Academic Senate

MEETING MINUTES

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, May 10, 2016, 2:30-4:30pm

Attendees: Adams, Virgil; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Sean; Aquino, Bryn; Banuelos, Selenne; Barajas, Frank; Berg, Gary; Berman, Michael; Bieszczad, A.J.; Buhl, Geoff; Burriss, Catherine; Campbell, Matthew; Carswell, Sean; Clark, Stephen; Clarke, Tracylee; Cook, Matthew; Davis-Smith, LaSonya; de Oca, Beatrice; Delaney, Colleen; Delgado, Jasmine; Dougherty, Geoff; Elliott, Jesse; Flores, Cynthia; Francois, Marie; Frisch, Scott; Garcia, Jorge; Gillespie, Blake; Grier, Jeanne; Griffin, John; Grzegorczyk, Ivona; Hampton, Philip; Hannans, Jaime; Harris-Keith, Colleen; Hartung, Beth; Hunt, Travis; Hutchinson, Gayle; Isaacs, Jason; Kelly, Sean; Klompien, Kathleen; Leafstedt, Jill; Leonard, Kathryn; Lee, Sohui; Liang, Priscilla; Linton, Kristen; Mack, Carol; Matjas, Luke; Meriwether, Jim; Patsch, Kiersten; Perchuk, Alison; Perry, Jennifer; Pinkley, Janet; Popenhagen, Luda; Rodriguez, Donald; Samatar, Sofia; Sanchez, Luis; Schmidhauser, Tom; Soltys, Michael; Stratton, Stephen; Thoms, Brian; Tollefson, Kaia; Veldmann, Brittnee; Vose, Kim; Wakelee, Dan; Weis, Chuck; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy; Yudelson, John;

