**Academic Senate Agenda**

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, October 25, 2016, 2:30-4:30

Attendees (65): Adler, Mary; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Stacey; Aquino, Bryn; Awad, Ahmed; Balen, Julia; Banuelos, Selenne; Barajas, Frank; Burriss, Catherine S; Campbell, Matthew; Carswell, Sean; Castillo, Heather; Clark, Stephen J.; Cook, Matthew; Correia, Manuel; Davis-Smith, LaSonya; Dean, Michelle; Delaney, Colleen Marie; Delgado, Jasmine; Elliott, Jesse; Ewing, Noelle; Flores, Cynthia; Francois, Marie; Gonzalez, Javier; Grier, Jeanne; Grzegorczyk, Ivona; Hampton, Philip; Hartung, Beth; Hunt, Travis; Isaacs, Jason; Itkonen, Tiina; Jenkins, Jacob; Jiménez Jiménez, Antonio; Kadakal, Reha; Kelly, Sean Q; Kenny Feister, Megan; Lee, Sohui; Lopez, Margarita; Liu, KuanFen; Lu, Zhong John; Luna, Jennie; Mack, Carol; Matjas, Luke; Meriwether, Jim; Monsma, Brad; Murphy, Paul; Nevins, Colleen M; Niemi, Charlene; Patsch, Kiersten; Pereira, Monica; Perry, Jennifer; Pinkley, Janet; Pribisko Yen, Melanie; Quintero, Elizabeth P.; Rodriguez, Donald; Schmidhauser, Tom; Soenke, Melissa; Stratton, Stephen; Thoms, Brian; Veldman, Brittnee; Wakelee, Dan; Weis, Chuck; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wyels, Cindy.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   1. Agenda approved with no objections;
2. Approval of the Minutes of Oct. 4, 2016
   1. Meeting minutes from 10/4/16 were approved with no objections;
3. Report from the Provost’s Office
   1. D. Wakelee: noted that we’re currently in the middle of the GE program review; added that today he’ll talk a little more about the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025; summarized that there will be a convening later in mid-November where we’ll have an opportunity for more feedback;
   2. Graduation Initiative 2025: the call is out for campuses to submit long range plans; the overall intent of this initiative is to increase graduation rates, and there has been lots of discussion for students to meet these perceived needs by 2025; observed that right now we have some campuses that are graduating students at embarrassingly low rates, cited example from CSULA who is currently graduating 6 out of 100 students; here at CI we’ve identified that some of our students have other life commitments that don’t let them make 4 year graduation targets; but there are other things we can do, including managing financial resources;
   3. Current graduation data. Noted that we graduate 25% of our first-time freshmen in 4 years, goal is 40%; we’ll also need to eliminate the gaps between underrepresented students and all; of particular challenge for us is that if we keep our students, the result is that we graduate them at a high rate; it follows that it may not be an objective of pushing people through faster, but rather to retain them better, observing that we’re losing about 20% of our freshman and transfer students after the first year;
   4. Improvement without lowering standards. Summarized that we want students to graduate in a timely manner, but we don’t want to change our standards; in looking at other ways that we can provide opportunities, one way of doing this may be summer classes – right now students’ options are limited because most students have exhausted their aid by then; but, we have a lot of capacity here, so we’re looking at a way to figure this out; recalled that the legislature was very generous in allocating $35M in one-time funds, but they wanted a plan from us right away; challenging in that it’s not enough time for a thorough analysis, but we were able to get the ball rolling;
   5. Short term strategies. Offered the approach that we should first do things that provide more capacity; first phase is 1) enrollment capacity and management; 2) data and technology support; and 3) advising and student support; we need to build our capacity to understand what our students are doing so that we can make informed decisions on the best steps to take; the “California Promise” legislation would follow, where students would be offered priority registration and academic advising with their commitment in completing 30 units per year ([CA SB 412](http://sd07.senate.ca.gov/news/2016-08-23-assembly-approves-glazers-california-promise-bill)); at this campus we’re really behind in terms of the number of professional advisors; if this initiative goes forward we may not see a lot of campus growth as a result; we’ll still be looking at where we have duplication, and where we need to focus for student success, including where we create obstacles for students in our business processes;
   6. Long term strategies. This is an opportunity to develop a plan to guide our efforts, to examine programs and organization to focus on successful approaches and coordinate campus student success and support; remove obstacles for students; identify needs and make strategic decisions about new resources; use data to inform decision making.
