



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**
C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Academic Senate
Del Norte Hall 1500
April 29, 2014
2:30pm-4:30pm
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Virgil Adams, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Sean Anderson, Julia Balén, Frank Barajas, Marilyn Buchanan, Karen Carey, Sean Carswell, Stephen Clark, Beatrice de Oca, LaSonya Davis, Nancy Deans, Colleen Delaney, Caroline Doll, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Genevieve Evans-Taylor, Therese Eyer mann, Marie Francois, Scott Frisch, Jeanne Grier, John Griffin, Ivona Grzegorzczuk, Beth Hartung, Gayle Hutchinson, Debi Hoffman, Dax Jacobson, J. Jacob Jenkins, Karen Jensen, Antonio Jiménez-Jiménez, Gary Kinsey, Jill Leafstedt, Ed Lebioda, Kathryn Leonard, Chris Mattia, Jim Meriwether, Jason Miller, Brad Monsma, Nancy Mozingo, Paul Murphy, Claudio Paiva, Monica Pereira, Luda Popenhagen, Toni Rice, Christina Salazar, Sofia Samatar, Tom Schmidhauser, Peter Smith, Steve Stratton, Kaia Tollefson, Dan Wakelee, Greg Wood, Cindy Wyels.

I. Welcome

Meeting called to order at 2:35pm

II. Approval of the Agenda

J. Balén proposed a Resolution on Hate Crimes as a First Reading Item. No objections. Agenda so amended.

III. Approval of the Minutes of April 8th, 2014

Approved without objection.

IV. Report from the Provost

Provost Hutchinson welcomed new AVP of Enrollment Management Hung Dang, who starts on May 1. Provost gave background on his experience and gave update on his goals for his term here.

Provost gave an update on current and upcoming budget situation. FTES have been increased by 600. Anticipated growth percentages will be 13.7% next year and then 8% for the following years. Stable funding of 4% growth is anticipated though 2016-2017. Provost thanked Dan Wakelee for all of his hard work in helping to better accommodate students. Gave an overview of state and campus-level budget processes as well as status and showed a PowerPoint of classification of expenses in Academic Affairs. In Academic Affairs for 2014-2015, requests totaled 11.3 million. Available revenue is 8.5 million with fixed costs of 2.7 million. Academic Affairs thus needs to prioritize its requests and the Provost is meeting with Fiscal Policies



tomorrow to that end and suggested that questions be directed to your respective Associate Vice President (AVP).

Regarding faculty hiring, there will be 17 new tenure track hires for 14/15. Displayed names. Provost congratulated DSC/ SCC. Showed demographics of cohort and noted that the campus will be doing fall and spring searches for 2014-2015. Committed to improving tenure-track ratio as well as diversity. DSC's will be receiving training on how to increase diversity.

Regarding the University Strategic Plan- a draft is being circulated via campus town hall meetings. The Committee has received feedback. There will be another Town Hall tonight in Petit Salon. Reminded everyone to give their input via the Wufoo survey, which closes 5/16.

Congratulated faculty on outstanding year. Gave update on expected attendance at Commencement and encouraged faculty to attend.

A. Questions re: Provost's Report

There were some questions about the PowerPoint pie chart that the Provost provided, and what percentages may be general fund and/or student fees (S. Aloisio). G. Wood asked if Ysabel could provide a pie chart that reflects divisions, and suggested showing percentages that directly impact in classroom versus everything else. Questions will be sent to Ysabel Trinidad for discussion in another public venue.

K. Leonard asked if percentages match what is true across CSU, noting that she has contradicting sources to the Finance data. Provost reiterated inviting Ysabel to have a campus-wide conversation.

I. Grzegorzcyk asked what are fixed costs of \$2.7 million. Chair Grier referenced prior President's Policy and Planning Council presentation (PPPC) and noted that something changed in how state is paying for insurance. A flat 44.3% benefits rate will no longer be charged and we are moving to an actual system. State will allow contribution, but is capping that- and the University has to figure out how to absorb those costs of benefits.

A. Jiménez-Jiménez noted the projection for 8% growth in enrollment. But funding is 4%. Governor has promised 4% over two years. Provost noted that campus needs to get together to examine that and made the point that our budget will have to be scaled. Other questions should be directed to Senate Chair.

Intent to Raise Questions was moved after time certain.

V. Report from Ed Lebioda, Associate VP for Wellness and Athletics

E. Lebioda introduced himself and noted that, although the title is new, he has been on campus since 2002. Director of Athletics title was added to Greg Sawyer's title as well. Would like to answer questions and clear up misconceptions about Athletics at CI.



