialogue action committee. Will be meeting with Rosario Cuevas, Virgil Adams, Sean Anderson, Jerry Clifford, Monica Pereira, Cynthia Flores, Taylor Drescher, Pilar Pacheco, and Michelle Hasendonckx. Will meet with these people. Will sit with them, learn with them, from each other, how to promote inclusive dialogue that allows for difference, diversity, and a variety of perspectives. Will be coming back next fall with updates from this Action Committee. Welcome your input. Showed much appreciation for those who shared their suggestions, those who have agreed to meet, and for the community for raising the issues.

Tenure Track Density Report for all CSUs released form Chancellor’s Office. Shared this report with the Provost Council and the Academic Affairs working group. Challenges outlined for the system as a whole are significant. Particularly given budget challenges we face and given the support we receive from the State. But they are challenges we must rise to meet. Will discuss with Senate Exec putting together a task force to look at tenure density at our institution and map out the progress we want to make in this regard. Proposing to do this in Fall not Spring because we can’t work it out in a few weeks. Will put task force together in Fall.

Budget requests are being submitted by all divisions to the Business Finance and Administration by next Tuesday. Still waiting for the May revision report from the Governor, at which time will take another look at the budget requests.

Strategic Initiatives process still ongoing. World Café scheduled for April 13 at 10am in Malibu Hall 100. Have received feedback- please continue to submit feedback.

Searches underway: This week – 3 candidates for the VP of Student Affairs; one yesterday, one today, and one tomorrow. Encourage all to attend the Open Forums and take some time to provide feedback to the search committees. Search Committee for the Dean of Arts & Sciences are meeting right now; 7 interviews today and 7 tomorrow. Expect to have recommendation for campus visits to Provost on the basis of those initial interviews.

Question raised – How many candidates do you expect to bring to campus?

Response: Not definite, but thinking about 4-5

**Report from Statewide Senators**

Simone Aloisio thanked Academic Senate Chair, Virgil Adams, for getting the Tenure Density Report out to Senate, which went to faculty. Encouraged to read report – lots of information. Specifically, campus recommendations, which are a bit blurry in the report: (1) Develop a campus specific tenure density plan that includes targets based on the needs and resources of the campus. The task force that Dr. Chase mentioned, which he mentioned would start in the fall, will address this. (2) At campus level, when a tenure/tenure track faculty leaves the university, s/he is replaced with another tenure/tenure track member. (3) Recruit and retain a diverse group of qualified tenure/tenure track faculty each year that exceeds the number leaving campus. This wasn’t in our charge, but recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty was important to the group. (4) Campuses consider qualified lecturer faculty for tenure/tenure track positions, as appropriate. We have many qualified lecturers; recommendation is to give those people consideration and hire them when we can. (5) Monitoring and reporting goals.

Budget: We’ve heard a lot about the $60 million shortfall system wide between existing and obligated expenses and what the state is giving us. $60 million may seem like a significant amount, but the whole CSU budgets is something like $7.1 billion, so it is not that much in that context. Discussion regarding positioning the CSU as a #1 or #2 priority with top legislators before the May revision, in hopes of getting some of that extra money. Faculty Trustee has stated the he will not vote for a tuition increase.

Shared governance was discussed due to the Chancellor’s Executive Orders 1100 1110. The majority of the senates in CSU believe the Chancellor’s Executive Orders 1100 1110 came out without adequate consultation with faculty. This conflict between the statewide senators and the Chancellor has spurred meetings with top executives from the Chancellor’s Office about how shared governance should work. Consultation/Joint Action, sometimes called Joint Decision Making – Faculty and Administration sign off together. At the statewide level, this does not happen. Rather, the faculty recommends and the Administration implements. Discussed difference between consultation and discussion. Genuine consultation is based on sound reasoning that each party has an equal opportunity to question the situation. Rather than being merely “informed” by the Chancellor’s Office, need to be consulted. Statewide Senate submitted a draft definition of “good consultation” to the Chancellor’s Office. Waiting for response – meet again next week.

John Yudelson reported on a few resolutions; one issue involving not enough counselors in the CSU. The number of counselors per student has decreased. Discussion with the Chancellor resulted in a resolution to try to get 1 counselor to every 1000-1500 students, which is the recommendation by the National Counselor’s Association. Second issue, no student or faculty member should be punished in any way for peaceful protest.

John announced that June 30 is the last day to apply for Learning Solutions funds. Affordable learning solutions, includes lab space, and many things. If you’re looking for funding for facilities or other materials, contact John Yudelson for information.

John mentioned the tenure density – Margaret Merryfield, Asst VC Academic HR for the Chancellor’s Office, stated hired 3000 new faculty in the past five years, but comes down to 150 net. Quick discussion took place about possibly non-tenure/tenure track faculty becoming more like UCs, in which there are 6-year contracts, security of employment.