   7. Announced that we’ve re-started the search for the Dean of School of Education;
   8. Announced that the budget call has come out at the campus level, which we’ll be rolling out at the division level;
   9. Named Phil Hampton as the Director of the HSI-STEM Grant;
   10. Announced that Cause Hanna is out on medical leave, so Robyn Shea will be stepping up to provide greater assistance in this role;
4. Report from the ASCSU Chair, Dr. Christine (Chris) Miller
   1. *C. Wyels read aloud this introductory statement to welcome C. Miller, the Academic Senate Chair of the CSU System*: Dr. Miller is a professor of Communication Studies at CSU Sacramento. She’s well regarded by her faculty peers at Sac State, having been chosen last year to give the John C. Livingston Distinguished Faculty Lecture, “one of the most prestigious awards given to a member of the Sacramento State faculty,” for which the criterion is to have personified the dedication to the University and to our students of the person for whom the lecture is named. A few years earlier she received the Outstanding Service Award, and just a few months ago the California State Student Association (CSSA) named her faculty member of the year in the Innovation category. Rather than rest on her abundant laurels, Dr. Miller is here in her new capacity as the Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU, otherwise known as the “statewide senate.” Without potentially stealing her thunder, I’ll note that her theme for the year is “Finding the Balance,” a theme that we can embrace here at CI. I’ll leave her to outline what that mean going forward in the work of the statewide senate and for the students of the CSU. Please welcome Dr. Chris Miller:
   2. C. Miller: remarked that she was pleased to share some of things going on at the statewide senate; something that in standing committees and chairs worked on over the summer was a focus on shared governance and faculty involvement; C. Miller summarized that she is on an outreach tour visiting campus senates, went to Chico’s campus senate retreat, her campus in Sacramento, Dominquez Hills, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Fresno, Bakersfield;
   3. Value of Shared Governance. On a panel with folks from SUNY (The State University of New York) – there it was mentioned that “[SUNY is] the largest public system of education in the country,” but they’re including hospital sites, C. Miller was able to enlighten them of the size of the CSU system (i.e. largest four-year public university system in the U.S.); noted that she was proud to represent our system; referred to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), who has subscribers, such as our CSU Board of Trustees (BoT) who are also subscribers; AGB did a survey of governing boards and campus presidents, entitled “Is Ok Good Enough”; noted that one of the principles of shared government is the distribution of authority relationships; it follows that inclusiveness strengthens our decision making abilities; but when surveyed, most people were saying that it’s just “ok”; referenced graduation initiative and how some have called these goals “audacious,” would posit that we need to be just as audacious with shared governance; J. Elliot asked how this connection is made; C. Miller answered because all of the initiatives that support students require coordination and distribution of authority; recalled that she has seen other campuses with broken systems, and students end up suffering from this lack of coordinated efforts of shared governance;
   4. Current Statewide Senate Resolutions. Summarized that ASCSU passed a resolution to approve Prop 55; also passed a resolution that referenced back to had a Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, who came out with four recommendations, two of which were 1) create a Center for Math Instruction and 2) to make a fourth year of quantitative reasoning; this doesn’t mean algebra necessarily, could be computer science or others; observed that this would be several years off;
   5. Current Work regarding GE. Summarized that ASCSU also has a resolution in first reading regarding General Education; it’s been on the mind of the governor, but CSU faculty would rather take this up than have it legislated; provided background in terms of GE, updated CI Senate that there was a concurrent California Assembly resolution related to transfer students and GE requirements, but this didn’t have teeth, so author was asked to convert this into a bill; so now statewide senate is proceeding with this plan – next week will be getting a group together to talk about GE; further noted that in August the Vice Chancellor asked campuses to put out a related survey; data is now coming in that is beginning to show what the landscape is for GE and what its value is;