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

At the CI Connection luncheon, President Rush announced cross country and golf as sports for next year. These sports were picked because they are easier to start than team sports. Also, CI has existing trails and on campus meets would not immediately be required. Golf is also easier to start, as teams can be small and can use local golf courses in area; also, campus does not need to host meetings in first two years. E. Lebioda's office is in the midst of gathering information and doing research, including type of governance, financial costs, budget (i.e. for coaches), positions, philosophy, and recruitment strategy. E. Lebioda noted that, as the next phase, there will be a planning group- including two faculty on that committee- as well as open town hall forums.

C. Wyels asked about the previous Athletics advisory committee, noting relationship between university and committee. E. Lebioda replied that they are doing research on setups on sister campuses. Division NC2A has scheduling challenges- a campus needs 10 sports operating for at least a year. NAIA is a possibility to get started; NCAA is also desirable. E. Lebioda's office is in the midst of gathering information in order to make most effective use of faculty time.

D. Downey asked- what is the difference in definition between "student-athlete" versus "scholar-athlete"? E. Lebioda replied that the former was coined by NCAA. Division II is the plan that was presented years ago; Division I has tighter rules, including GPA. Scholar athletes have more emphasis on education and higher standards for grades. Important to inform coaches of those standards when recruiting.

J. Meriwether countered E. Lebioda's assertion that his office is in the middle of researching, as decisions have been made, such as in planning golf, cross country, and the recruitment of four coaches, and questioned lack of faculty consultation. E. Lebioda answered that the planning committee could not yet meet because budget was still in process. However, the planning group will be 7 or 8 members, will meet on a regular basis, and consult constituents form around campus.

C. Delaney asked- as a former runner, NCAA has very strict order about when sports can be started. What order is the campus following (according title 9) and is this part of the research planning? E. Lebioda answered that soccer was considered at first. Cross country will be among the first, noting that female teams can be a little bigger. E. Lebioda also noted that there will be no scholarships right away; a campus needs 10 teams for a year before you can apply. Noted that applications are due in February. Regarding who can we compete against, E. Lebioda noted that San Marcos is independent and in NAIA, and that there are two additional NAI conferences in CA including GSAC. NAIA has less requirements and is a lot easier to start; athletes can compete for championships sooner than they can as part of NCAA.

S. Aloisio asked if there are general fund requests atop athletics fee? Gave background on how two campus recreation staff were moved on to the fee and that the campus also acquired Boating Center. Recreation Center almost eats up whole fee. Athletics is going to require multiple

sources of funding including fundraising, and a possible increase in athletics fee that would need to be passed by referendum. The goal is to make the program visible (by offering two sports) in order to increase fundraising and fee.

C. Wyels commented that research has been done, and asked at what markers will the planning group be called together? E. Lebioda responded that would transpire in the next few weeks after getting more budget information and more recent information (including sources of revenue) from sister institutions, and added that if CI wants to do something in the summer, we would need interested faculty.

I. Grzegorzcyk asked why doesn't the campus go into watersports? As far as CCAA (NCAA division II California institutions) watersports are not part of their program. For division regulations, the campus needs to have 8 sports; two could be watersports. E. Lebioda outlined the campus needs to meet division requirements. CI needs sports in fall, winter, spring; also individual sports. Cross Country is an individual sport, along with tennis, golf. Rowing is a NCAA sport- however, sailing is not. E. Lebioda noted the 13 active sports club on campus, including CI having a top competitive surfer on campus. E. Lebioda also noted other club sports on campus including sailing, cycling, and lacrosse, noting that there are no coaches for these clubs- they are all volunteers.

B. Monsma asked about the previous raising of the Recreation and Athletics fee of \$20 a semester for students that took effect this year 2013-14. E. Lebioda noted that revenue supports the CI Boating Center, sports clubs, and additional hours in recreation center.

J. Miller asked about J. Wade's role and the Boating Center. She noted that he has been doing a great job of programming plus providing source of revenue generation. J. Miller asked for comment on the revenue generation portion, and as to the likelihood of self-support for the Center. E. Lebioda responded that the campus is in the process of hiring a director of campus recreation whose role to start making contacts in community and to get the boating center it more self-supporting. Contact Ed to get more information about summer programs for children ages 9-16 in sailing, kayaking, windsurfing, paddleboarding, Send additional questions to Chair Grier to forward to E. Lebioda.

