**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, October 4, 2016, 2:30-4:30

Attendees (58): Adams, Virgil; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Stacey; Aquino, Bryn; Awad, Ahmed; Balén, Julia; Banuelos, Selenne; Barajas, Frank; Bleicher, Bob; Buhl, Geoffrey W; Burriss, Catherine S; Carswell, Sean; Clark, Stephen J.; Cook, Matthew; Davis-Smith, LaSonya; Delaney, Colleen; Downey, Dennis J.; Sowers, Elizabeth; Elliott, Jesse; Flores, Cynthia; Garcia, José; Gonzalez, Javier; Grier, Jeanne; Grzegorczyk, Ivona; Hampton, Philip; Hannans, Jaime A; Harris-Keith, Colleen; Hunt, Travis; Isaacs, Jason; Jenkins, Jacob; Jimenez, Antonio; Kadakal, Reha; Kelly, Sean Q; Kenny Feister, Megan; Lee, Sohui; Leonard, Katherine; Lopez, Margarita; Luna, Jennie; Mack, Carol; Meriwether, Jim; Monsma, Brad; Murphy, Paul; Nevins, Colleen M; Ornelas-Higdon, Julia; Pereira, Monica; Perry, Jennifer; Pinkley, Janet; Pribisko Yen, Melanie; Schmidhauser, Tom; Soenke, Melissa; Soltys, Michael; Stratton, Stephen; Thoms, Brian; Usera, Daniel; Veldman, Brittnee; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy;

1. Approval of the Agenda
   1. C. Wyels welcomed back attendees, joked that you always want to be the last one to make quorum because then you get a round of applause; but seriously, thanks to M. Pereira for being our “quorum maker”; meeting agenda approved with no objections;
2. Approval of the Minutes of Sept. 13, 2016
   1. Meeting minutes from 9/13/16 approved with no objections;
3. Report from the Provost’s Office
   1. B. Hartung delivered report on behalf of D. Wakelee, who is at the Chancellor’s Office (CO) being on-boarded;
   2. Reminded that some of you know that the Dean of the School of Education search has been suspended at the moment, the Provost Office is currently assessing plans to move forward; some had agreed to serve on task force, but this group will not be meeting formally; we began the year focusing on reorganization, but current uncertainty in methods and resource allocation led to this new consideration;
   3. The CO convened a symposium for student success (aka 2025 Graduation Initative) at the end of last month, will be more discussion of this going forward;
4. Report from Statewide Senators
   1. S. Aloisio: two big topics from the last statewide meeting were graduation rates and general education (GE); basically when you hear them use the term “student success” in our minds this should equal “four-year graduation rates”; they’re under a lot of pressure to meet these targets – each campus was asked for target, which the campuses submitted, then the CO raised these targets; estimated CI target is 40%, some campuses have plans to improve this by adding sections, but we don’t have that option here, we really don’t have the wait lists that other campuses do;
   2. Regarding GE, FYI that the CO has to answer to the Board of Trustees (BoT) and then the president of each campus; comment that the BoT isn’t very receptive to GE-related discussions; nevertheless, GE reform is a theme of the CO; suggestion that we should get on top of this so that we do what we want to do rather than what we’re told to do;
   3. Back to the tenure density discussion, the tenure density task force is forming ideas on how to increase this density, we’re still at 40%, i.e. last place in the CSU system in terms of percentage of tenure-track faculty; one thing that could come out of this is that we end up having tenure density targets for each campus; but without funding it’s hard to increase this density; Chancellor White said that the CSU is going to ask for more money from the legislature; comment that he seems to understand this need, as he also mentioned in a priority list in support of promoting student research;
   4. B. Veldman asked if one of the ways to relieve tenure density would be via a senior lecture line; S. Aloisio recalled that it’s clear that CFA is pushing for some kind of fast track or conversion, but doesn’t think the CO is telling us to push for such a conversion;
5. Report from CFA President
   1. J. Griffin: announced that we are having a meeting after this Senate meeting in Sage 2030 with light refreshments – guest is Kevin Weir, chair of our CFA bargaining team; announced that the survey will be coming up soon so that members can indicate their priorities, such as the tenure density topics we’ve been discussing; mission is to get more funding for CSU – FYI that you may get a phone call on Prop 55, which is critical for funding K-12 and community colleges, relieving some of the pressure for funding for CSUs;
   2. We attended a CFA awards event, was good to show and renew our commitment to our strong representatives to the legislature;
   3. Our campus has spots for four delegates to the CFA Assembly; we’re hoping to bring presenters to campus to offer “unconscious bias” workshops; J. Griffin will also be giving a presentation on Bond Financing; this is another resource the CSU has to raise money, due to historically low interest rates;
   4. M. Pereira added to clarify that the unconscious bias workshops will be held in the Spring semester;
6. Report from the Senate Chair
   1. C. Wyels reinforced that same themes as last time, discussion, debate and decision-making to support strong communication – reminded that Senate Chair Coffee Hour will be held next Tuesday;
   2. Regarding University Committees, thanks to all Senate officers and D. Daniels, notices went out earlier today indicating your recommended committee membership; thanks to those who said “assign as needed,” we also know that things will be coming up throughout the year, and we may be reaching out to you in the future when opportunities arise; please note that when you’re on these committees that you’re representing faculty; you can reach out to C. Wyels for any updates or questions, and our Senate committees look to be up and running;
   3. Regarding the Provost search, we want a great pool of candidates, and thanks to all participants during the scoping meeting; observed that it was very gratifying to sit in on those meetings and to hear about who we are as an institution, what our challenges are and how we are facing them; we are now in a recruitment period for our Provost search, which will be a quiet period on our campus – this is the time where you can use your networking to contribute to this candidate pool; contact me with any suggested names and their contact info and we’ll make sure that the search firm gets it;
   4. Regarding aligning resources with priorities, we’ve discussed that time is our most valuable resource; we want to focus on discussion and debate; recalled that J. Leafstedt and C. Wyels created a blog post spelling out goals for people asking time to present in Senate, along with tips and ideas for flipping announcements; now the task is on senators to prepare more ahead of Senate;
   5. Finally, we do have continuing business items on today’s agenda, which we will be utilizing Robert’s Rules for;
7. Extended Announcements (up to 5 min. each)