   6. Other Issues of Faculty Concern. Summarized that Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property are also on the minds of faculty; the Chancellor’s Office (CO) has produced a draft policy on academic freedom, which the Statewide Senate is currently looking at to see if it’s going to work for faculty; similar status for intellectual property; other topic of note is tenure density task force, which S. Aloisio can discuss further, as he is on this task force;
   7. Reframing Graduating “On Time.” Noted that the CI Provost earlier used the language of “graduating students in a timely manner”; commented that she liked this language because a lot of what you hear is graduating “on time,” but what does “on time” really mean; surmised that there could be aspects of a student’s learning objectives that are totally within their control that maybe don’t fit within a four-year graduation model; would hate to think of students thinking they’re failing because they’re not “on track” to graduating “on time”; we should instead be helping to graduate students “on their time” / “in their time” – I. Grzegorczyk commented that no one is really talking about quality of education anymore, referenced CCT requirements for teachers, they can barely finish in 120 units; when you look at Engineering programs they cannot finish in 120 units; expressed concern about a push from CO that would cause the quality to suffer; noted that she is chair of the Math Council and that they endorsed the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force – J. Elliot commented that he observed parallelism between illiteracy and literacy, then related it to innumeracy as something that people are proud of, rather than the converse – J. Elliot then asked C. Miller if this task force report is available; C. Miller answered yes, if you go to the ASCSU website under “Reports” it’s under “Just Released”;
5. Report from Statewide Senators
   1. No report
6. Report from CFA President
   1. J. Griffin: announced that in another two weeks we vote in our state election, commented that all of us are happy about that; CFA has been actively promoting Prop 55, we’ve been out knocking on doors, making phone calls, contributing money to political activism, summarized that we’re the engine that provides the muscle behind this campaign; recalled that we were recently up at the CFA Assembly in the Bay Area, we had a good representation from CI, lots of discussion on the graduation initiative; observed that the legislature is looking for some accountability, thought is that it's our CO that came up with this graduation initiative in the first place; noted that there are many students that can’t graduate in the four year time line, which could stigmatize them; commented that the graduation initiative targets are not real goals, but are instead “stretch” goals;
   2. Recalled that CFA survey has gone out, and hopefully you’ve taken this survey;
   3. Noted that parking continues to be a discussion; further Senate discussion of whether the aforementioned 400 new parking spaces was indeed a new influx of 400 or just 250 new spots and 150 reallocated spots and where they are located on campus;
   4. Announced that they are looking to recruit three new officers, thanked B. Veldman for expressing her interest, also a position for tenure-track and VP of membership (noted that J. Yudelson has been doubling as this VP and VP of lecturers)
7. Report from the Senate Chair
   1. Parking! Window just about closed for comments to Terry Tarr.
   2. SoE Dean Search – call for volunteers out; closes noon Nov. 1. Expecting most activity to occur in March and April, wrapping up before the end of the academic year.
   3. Possible tuition increase for AY1718
      1. CO proposal of Sept. 29 to CSSA laying groundwork for possible tuition increase; expresses intent to explore every option to keep costs low and to engage in joint advocacy, but…
      2. CSSA responds (sometime before Oct. 21, undated): “CSSA firmly believes that CSU students should not be expected to bear any additional financial burden for pursuing a college degree.”