1. Consent Items
	1. Update SP 15-04 Policy on Golden Four General Education Courses
		1. Consent item approved per approval of 5/10/16 agenda in Section 2;
	2. Revision SP 13-14 Policy on Research and Sponsored Programs Records Retention
		1. Consent item approved per approval of 5/10/16 agenda in Section 2;
	3. Update SP15-01 Policy on Principal Investigator
		1. Consent item approved per approval of 5/10/16 agenda in Section 2;
	4. Revision of SP 14-05 Policy on Principal Investigator Financial Conflict of Interest
		1. Consent item approved per approval of 5/10/16 agenda in Section 2;
2. Approval of the Agenda
	1. A. Perchuk asked to move the Art History discussion from item 8.(g.) to 8.(a.) due to class time commitments this afternoon; no objections;
	2. C. Wyels moved to amend the consent calendar with SR 15-07; clarification sought that this is the Senate Resolution for the Commendation and Appreciation of Provost Gayle E. Hutchinson; no objections;
3. Approval of the Minutes of April 19, 2016
	1. Academic Senate meeting minutes from 4/19/16 were approved with no objections;
4. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
	1. G. Hutchinson offered reflections, had the opportunity three years ago to join us, and one of the many things that attracted her to CI was the mission pillars, intersecting interdisciplinary and inclusivity; summarized that CI accomplishes this in ways I had not seen; when asking herself “do they walk the walk,” her answer was Yes; recalled that goals have always been set with students in mind while overcoming the challenges that present themselves along the way; but here at CI there is a sense of community while you grow, it’s something special, very few institutions can claim this; commented that CI is maturing in an elegant and outstanding way; thanked us for this opportunity;
	2. Noted that we’ve accomplished much over the past three years; cited multiple examples, including a successful move of Enrollment Management to Academic Affairs, a collaborative effort on the Strategic Plan, improvements to the structure of Faculty Affairs, improvements to RTP; further noted a strong feeling that J. Grier has been a partner over the last three years with effective communication and was grateful for her efforts; other examples include improvements to the budget process and transparency, hiring 48 tenure-track faculty, noted that we’ve secured off-the-top funding for faculty hires and faculty allotments such as sabbaticals, also improved the budget timeline to ensure a greater alignment with strategic planning; recalled a successful WASC review with the leadership of A. Wallace; created more professional development opportunities, made other academic program improvements, and helped to bring Santa Rosa Island initiatives to fruition;
	3. Asked senators to please stay tuned for a forthcoming letter coming from G. Hutchinson, in the form of thanks and to stay focused on the future; noted that she has enjoyed working with each one of us and that we’ve helped her become a better person;
	4. J. Grier read aloud to senators Senate Resolution 15-07 Commendation and Appreciation of Provost Gayle E. Hutchinson;
5. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
	1. S. Aloisio noted that we’re meeting next week, with quite a few resolutions on the table; the topic of library subscriptions has come up, specifically that the costs are increasing for various reasons – system-wide talks about cuts, not sure what’s on the chopping block (maybe the Lexus system); added that there may not be a lot statewide senate can do about that, but please let him know if there are any questions about how you may be impacted;
6. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
	1. J. Griffin: thanked senators and faculty for their vote on the new contract offer; noted that we are solid for the next three years; but, we won’t see the money on our paycheck until October; wait for announcements on the “party” (applause!);
7. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
	1. J. Grier opened her report with congratulations to B. Aquino on her new lecturer position; reminded that voting for senate committees is open until May 11 at 5pm; recalled that you may have noted that we’ve had some issues this semester with Qualtrics and voting, but confident that these issues are resolved and wanted to be very clear that once issues were discovered the ballots were closed and reset along with an additional message requesting votes be made again. And, now, you are each receiving your own personal voting link—which brings about its own issues that will once again be resolved;
	2. Announced to please be on the lookout for a call for university committees next week;
	3. Announcement from A. Jiménez Jiménez re: program name changes from “Spanish/Languages” to “Global Languages and Cultures”; making way for the diverse nature of the program;
	4. The Fiscal Policies Committee has submitted a working report that includes both long term and immediate recommendations. They seek your feedback on a resolution that would come to senate at the first meeting next year. You can find the working report and a survey link on the most recent senate newsletter—link at the bottom of the page;
	5. From J. Grier: “As this is the final senate meeting over which I will be presiding, I want to say a sincere thank you to all of you for your participation and support. This is not an easy role at times, and I hope I have served you well these last three years and moved us forward—at least a bit—as we continue and need to grow;
		1. This is bittersweet for me because I have enjoyed this position tremendously and it came in a time in my own professional life where I needed a new challenge. It certainly delivered on that promise! However, I do not feel that I ever served alone as I relied heavily on S. Clark and C. Wyels as senate officers, and on D. Daniels for senate support. Additionally, I ran many decisions through senate executive and we tried as we might to reach consensus or at least an agreement to disagree. Whatever the case, it has been my honor to serve as the senate chair;
		2. From this vantage point, one learns a great deal about the functioning of the university and the various people and tasks that must be in place. It’s eye opening. Really. I wish each of you could sit here at some point and see the things I have seen but perhaps without the craziness! I’d like to leave you all with something to think about as we are in the midst of many transitions and that is how we go forward, not as we were but as who we want to be. There are many questions that arise from this viewpoint and I’d be happy to discuss these over a drink or a meal, however, we need to be good to each other and support one another if our institution is going to move forward in a way that we can all be proud;