**Report from CFA President**

John Griffin reserved his time for Guest, Dr. Cecil Canton to address Senate – Dr. Cecil Canton thanked John Griffin and Senate for the time. Reported that he had a robust conversation this afternoon and fielded questions yesterday about multiculturalism and issues of diversity on our campus. He stressed that he believes faculty is ready to have a real conversation about this. Need to have ground rules so that when conversation happens we have rules about how we engage one another. Respect and honesty are important. In this body, your faculty, your academic senate, this is where you have your power. This is where you have the opportunity to engage in conversations that are going to affect not just this institution, but the community in which it resides. It is that community that wants us to provide everything that we can for their families and their well-being. It is important that we remember that, and that we have to engage that community. And students live in this community. [The students] need to have expression, too. Students want to have faculty who look like them as well, who they can, in fact, go to because they have had similar experiences. Acknowledged that there are issues on campus, but that they are not irresolvable issues. Encouraged Senate to have the authentic conversation – use this space to engage and have the conversation. If we don’t hear people when they speak, they will express what they need in other ways. Listen, hear the frustration and anger but get past it. Anger and frustration are natural things. Thanked all for the work they do. Acknowledged that the work of multiculturalism is a part of our mission. It is not just faculty’s responsibility for this mission, it is also Administration and ultimately the President is responsible for ensuring this mission is met. He would like to see the President involved in these conversations about multiculturalism.

**Report from Senate Chair**

Virgil Adams publicly commended Stephen Clark and the Faculty Affairs Committee for their work on the RTP policy.

Community and Dialogue Action Committee – in discussion on how to move forward. Highly encouraged to provide him with ideas and how to assess them by this Friday at 5pm to ensure your ideas are presented at the Monday retreat.

Forming a task force in the fall to look at tenure density report. Shared conversation he had with Kent Porter – an announcement will be going out in the next couple of weeks for four faculty members to work on faculty diversity moving forward. Statewide Academic Senate has passed a few resolutions (John Yudelson mentioned a couple previously). None of the resolutions are urgent and will be forthcoming.

**Continuing Business**

SP: University, Retention, Tenure and Promotion (second reading item)

Faculty Affairs Committee: Stephen Clark presented PowerPoint [..\7-senate-meeting-materials-02-27-2018\8-rtp-proposal-changes-by-fac-for-senate-meeting.pptx](../7-senate-meeting-materials-02-27-2018/8-rtp-proposal-changes-by-fac-for-senate-meeting.pptx)

Discussion: (extensive)

Question raised about clarifying “period of review” seemed unclear. Policy states they will be reviewed by second semester but then it states that if they start in fall, they are reviewed in the second semester of spring.

S. Clark responded that proposing they do their first PDP and teaching observation, if they do it in Spring, they do it in second Spring – he referred to his PPT (slide 12) New language states: Faculty whose appointments begin in Fall submit PDP and at least one teaching observation during first spring semester. Faculty who begin in spring… during their second spring semester. Further clarified that the point is to bring everyone into the same cycle. It’ll just take an extra semester for them to get on the same cycle as everyone else.

Question raised regarding statement on p. 13, request for tenure. #3. If you go up for early tenure it says, “In addition, granting of early tenure….. and confirmed by PPC and URTPC.” What does it mean by “confirmed”? Is it in writing? How is that confirmed by your PPC and URTPC?

Clark: Suggesting that be reviewed and specified in evaluation narrative offered by PPC.

Question raised on Section H-1, Professional Development Plan, regarding this change: Still says under section 1 that PDP will be approved by end of faculty member’s first year of appointment.

Clark: Thank you. Will correct that on the floor since we vote on this today.

G. Wood: Confirmed, “The end of the first full academic year.” Friendly amendment accepted.

Question raised if this process is fair for people working tenure at this point in time to raise the bar for them. This would be changing the rules in the middle of the game. Consider language that states the next incoming class of new hires would be under the proposal – people already in the process would be under previous rules.

Academic Senate Chair, Virgil Adams, stated this was a question for Kent Porter. Stephen Clark did acknowledge that this was discussed at the meeting.

Kent Porter stated that this is similar to CBA. When you make a contracts change it applies to everyone going forward. Don’t grandfather people to previous contract as it may disadvantage them. Same for policies. Otherwise would have different RTP policies. FAC attempt to codify what is difficult to achieve. Trying to demonstrate that you are head and shoulder above colleagues. Added that this isn’t a dramatic change. Anyone just hired would have more than enough time to get early tenure and promotion if they wanted.

J. Elliott stated he disagreed with K. Porter’s statement - When students come in they have catalog rights, to choose an earlier catalog. I had option when I first came here, faculty could choose to be under old or new policy. Can’t change requirements as you move forward. Seems to be common sense to me. Very opposed to that.

Question raised by J. Elliott regarding every year being a discrete year and wants to know how that will affect … How do you know every year that the review just applies to the year? Expressed confusion.