\* J. Leafstedt: referenced CI Learn and the upcoming pilot of a new learning management system called Canvas; referenced video in Senate meeting materials; noted that regardless of what we decide, Blackboard is undergoing a major overhaul, so we’re starting our preparations with Canvas; the earliest we would make a shift would be Fall 2017, other campuses have proceeded with a gradual shift; encouraged that if you’re interested in participating, please see the form within the Senate materials on the blog page, please direct any questions to J. Leafstedt;

1. Continuing Business Items

New Degree Proposal: Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies (slightly revised proposal provided with Senate materials)

C. Wyels asked if we needed a motion to discuss, answer from G. Wood was no we don’t, since it’s on the table / in the agenda as Continuing Business;

C. Harris-Keith commented that if we’re going to be hammered on graduation rates, and these are folks who have already dropped a degree, and 8-week courses are a bear, but was curious as to how this might impact our graduation rates;

P. Hampton observed that this outlines specific upper division courses, but didn’t believe that this course would function well for students of another major, such as business, doesn’t contain the depth that would like to be seen, and as a result P. Hampton planned to vote against;

B. Bleicher answered comments by noted that for students coming here to complete a degree, they’ll need to establish residency with 30 units; the way this program is designed, it’s likely that upper division courses can fit within one of our mission pillars;

I. Grzegorczyk observed that this tends to look like a “finish your degree” program, so we may not be expecting students to go into depth, was not worried, students are expected to show some maturity in completing their requirements; other students may have life circumstances that may have led to why they hadn’t completed their degree in the past, so this program would help to capture them no matter what their previous major would have been;

S. Carswell noted that essentially we’re offering a degree for people that just want to get their degree out of the way, wondered if this is the direction that our university should be going in;

G. Buhl expressed concerns about the faculty time component of this proposal, and referred to S. Aloisio’s comments about our campus having the lowest tenure density; we should first serve students who are local/ regional,; asked why should a campus with the lowest tenure density be responsible for serving the state by providing an online degree completion program; observed that the program suggests that people could teach this on overload via Extended University (Ext-U); summarized faculty have two options, either as overload or as a buy-out via Ext-U, which would impact our stateside workload;

B. Bleicher answered that this is why this program was designed in this way, with the least amount of impact on statewide as possible; further, it takes advantage of our strong UDIGE course structure;

M. Soltys asked if we had a rough estimate of how many students would be able to take advantage of this program; answer was yes, it’s within the proposal, 63 students;

C. Harris-Keith observed that CSU Northridge explored doing this but later declined to do this;

A. White read a statement aloud on behalf of K. Tollefson: “I support approval of the Liberal Studies Online program and regret that a commitment at a local school district has me away from campus this afternoon. I had opportunity to review the program while it was being developed over the past two years. My support is motivated by the rationale for the program, expressly designed as it was to serve a unique population -- providing access to those who have made significant progress toward completing their BA but whose life circumstances have made continuation anywhere from difficult to impossible. For this population, whether they are parents, members of the armed forces, people living some distance away from a BA-granting institution, or whatever, university access that doesn't require physical presence is what we can offer. I understand and respect arguments against the program that derive from our low tenure-track faculty density and capacity issues. I believe those are surmountable, with the program run via self-support through Extended University, and will have limited impact on any program. Why CI is a good question, too, which I answer to myself by thinking about the quality of what we have to offer and the quickly growing expertise that many of our faculty are developing in an online context, with phenomenal support from our colleagues in TLI.our faculty”;