		3. I’ll be handing the gavel over to C. Wyels at the end of this meeting confident in her and what she will be able to do for us”;
		4. S. Clark moved to present J. Grier with a parting gift, invited senators to second his motion in appreciation for J. Grier’s outstanding service[[1]](#footnote-1), offering her a silver dolphin trophy on behalf of the faculty, in appreciation.
8. Continuing Business Items
	1. SR 15-05 Resolution in Support of the Academic Senate Chair as a Member of the President’s Cabinet (Exec)
		1. No objections to voting;
		2. VOTE: 46 YES – 2 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; SR 15-05 was approved;
	2. SP 15-14 Policy on Perpetual Academic Calendar with Fall Break (Exec)
		1. P. Hampton cited a memorandum from the Chancellor’s Office, indicating that the year 2025 does not have enough meeting time to be in compliance;
		2. J. Meriwether found himself in favor of a perpetual calendar, but having mixed feelings with a fall break; moved to take out the fall break portions, seconded by C. Wyels; J. Grier and D. Daniels pulled up files received from D. Vea to display current version; S. Aloisio spoke against the motion, summarizing that we’re basically trading out three days in November and adding five instructional days in December, so the Fall Break calendar has more instructional dates, which I’m in favor of; C. Wyels asked D. Vea to address the verity of the “more instructional days” comment; D. Vea noted that we’re always around 145-149 instructional days, and we’re still in compliance with or without the fall break as the models present;
		3. Further discussion to clarify motion; J. Meriwether summarized that he believed that we can pass a perpetual calendar now, but leave the discussion of the break until next year to allow us more time; C. Burriss asked if it was possible to make the calendar only go to 2024; J. Grier answered that this would be a different motion, but let’s get back to the one on the floor; G. Buhl recommended to strike the last paragraph; G. Wood asked for clarification, G. Buhl saw similarities to SRT policy that included the instrument itself; K. Leonard added that since the calendar attachments contain the controversial parts, that these could potentially be removed; A.J. Bieszczad didn’t see the advantage of disconnecting the calendar from the policy, spoke against the motion; J. Meriwether summarized his intent was that the alternate policy without a fall break be considered;
		4. J. Grier summarized that we’ll remove the citations to a fall break in the document, and we’ll have the no fall break option; K. Leonard commented that currently we don’t have a perpetual calendar, what we’re voting on is a new system of calendaring; further discussion on options; G. Buhl thought that tying the two things together may conflate things, if this senate policy is established it may last too long / set in stone to always; C. Wyels commented she and S. Aloisio had counted days in 3 – 4 years on the two options; in each case counted, the “no fall break” option had more instructional days; S. Carswell observed that this policy sets the perpetual calendar, but isn’t the reverse also true, i.e. if we can revisit the idea of a perpetual calendar later we would also be able to revisit the idea of a fall break? In other words, do we want to fight for a fall break or to fight to remove a fall break; K. Leonard called the question, seconded by S. Aloisio;
		5. VOTE on the motion to remove fall break references from the policy: 36 YES – 8 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; policy will remove paragraph citations to a fall break and fall break calendar options;
		6. T. Hunt asked to bring up the calendar with a Wednesday fall break option as that is what many students who wanted a fall break preferred. J. Grier stated the fall break was no longer in the policy as an option, and thanked him for representing student perspectives.
		7. K. Vose asked to clarify the Senate’s ability to say, next year we’d like a Wednesday fall break, and if this would be possible – answer was yes, that would be possible;
		8. VOTE on SP 15-14: 43 YES – 3 NO – 3 ABSTAIN; SP 15-14 was approved as amended;
	3. SR 15-06 Resolution on E-portfolios (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton spoke to the need to be more sustainable (“kill less trees”) as well as having a more robust repository; noted that this would be implemented for the AY17-18 year;
		2. S. Kelly moved that in addition to the FAC office that CFA be represented in this discussion and on the document, due to important contractual issues that we wouldn’t want to circumvent, seconded by B. Veldman; I. Grzegorczyk expressed worry that there is no language about electronic security, and there are also no IT people included here; J. Grier asked her to clarify if I. Grzegorczyk was in favor of S. Kelly’s motion – answer was Yes; J. Leafstedt recalled the new IT procurement process that has many security enhancing measures in place, indicated that this would be handled at this step; J. Grier asked S. Kelly if he wanted to add security to his motion – answer was No;
		3. VOTE on motion to include CFA language; 46 YES – 3 NO – 1 ABSTAIN;
		4. VOTE on SR 15-06: 46 YES – 3 No – 2 ABSTAIN; resolution was approved as amended;
	4. SP 15-15 RTP Policy Revision (FAC)
		1. P. Hampton summarized that this cleans up old language that is no longer applicable, and also creates guidelines to get off of RTP if you’ve recently served;
		2. VOTE 47 YES – 3 NO; SP 15-15 was approved;
	5. SP 15-16 Mechatronics major (Curriculum)
		1. B. Veldman opened discussion by speaking out against the major and the potential passage of SP 15-14; recalled that at the last presentation that a Google map was displayed for all of the engineering jobs, but she thought that A. Perchuk brought up a good point at the last meeting, i.e. asking if mechatronics would prepare students for a variety of engineering applications; B. Veldman added that in her research a mechatronics degree isn’t going to get you a civil engineering job; researched that there are 43 institutions within 100 miles of CI offering degrees in this field; now, of those schools only Chico has used “Mechatronics” as the identifying term; further, usually these jobs require 3 years of experience in addition to a degree, so our students wouldn’t have the qualifications at the onset; asked how will CI students fare against such competition with the tens of graduating students from other institutions; further noted that a 500K in a one-time payment is not sufficient to start an engineering program; recalled that she put in a grant and a contract (noted that a contract would also be necessary) for 1.5M for a single piece of equipment;