   4. Academic Planning: AMP to CO by Jan. 3; CurrComm discussion around Academic Planning policy – plans for planning + policy S’17
   5. Next Senate Chair Coffee/ Office Hour: 2 – 3 pm, Tues., Nov. 1, SUB courtyard
8. Continuing Business Items (none)
9. New Business Items
   1. \*Add Policy (SAPP)
      1. C. Wyels noted that SAPP gets the prize for being the first Senate committee to put forth a policy;
      2. P. Hampton moved to discuss item, A. Jiménez Jiménez seconded; T. Itkonen introduced policy and provided background that this was left over from last year, recalling that in the past the student was required to get a number of signatures to add a class; we are proposing to remove the Dean signature requirement, so this policy would take away layer(s) to increase efficiency and reduce burden; summarized permission numbers are used to add classes in the first three weeks, then in the fourth week the signature of the instructor;
      3. Discussion: J. Grier offered two comments, 1) that these are semester long courses and not 8-week courses, asked where is this stated in the policy… committee answered with the cited reference in policy, was thanked by J. Grier for helping to clarify intent of 15-week courses; J. Grier’s second comment was 2) regarding the “paper always” language, this may not be the best approach for possible electronic forms or more efficient approaches in the future; T. Itkonen replied that this language could be changed to apply to the future; J. Grier added that if 15-week language is there, what do we say for 8-week courses, cited examples of these in SoE; J. Elliot asked what is the current practice – J. Grier answered that current practice is the policy currently under review; S. Carswell suggested that instead of the “fourth week” a percentage could be used and this would align with circumstances related to course withdrawals; B. Aquino asked if there is still a reason why we need to sign this in the fourth week instead of using permission numbers; A. Jiménez Jiménez asked to clarify last paragraph, it’s asking if someone wants to add a class, not seeing a clause for students want to drop; J. Elliot added that sometimes when students get dropped for financial aid they have to be added several times; SAPP will take this feedback into account in their upcoming meeting;
10. \*Special Session: Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IRPE): Michael Bourgeois – metrics pertaining to 2025 Graduation Initiative; capabilities of IRPE and campus to use data to enhance student success. (15-20 minutes allotted; time certain 3:30)
    1. Data overview. M. Bourgeois summarized that IRPE helps to track student success; referenced slide presentation brought to Senate and displayed the new graduation rates; this presentation on the website has much more detail; our campus is consistently ranked in the top five in all matrices, but we’ve still got room to improve; given the percentage graduation targets to be in line with 2025 G.I., we are comparatively doing well, but we will be assessed independently and not where we rank comparatively;
    2. Data available to programs. M. Bourgeois notes that they have lots of data available, can come to programs and present there as well; has academic unit profiles, will have dashboards available to be able to get needed data and to “slice and dice” it as needed;
    3. Data Walk-Through of Key Slides. College readiness slide: CI gets a much higher percentage of students in need of remediation, and yet we have one of the higher 5-yr graduation rates; Student prep slide: preparedness measures decline, but students in need increase; FTFT slide: the definitions have changed (underrepresented minorities used to include Asian Pacific Islanders, but they’ve been removed here; also students are now only “First Generation” if their parents never took a college class); referenced transfer graduation rates, 2-yr goal is 54% and CI is at 42%; regarding six-year numbers, we need about a 6 percentage point improvement;
    4. Discussion: S. Lee asked in reference to talking about students leaving after the first year, did you study the reasons behind this—M. Bourgeois replied yes they did study this, the data have been collected and are being reviewed; noted that they’re also looking at patterns from feeder schools – S. Aloisio asked what about economic factors, like when tuition goes up or when the economy goes bad—M Bourgeois agreed that it’s tough to capture this info due to the numerous variables; F. Barajas asked about First Generation if this is university wide; C. Flores added what about for those parents who did some type of technical school—M. Bourgeois replied that it may depend on whether the student selected this box or not on the application; noted that readiness impacts certain majors more than others; average graduation time is four years plus a semester; B. Veldman asked if the first year attrition is broken down by semester – M. Bourgeois answered yes, in our current look at feeder schools, we’re getting more freshmen from Los Angeles and more transfers from Ventura; M. Pereira asked what are the chances that we don’t admit students that we don’t think will succeed—M. Bourgeois replied that being exclusive may have an adverse effect, focus is on being here to help students get the chance they need; J. Issacs commented that he didn’t graduate “on time” in four-years due to a yearlong internship and having a double major; J. Grier added that travel abroad could also impact graduation timeframes; C. Wyels agreed that as a campus we value international experiences, internships, but we’ll want to keep in mind what student success really looks like to individual students; J. Balen asked how soon is this information going to be available and reported at the CSU level—M. Bourgeois replied that since we’re a young campus we don’t have some of the data available that they’re asking for, but we’ve submitted everything we’ve been asked for; we’re also building our internal dashboard, so this will all be available for you shortly;