M. Francois observed in the list of courses that there are more listed face-to-face than blended, trying to figure this out, if they are required to take five courses but only three are available; recalled from her own experience that it takes a while to transition a course from 15-week face-to-face to 8-week online;

J. Grier added that this may take maybe a year and half; further noted that we’ve put programs forth all of the time when courses aren’t even developed, so this would give us at least a two year option;

B. Buller observed that some of this was covered in the FAQ section in the Senate meeting materials;

VOTE: 25-Approve, 31-Oppose, 1-Abstain; degree proposal was not approved;

1. New Business Items (none)
2. Reports from Standing Committees (*As Needed*)

* Faculty Affairs Committee – No report
* Fiscal Policies Committee: M. Francois commented that she and C. Burriss were reluctantly reelected as co-chairs; asked to please recall the survey in the Senate newsletter from our first meeting, and please respond again to the survey listed so that we may be able to capture your feedback;
* Student Academic Policies and Procedures: P. Murphy recalled that they met a few weeks ago and are making progress towards new business; C. Wyels added that they’re mainly working on revising our internship policy, expressed appreciation for their heavy lifting on this;
* Curriculum Committee: J. Rizzoli reminded that program updates are due on Oct 17th, so for one more week; C. Wyels recalled previous announcements re: some new requirements in terms of how to submit; J. Rizzoli added that these are also displayed on the website;
* General Education Committee: G. Buhl noted that he and M. Francois are co-chairs; reminded that new course mods due Oct 15-17th
* Committee on Committees – No report
* Committee on Centers and Institutes: C. Nevins noted that we met last week, our deadline was Sept. 15th, we’ll complete our reviews at the end of October; M. Francois asked what the status was regarding the stateside support of Dr. Sohn’s pay; C. Wyels reminded that this was announced at the last meeting, and that this pay is now off the general operating funds “books;”
* Professional Leave Committee: S. Stratton recalled that C. Teranishi-Martinez is chair but was not at first meeting; we met today, there were nine WTUs available next semester for outstanding service to students; we’ll meet next week to start work on sabbaticals and other leaves;
* Mini-Grant Review Committee – No report