S. Clark confirmed that is the case. He explained that every year is an evaluation of that year’s performance. One would expect that if they have done well every year, they would end up doing well. That caveat placed in there because of multiple, unsuccessful applications for early tenure and promotion, based on limited number of years of successful scores.

Additional concerns raised: People who usually get early tenure, are the scores that should be the minimum, are they the scores that early tenure recipients generally get? This would impact salary and retirement benefits. How interim ratings in year 2, 3 and 4 compare with someone going up for tenure and promotion - Someone might be on track, but not have the number of pubs for example, for the PPS. What is a 4 at the different stages? Idea should be that if you work hard enough, meet requirements to achieve tenure prior to Year 6, then you should. By changing scores from 2 fours and a three to 2 fives and a four, not maintaining that reality.

S. Clark responded that it was an honest attempt to bring our policy in line with CSU campuses throughout state and to bring our policy into line closer to existing practice.

J. Alamillo added that the committee spent a lot of time researching other campuses’ RTP policies. A lot of time looking into language. A lot of language when it comes to early tenure does talk about the notion of exceptional circumstances. Early tenure is not a right. Part of what we’re doing is, we’re trying to align our campus to what other campuses are doing. Not just RTP policy.

Motion brought forward by Jesse Elliot to send policy back to the Faculty Affairs Committee Sean Carswell second motion

Vote: 36 = YES, 16 = NO, 0= Abstaining

*Policy sent back to Faculty Affairs Committee*

SP Unit Load Policy (second reading)

Brought to the floor by the Curriculum Committee

Discussion: None

Vote: = YES, 0= NO, 2 = Abstain

*Policy Passed*

**New Business**

**Reports from Senate Committees**

General Education Committee – Bob Bleicher emailed statement to Academic Senate Chair to be read into minutes. GE Committee plans to meet with programs during spring to discuss GE curriculum planning for next year.

Committee on Centers and Institutes: No report

Curriculum Committee – No report

Faculty Affairs: No report

Fiscal Policies: No report

Committee on Committees: The candidates comment/question period took place before Senate today. Ballots will open for Senate officers tomorrow. After elected, next week, call will go out for standing committees and subsequently a vote.

Mini-Grant Review: No report

Professional Leave - No report

SAPP: Brian Thoms reported that the committee will meet with members of Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and Records to review and examine policies related to academic honesty next week.

**Reports from other committees/centers on campus**

None

**Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQ)**

**[ITRQ8](../8-senate-materials-03-27-2018/ITRQ8.pptx)**

New Questions: Please email to Steve Stratton at [stephen.stratton@csuci.edu](mailto:stephen.stratton@csuci.edu) or to [senate@cscuci.edu](mailto:senate@cscuci.edu)

Jesse Elliot raised a question regarding hiring. Requesting a process similar to the nomination and election process we do for Senate. Acknowledged suggestion for faculty hiring handbook given that each program does things differently and we don’t have norms for diversity and other things. “it’s a suggestion in the form of a question”

Academic Senate Chair responded that Academic Senate is working on it. The Faculty Affairs Committee is looking at SR 11-03 and the possibility of converting it to a policy. Also work starting next week to talk about hiring, as well as a taskforce coming together in the fall.

Melissa Soenke added she has similar feeling that faculty getting notices about committees being created without notice about how they are being created. Requesting to be more involved in the process, or at least understand how they are being formed.

Provost Chase responded that when he arrived, he checked the current policy and has tried to follow that. He acknowledged that he sat with the Academic Senate Executive Committee and shared names with the members. If that process isn’t working, which is what the policy states, we can change that.

Jesse Elliott further expressed that he believes the process has morphed over years and that Senate Executive Committee now has much more control over things. Stated that Senate Executive Committee was appointing people. Academic Senate Chair, Virgil Adams disagreed with this statement.

S. Andrzejewski asked if we have re-visited the opportunity for extended new faculty orientation. Is there a way, or do junior faculty even want, sustained faculty orientations that meet once a month or a few times a year?

**Announcements**

• S. Stratton: Immediately following Senate, Faculty Accomplishments Celebration. Get your soccer jersey on and join us. There will be a Food truck, lots of awards, plus you’ll get to see what everyone has been doing.

• C. Burriss: The Importance of Being Earnest, performance coming Thursday through Saturday. 8pm Thursday and Friday, 2pm and 8pm performance this Saturday in Malibu 140. Will be amazing. Laura Cobalt, lecturer, directed, and your students will be in it. Press release went out, search for it in your email, or go on PA web page for more information.

• T. Itkonen: Baby box from Finland on display: Every mother since the 30s has received this. If you want this in your class, email me. Have to return it in a week.

• M. Ballesteros-Sola: Collecting business clothes. If you have any to donate, Sage Hall 2153 or Career Center. There will be a “Soft Opening” of the Ekho Closet: April 9 between 12:00-5:00. Service for our students, help promote it across campus.

**Adjournment**

C. Harris motioned to adjourn; T. Itkonen second