11. Extended Announcement (up to 5 min. each)

\*Fiscal Policies (Co-Chairs Marie Francois and Catherine Burriss) – recommendations from AY15-16 budget process

<https://csuci.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_ba7i73Vm62WNrMh>

C. Burriss displayed slide presentation, summarizing that very little of this info is new relative to the documents the committee has provided; lots of progress toward transparency and have come close to fulfilling its charge, which is to review the entire university’s budget; last year didn’t have much to wrestle over, but they focused on overhauling budget process (read aloud the long-term recommendations from the slide); FP is gearing toward a model where the Provost retains executive authority over the entire budget and not just for Academic Affairs; another focus is to get faculty representation on committees, added that the amount of workload that needs to happen and prepare for is massive; trying to move the budget process to reflect revenues and expenditures to see patterns of growth, made some progress on seeing staffing differentials; moving towards a “one campus” approach as well as long-term planning; doesn’t seem to be an influx of new money any time soon, so we will have to be efficient; immediate recommendations include distinguishing the funding sources showing the whole budget and not just i.e. Academic Affairs;

1. \*Special Session: Advancement vis-à-vis Faculty: Nichole Ipach. (20-25 minutes allotted)
   1. N. Ipach displayed slide presentation, summarizing that Advancement partners with faculty in order to generate campus support and philanthropy, we want to continue to bring campus resources here; displayed slide on what Advancement’s contributions have been, i.e. $46.5M total so far since 2002 – J. Elliot asked if these are gifts; N. Ipach answered that there are “in kind” gifts, equipment for example, and grants are also included on this; Advancement also coordinates sponsorships, like the President’s concert, and in turn we give sponsors recognition;
   2. Staffing. N. Ipach noted that Advancement’s staffing breakdown is 18.5 FTE (all staff); displayed slide on stateside staffing allocation, about $1.5M in permanent funds and $1.6M in temporary funds; we’re the smallest VP-led group in terms of resources on campus;
   3. Reports. Summarized that there are two major reports that we’d like to share to illustrate our charge, 1) is the Philanthropic Productivity report – here CI outperformed all but 5 of its 11 sister campuses in its three-year average; this includes deferred and revocable gifts; this report is used by the CSU to celebrate gifts and recognize donors; and 2) the other report is the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE), a national benchmarking report that goes to the VSE and the Chancellor’s Office and illustrates charitable gift commitments;
   4. Revenue Allocations. Offered the question, “So where is all this money going?” – Displayed revenue allocations slide, to show that most money is going to Academic Affairs and into academic programs; J. Elliot asked if they would be able to break down the larger piece of the pie chart displayed – N. Ipach replied yes we can do that; J. Elliot further asked if this money could be used to hire a new faculty member; N. Ipach replied yes this money can be used for this, but in general donors tend to not like using money for salary, preference is to endow faculty members;
   5. Funding Priorities. Currently Advancement works under assignment from the President, who gains recommendations and input from the Provost and Vice Presidents and then makes the assignment to Advancement; sometimes as a university a priority is identified, then Advancement reaches out to donors and gains other information from donors on topics that they’re interested in supporting; summarized support for things that can help nurture and help facilitate; Advancement does not want to prohibit fundraising;
   6. Goal-Setting. It’s expected from the CO that Advancement raise 10% of campus state allocation; part of the challenge is that CI is a young institution and doesn’t have the alumni base that others do; however, in the last three years has hit historic fundraising numbers;
   7. Opportunities for Collaboration. Advancement will follow faculty leads; there are opportunities to track alumni, and communicate because the more Advancement knows, the better prepared to help; C. Burriss and N. Ipach further discussed goal setting, noting that it is not an exact science; N. Ipach summarized that CI has about $11M floating around from estate plans, and expects the lion share of this to come in within the next five years; further noted that government support is not counted in philanthropic reports (although some cities can award non-profits);
   8. C. Wyels asked what’s the best contact, and N. Ipach replied that faculty should feel free to call, x8893 or email: [nichole.ipach@csuci.edu](mailto:nichole.ipach@csuci.edu).