		2. M. Soltys thought that having these questions makes our program better; recalled that the slide was a visual tool; we’re following the study commissioned by the university, we found 300 firms that are hiring; the Navy is also pushing us, we’ve spoken with Lockheed-Martin; further, to date all of our students are getting jobs amid the competition; in terms of financing, as soon as we have a mechatronics major, we can ask all of the companies that have been pushing us; but, without it in place, then we’re just making promises;
		3. S. Kelly commented that he’s not philosophically opposed to the idea, but the problem has lasted a long time on campus, citing the “performing arts center” that has yet to materialize; Physics also had a similar argument; added that the Administration should be including the request for these resources in their strategic plan, adding that we have a hiring plan, why aren’t we putting 2 or 3 new hires in to ensure that this is a successful venture; noted that he’s voting against it not because he didn’t think it to be a good program, but to send a message to administration to get out of this cycle of insufficient attention to resources;
		4. I. Grzegorczyk commented this is the first program on campus to get this kind of financial support, the Navy committed equipment, they’re also going to donate instructional time; there is a NSF initiative to improve engineering skills, so once established we’ll be able to tap into this resource; clarified that the civil engineers were not included on the Google map referenced earlier, it was only the jobs that would coincide with mechatronics; Ventura College and Moorpark are already offer pre-engineering courses, they would be the ones to train our transfer students; we already have an agreement with Moorpark to get this done; over 80% of computer science students are minority students, and we’re looking to increase the number of female students;
		5. A.J. Bieszczad commented that he is obviously in support of the proposal, but summarized that this discipline combines many skills from computer science, mechanical and electrical engineering; he would challenge anyone to find a person that doesn’t have a job that has been trained and credentialed in this diverse skillset; his colleague from the University of Toronto commented that we have many things at this campus that they don’t, and they are a leading university in this field;
		6. J. Garcia recalled many students coming to him asking when engineering will become a program; his son is in high school and would seek out this program should it be offered here;
		7. S. Aloisio added that his colleague S. Kelly makes a good argument that we shouldn’t commit to programs that don’t have the resources; but, thought that we’ll get a strong attractor of science students with this in place, translating into benefits for all of us; noted that engineering is an expensive program, but that students will be able to get high paying jobs as a results; spoke in support of this program;
		8. C. Wyels added that she though the curricula to be well thought out, and agreed that it will strengthen our national presence in the field of science; also thought that what with our GEs, particularly our UDIGEs we’d ideally be educating humanistic engineers; commented that since she teaches math, she’s used to hearing the phrase “if you’re good at math go do engineering”; in meetings for with the Ventura College MESA group she’d guess that 90% are underrepresented minorities and 80% of these are engineering majors; recalled that we do have the space in Sierra Hall, and until a major like this comes to fruition, you may not receive the support or the attractants in terms of students, speaking in support of this program;
		9. M. Soltys added that he recalls Chico State as having the only recognized program in mechatronics; further added that this is the cheapest way of bringing engineering to CI; C. Delaney commented that most of the jobs out there require the 1 to 5 years of experience, given this how are we to ensure their job readiness; M. Soltys replied that the Navy is coming this Thursday to our capstone presentations, which shows example of their support;
		10. S. Stratton spoke against the policy, it’s 133 units which is over the Chancellor’s limits; also this appears to be a lightly-enrolled program, we wouldn’t want to see another program created that would have insufficient draw from students and insufficient support from the community; A.J. Bieszczad replied that basically when students graduate, one of the reasons for this unit load is that our GE is so huge we can’t squeeze enough units in; also part of the issue is that to train a good engineer it takes time and unit allocation;
		11. M. Cook called the question, S. Aloisio seconded;
		12. VOTE: 23 YES – 14 NO – 8 ABSTAIN; SP 15-16 was approved;
	6. SP 15-17 Astronomy minor (Curriculum)
		1. G. Dougherty opened discussion by stating that we’ve been running these courses for a while now with good enrollment numbers; this is a minor in response to student demand; noted that we have the resources, well-equipped with the telescopes and the software, along with a competent and willing staff; question on how many units, replied with a range of 27-39 units;
		2. VOTE: 30 YES – 6 NO – 2 ABSTAIN; SP 15-17 was approved;
	7. SP 15-18 Art history minor (Curriculum)
		1. Moved from item G to item A on agenda; A. Perchuk noted that we did modify this in response to the recommendations at last meeting, particularly with double counting;
		2. VOTE: 50 YES – 3 NO; SP 15-18 was approved;
	8. SP 15-19 Creative writing minor (Curriculum)
		1. S. Carswell recalled that there are a lot of writers who take other courses to hone their discipline, this minor addresses this need;
		2. VOTE: 37 YES – 1 NO; SP 15-19 was approved;
	9. SP 15-20 Healthcare interpretation certificate (Curriculum)
		1. No objections to voting;
		2. VOTE: 35 YES – 1 NO; SP 15-20 was approved;
9. New Business Items
	1. None

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

 Faculty Affairs Committee

* No report

 Fiscal Policies

* No report

 Student Academic Policies and Procedures

* No report

 Curriculum Committee

* C. Delaney reminded to vote before ballot closes tomorrow by 5pm;

 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

11. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

 a. None

12. Announcements

 a. None

13. Adjourn

 a. C. Harris Keith moved to adjourn, seconded by K. Vose, meeting adjourned at 4:28pm.

1. * 1. “ the leadership and service [she has] provided over these past three years, both to our body and to the greater university, and for doing so in a manner that exemplifies the values we all cherish—shared governance, collegiality, civility and collaboration—; while at the same time performing your duties with grace, efficiency, and good humor…” [↑](#footnote-ref-1)