Jim read statement- President GF not planning on using for Athletics. Last fall, in October, VP Greg Sawyer gave the following statement to the Academic Senate:

What are the budget implications of instituting Athletics at CI?

The actual budget has not yet been determined, as the program itself has not been fully developed. The President has stated in the past that he does not plan on utilizing General Funds to fund Intercollegiate Athletics ...



Six months later, we learn -- although only by looking at budget requests -- that General Funds are being requested for Athletics.

VI. Report from Statewide Senators

No report. Next meeting is in two weeks.

VII. Report from CFA President

N. Mazingo read from a prepared statement. Governor's Budget calls for 5% increase. That is not enough! Provost is being asked to "prioritize". That means "cut". Write to Governor Brown now to increase budget to CSU. Forms available at <http://www.calfac.org/>. Also announced 5/1 all union lunch.

VIII. Report from the Senate Chair

Chair will ask Faculty Affairs to bring out orientation schedule at beginning of year, so as to include faculty input. Volunteers for planning let Jeanne know. All faculty including lecturers How are lecturer concerns addressed in Senate?

Chair also announced a small task force will be working on online learning issues over the summer, and a Strategic Planning meeting that is taking place today in Petit Salon right after Senate.

Call for participation in University Committees will be upcoming. Voting for Senate Standing committees is currently open, with 35 openings for 20 Committees.

On behalf of the entire Senate, Chair gave generous thanks and recognition to Therese Eyermann for her ten years of service. There will be a going-away Fiesta next Monday 5/5 in the Archives Courtyard. Chair also gave recognition to Peter Smith, who is retiring after ten years (but will still be around!)

IX. Intent to Raise Questions

A. Responses to Questions raised at last Senate meeting of 4/8/14

1) Q. Whose responsibility is it to manage an inventory of our computer assets?
--Christina Salazar

A. Technology and Communication maintains the official inventory of computer equipment. The Provost's office is working with units in Academic Affairs to provide T&C with more accurate information about computers in use within the division. ~Dan Wakelee, Associate Provost



2) Q. After reading two articles in The Economist recently regarding putting a real/quantifiable value on degrees obtained and whether they are worth the investment and debt, is there an organized effort on campus looking at this data and to addressing these issues? A.J. Bieszczad
A. I can imagine addressing this question even though our alum are young, if we can get an average or median value for graduates of our university. We can use national averages of BA salaries over time (recoded into current dollars) as weights/baseline to predict future income. We can calculate ROI as a function of cost-of-attendance for the "average" time to degree for our campus, controlling for expected salary if the student had only graduated high school (these estimates are available) and projected over the next 20 or so years.

The math is easy. It's getting data on our alum to build a baseline that is challenging. If this question is in our future, let's generate a discussion now among our many talented colleagues about how to plan a response. We need to build and maintain relationships with our alum in order to stay ahead of the curve. I like this question. A lot.

3) Q. For International courses happening in summer, students have to pay a number of campus fees for technology and other related on-campus resources and services. Since those students are not here on campus to benefit from these resources, could the Student Fee Committee waive that fee for international courses? A. Jiménez-Jiménez

A. We actually get this question regularly. Category 1 and Category 2 fees are mandatory fees (cat 1 are CSU wide; Cat 2 are campus specific); therefore regardless of where the class is being taken, how, when etc. the fees are required. For summer those fees are less than during the regular terms, but they are still required to be charged to all students. Sorry, it's probably not that answer you wanted to hear, but because they are mandatory, they are charged to everyone. ~ Missy Klep Jarnagin, AVP for Finance and Budget

A2) Additionally, from Luis Sanchez, faculty rep on Student Fees Committee:
The Student Fee Advisory Committee met this morning and the following is a general summary of the feedback provided in relation to waiving fees for students studying abroad.

First and foremost, the SFAC does not have authority to waive mandatory campus-based fees (which I believe the question was in reference to student studying abroad having to pay Category II fees).

In addition, one of the interesting points brought up by committee members was an ethical issue: students studying abroad have the privilege of utilizing IRA fees to offset that cost. Those IRA fees are among the mandatory fees paid by students even if they never utilize them (i.e. study abroad) yet the proposal asks to relinquish mandatory fees for those who do study abroad. There were some reservations about a double standard for waiving fees.

I hope this information is useful and please let me know if you would like any additional



information.

-Luis Sánchez, Faculty representative on SFAC (Student Fee Advisory Committee)

4) Q. Regarding waste generated on campus. How much waste does our campus produce, including food that is thrown away? And are there ways that we can reduce that ?