1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
   1. P. Murphy announced that the IRA application portal has now reopened, we have a surplus of funds to help support your instructionally-related activities in Spring 2017, please submit your application online;
   2. K. Leonard announced that CIS mini-grant proposals are due Oct 9th;
2. Intent to Raise Questions (ITRQs)
   1. C. Wyels reviewed the Power Point slides, noted that these materials are online so we don’t have to scribble everything down right now; noted that immediately following this document review, we’ll be having a presentation from Parking Services and Facilities;
   2. C. Wyels noted that ITRQs may not be emailed in, you have to come to Senate to express your feedback; M. Cook asked if this is in place because the bylaws says it; C. Wyels answered no, it’s because my Inbox won’t allow for it, reminded those present that they could always ask a senator to read their question if they could not attend
3. \*Special Session: Parking and Transportation Demand Management (Terry Tarr, John Gormley, Chief John Reid, Colleen Haws; consultants from Nelson Nygard) – 15-20 minutes allotted:
   1. T. Tarr thanked everyone for the opportunity to be here, will quickly flip through the presentation; joining him was C. Haws, and later J. Gormley will join us; recalled hiring Nelson Nygard as the consultant charged with finding out what our existing conditions are; the goal now is strategy development, this is why we want feedback from Senate, and we’ll also have multiple meetings tomorrow to get feedback from other campus entities (e.g. Housing); after this study we’ll produce a draft; main factor is growth, and we’re all familiar with the CI 2025 vision plan; recalled the survey that had 1700+ responses, which is great participation; displayed the seven aspects of the plan leading to phased implementation; the idea is to assemble this feedback so that Nygard can help us with our policy making efforts; opened this up to ask what in the current sense of policy is problematic;
   2. C. Burriss asked if it was true that every student that has on campus housing is allowed a parking space; answer from C. Haws that at this time the ratio is 2 students to 1 parking slots;
   3. S. Lee asked for clarification – T. Tarr noted that Nygard can use technology to tell us at a given time of day how many spots are available, we’re aware that we have inadequate parking now, but other budget concerns have to be heard as well; C. Haws added that the status on this is a holding pattern; T. Tarr commented that you can’t just open up a particular space, we have to have lights and basic safety services;
   4. J. Issacs asked if in the long-term plan was there to be any structures built or will there be just open lots; T. Tarr answered in the long-term plan there may be structure, but right now in the short-term plan it’s for open lots, as there is no existing budget for structures;
   5. K. Leonard asked if there was a sense of what our transit availabilities are based on how many students live within proximity; T. Tarr referred to slide on “Transit Strategies,” indicating a plan to work with VCTC to double service frequency; B. Veldman asked if we are talking about extending existing routes or increasing the frequency; T. Tarr highlighted the two routes in Camarillo, one of which goes to the Metrolink; B. Veldman recalled when living in North Oxnard she had to take three buses;
   6. J. Rizzoli asked if they will be offering Sunday service for the bus, the students want to come back to campus after e.g. seeing mom and dad off campus and can’t; T. Tarr recalled an idea proposed that our campus could have our own shuttle, to say take folks in between main campus and University Glen, this is a component of our discussion;
   7. S. Anderson (Stacey) expressed concern about driving on Potrero Rd, would like to know that we have support from the county, as these are heavily traveled roads that are not meant to traveled heavily; T. Tarr thought this to be a valid concern, although is outside of the scope of this management plan; Another question voiced regarding the environmental impacts, is there the technology to determine how many spaces are available before arriving at campus;
   8. J. Ornelas-Higdon asked if there is a discussion about making the closer parking spots more expensive; T. Tarr answered yes that this is part of the conversation;
   9. B. Aquino asked if there are any schedule studies going on, is it possible for faculty who may need a multi-category pass to be able to park; T. Tarr thanked B. Aquino for this feedback;
   10. B. Veldman asked if there are any plans for increasing the number of campus showers opening; T. Tarr noted that people can get a year membership at the campus gym, very inexpensive for faculty and staff, but currently only one shower in Sierra Hall; B. Veldman recalled that this is locked; J. Gormley answered that we’re working on this, but right now you’re stuck with the gym;
   11. C. Harris-Keith offered an FYI that one of the fields that’s really close is going to be converted into apartments, which may be a future location to house our students; J. Gormley reassured that the U-Glen doesn’t house students, although there are a few spots for graduate students in the Univ. Town Center; the other challenge is U-Glen residents renting out rooms to students, but we want students located in the core of campus;
4. Announcements (no more than 2 min. each)
   1. \*Student Conduct Code: new regulations and internal processes (Claire Langeveldt)
      1. C. Wyels referred to the FAQ sheet posted to Senate meeting materials, read aloud; summarized that we’re looking to have people that are trained in intervention being able to come to our aid;
   2. Call for Applications: Resident Directors in France, Italy, and Spain (Elizabeth Sowers)
      1. A. Jímenez Jímenez offered that he is available to contact for additional information;
   3. Housing: Faculty, Staff & Student Mixer, October 5th (Venessa Griffith)
      1. This occurs tomorrow from 11AM – 1PM;
   4. C. Burriss on behalf of H. Castillo, who is the mastermind behind the Arts Under The Stars production in the Spring semesters; noted that this production reaches across all disciplines, there will be a call for research going out Oct 15th for proposals, these will be due Nov. 15th; this is also our Spring production for Performing Arts this year, so applicable students can participate in this and get 3 units credit;
   5. J. Balén recalled that every week we have a faculty writing circle to help meet all of our deadlines that require writing; if you’d like to be on this email distribution list, please contact her;
   6. C. Flores announced that 55 CI students will be attending the 2016 National SACNAS conference and will receive full participation funds provided by the university; we’re equally pleased that twelve CI faculty and staff recognize the value of this national association in providing a model for our institution in terms of inclusive excellence in STEM and Psychology and are planning to attend this year, taking place Oct 13th through Oct 15th; organizing committee is Drs. Selenne Bañuelos, Cynthia Flores, Brittnee Veldman, Cindy Wyels, Carissa Romero and Carolina Mendez;
   7. P. Hampton announced that Nov. 5th is the Science Carnival, please bring your kids, but it’s also a great place to go for those of you who are a kid at heart;
   8. J. Luna announced that this Thursday, Lalo Alcaraz, the renowned political cartoonist, will be here in BEL 1302 at 4:00PM;
5. Adjourn: P. Hampton moved to adjourn, second by C. Harris, meeting adjourned at 4:00PM

\*Flipped presentation: senators are asked to inform themselves regarding this topic prior to the meeting. See Senate materials for this meeting.