Jesse Elliott

A. I am sending a spreadsheet that lists wastes generated by each area (Housing, Dining etc). The latest data we have is for calendar year 2012. I have also attached pages from the Sustainability Score Card completed earlier in the year. (see email 4/15/14)

Note that all of the waste frying oil recycled through a waste to energy program that converts it into biodiesel fuel. Dining has reduced organic waste by utilizing just in time cooking which prepares much of the food we serve to order, thereby reducing waste.

Waste reduction is depends on the campus community who produce the waste. DFS had conducted a waste audit two years ago in Bell Tower and Aliso Hall. The audit showed more than 60% of the “trash” could have been recycled if disposed of properly.

The most effective way to reduce waste is to educate and motivate the campus community. The campus lacks a committed communication program. While DFS has developed communication materials, and makes sporadic attempts, it does not have the resources to implement and continue a strong program. DFS welcomes leadership from the faculty to establish and lead an effective communication program.

--Dave Chakraborty

Associate Vice President for Facilities Services

Chair added that they are looking into “one bin” issue. Food waste in recycling have to go into trash. Looking at ways to educate campus members better. Pass your Name to Jeanne Grier.

5) Q. Do we have parking to accommodate our amount of new students in the Fall? Nancy Deans Amendments: Do we have faculty to accommodate our amount of new students in the Fall? And classrooms? (from floor, speakers not identified)

We have an approved formula that is used to calculate the number of spaces needed on campus to accommodate everyone. That is 2 FTE per parking space. Based on an enrollment of 5000, that should be 2500. Currently we have 2547 total parking spaces and are in the planning stages to increase parking for Fall 2015. Ray also mentioned that since we have sustainability practices in place it should be noted that 498 students, 12 staff and 13 faculty utilized the bus system in Fall 2013 and 431 students, 11 staff and 8 faculty are currently using the bus to get to and from campus.



-Ray Porras, Director of Parking and Transportation Services

In addition to seventeen tenure track hires for the coming academic year, programs will have funding to accommodate projected increases in student enrollment.

There are facilities to accommodate the projected student enrollment for fall. Two classrooms will be added (one in University Hall and the other in Ojai Hall) in addition to adjustments to better utilize morning, evening and Friday times in the schedule.

-Gayle Hutchinson, Provost and VPAA

The Schedule Template policy permits the use of "special scheduling". Academic Affairs will work with programs that would like to offer courses in a 7:30-8:45am slot in the future to better utilize classroom space.

-- Update 4/28/14 from Dan Wakelee, Associate Provost

6) Q. We recruit new faculty expressing values around team teaching and interdisciplinarity, but there is a lack of support for their efforts once they are here. Regarding team teaching in Fall 2014, is there a policy or plan in place for our institution and administrators to support this?

--Frank Barajas

A. I can imagine addressing this question even though our alum are young, if we can get an average or median value for graduates of our university. We can use national averages of BA salaries over time (recoded into current dollars) as weights/baseline to predict future income. We can calculate ROI as a function of cost-of-attendance for the "average" time to degree for our campus, controlling for expected salary if the student had only graduated high school (these estimates are available) and projected over the next 20 or so years.

The math is easy. It's getting data on our alum to build a baseline that is challenging. If this question is in our future, let's generate a discussion now among our many talented colleagues about how to plan a response. We need to build and maintain relationships with our alum in order to stay ahead of the curve. I like this question. A lot.

--Michael Bourgeois, Director, Institutional Effectiveness

Send follow up questions to Chair.

X. Continuing Business Items

- SP 13-11 Student Opinion of Teaching Survey.

Amendments were offered by Faculty Affairs. Floor was opened for discussion. S. Sanders gave questions from Student Government. Why title was changed to "Student Opinion" instead of "Evaluation". N. Mozingo responded that the committee thought the current title captured what



the nature of what students are being asked. M. Pereira added that change is a reflection of what is currently happening in academic culture out there but in no way diminishes impact of student responses. S. Sanders also suggested having a question of blended learning and use of Blackboard. N. Mozingo responded that the survey is looking to have general questions and that students can put comments in open response section.

J. Elliott questions 1-3 if expected grade could not be first? Typically students are asked questions about expected grade at the end of a survey. B. de Oca responded that having this question first would allow student to focus on course and their participation/involvement in the course before they proceeded to other questions. N. Mozingo added that this item order was changed and moved to beginning based on feedback from survey. J. Elliott made motion to switch numbers 1 and 3 in the question items. Seconded by K. Leonard.

Vote taken on motion:

Approve: 22

Oppose: 11

Abstain: 3

J. Leafstedt commented about Blackboard. Suggested that faculty look at a way to get that input from students. L. Popenhagen suggested question about Blackboard and adding in a question: how many hours a week on time spent checking emails?

M. Adler commented on question regarding response time on SRT- SOTS- question 8. Returning something quickly discourages feedback when response time is foregrounded. I. Grzegorzcyk made motion to include student timing of request in #8 with respect to exam and also that question #12 should include the word “reasonable” to request for help made outside of class. Seconded by C. Paiva. C. Paiva suggested adding “with enough advance notice” to request.. J. Leafstedt suggested that faculty put policy on e-communication in syllabus.

Motion to postpone discussion of this policy to a time certain by D. Hoffman. Seconded by J. Balén. Business to be discussed starting at first Senate meeting in Fall (September 16th, 2014)

Need 2/3 vote to approve postponement until first Senate meeting of Fall:

Approve: 22

Oppose: 7

Abstain: 1

Vote was over 2/3 by one vote. Motion carries. Policy will return to next Senate meeting as a second reading item.

XI. New Business Items

- SP 13-12 Policy on Mode of Instruction.



Discussion opened. J. Leafstedt asked if this policy should be postponed until new task force on technology convenes and has made some progress over summertime. J. Leafstedt motioned to postpone. Seconded by I. Grzegorzczuk.

Motion to postpone until first Senate meeting of the year:

Approve: 22

Oppose: 7

Abstain: 0

Motion carries. Item will return as second reading item to first Senate of Fall.

- SP 13-13 Policy on PI Financial Conflict of Interest

No discussion. No objections to voting.

Approve: 21

Oppose: 3

Abstain: 1

Policy approved.

- SP 13-14 RSP Records Retention Policy

No discussion or objections to voting.

Approve: 21

Oppose: 1

Abstain: 4

Policy passed.

- SP 13-15 Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring

No comments. No discussion. No objection to voting

Approve: 23

Oppose: 1

Abstain: 3

Policy passed.

- SP 13-16 Academic Calendar

It was noted that during the first reading of this item at last Senate, K. Jensen had suggested a 5 week summer terms. J. Grier announced that Extended Ed is happy to accommodate this request. K. Jensen asked if it includes Stateside programs and chair answered that G. Berg is happy to do



whatever needs to be done. Motion by K. Jensen to change August 10th, 2018 to August 3rd, 2018 under Session II under the third section, in order to create a 5 week schedule. Motion was seconded by I. Grzegorzczuk.

Approve:21
Oppose:1
Abstain: 3

Amendment passes.

Vote taken to approve policy.

Approve: 23
Oppose: 1
Abstain: 1

Policy passes.

- SR 13-03 Resolution on Hate Crimes

J. Balén moved to introduce item. G. Wood seconded. J. Balén gave background on this item, noting that a number of state resolutions have been passed, including those supporting student resolutions as well as campus Academic Senate resolutions. Julia described the initiative “Don’t Hate, Elevate Initiative” is seeking faculty support. S. Sanders asked if the crimes noted in the resolution are still “alleged”? J. Balén could not confirm for certain, but suggested that that wording perhaps needs to be used until conviction. S. Sanders will ask about San Jose. I. Grzegorzczuk asked as to whether or not examples belong in the body of the resolution itself. J. Balén responded that this resolution emulated other campus resolutions. C. Wyels moved to make this a second reading item. Motion was seconded by A. Jimenez.- Jiménez. No discussion. Vote taken to moves forward as second reading item

Approve: 21
Oppose:2
Abstain: 0

Items move forward to second reading item.

J. Meriwether commented that he supports resolution but is reluctant to using sweeping language. Motioned to strike all instances of the word “all” from the resolution except for “all sorts”. A. Wallace suggests using “CI” instead of “CSUCI”. Suggestion was taken as an editing comment and will be changed. Request to vote by hand on removing “all” verbiage. No opposition.



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

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

Hand vote taken.

Motion passes.

I. Grzegorzcyk motioned to removing italicized section. Make a motion. Seconded by P. Smith.

S. Sanders communicated that students felt that vote gave more meat to efforts to end hate crimes if resolution laid out specific examples; students wanted incident report in there. S.

Anderson voiced support for S. Sanders' statement.

Hand vote taken. Amendment failed.

J. Balén called the question. Hand vote was taken.

Resolution passes.

XII. Adjourn

--4:22 pm