2. Reports from Standing Committees (*As Needed*)

* Faculty Affairs Comm – no report
* Student Academic Policies and Procedures – no report
* Curriculum Comm – no report
* General Education Comm – no report
* Committee on Committees – no report
* Comm on Centers and Institutes – no report
* Professional Leave Comm – no report
* Mini-Grant Review Comm – no report

1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
   1. M. Bourgeois announced that Data and Donuts will be held December 19 th.
2. Intent to Raise Questions
   1. K. Jensen asked for further clarification on the new paperwork for Technology purchases -- What is the purpose? What category of equipment needs to have the paperwork? What is the implication on the time of processing for the additional paperwork? If we are using an external vendor for the equipment and they maintain the equipment, why is the extra paperwork needed?
   2. A. Jimenez commented that he recently learned that the glossy program brochures that we used for recruiting and advising are not being printed anymore, asked why and if we can have them back;
   3. J. Elliot asked to have Faculty Affairs Committee or administration discuss the following two proposals: 1) Require tenure-track faculty to teach 3 (or perhaps even 6) units of teaching per academic year, with the exception of sabbatical years, to include faculty "bought out" on grants; 2) Re-examine the committee structuring process for the current Provost Search Committee: The current Chair of the committee was also on the President's Search Committee and is now Senate Chair; Having the Senate Chair lead Senate Exec's choice of the Provost Search Committee places too much power in one individual and seems counter to our value of shared governance. Recommends that a different chair be selected for the Provost Search Committee or that the committee be constituted by election;
3. Announcements (no more than 2 min. each)
   1. J. Balén announced that tomorrow she and M. Francois are doing a workshop in the Fit Studio, please go to Teaching & Innovations website for more information;
   2. H. Castillo announced that the link is available for the call for research for the Spring 2017 production of Arts Under The Stars; soliciting campus-wide proposals to help add a performance element to their research ideas; noted that this year’s theme is “Borders”: “The only border that exists is the border in your mind”;
   3. C. Wyels read aloud the iPath announcement from G. Buhl: Project iPath is a cooperative HSI grant with Santa Barbara City College focusing on increasing transfers and transfer success. Last year five CI faculty participated as iPath fellows in a learning community that also interacted with faculty at SBCC. We have five iPath fellowships available again this year. On Monday, faculty were emailed an announcement and application form for iPath fellowships. If you are interested in learning more about transfers and curricular alignment between SBCC and CI, please consider applying. The deadline is Friday November 4th. If you have any questions, please refer to the email announcement or email Geoff Buhl.
   4. C. Nevins announced free flu shots on Nov. 8th and Nov. 10th, located in the Bell Tower Mission Lounge;
   5. C. Burriss announced that this Wednesday the Performing Arts Fall Production by B. Mayberry opens, entitled “The Thief, The Madman, Quixote and the Magic Doors”;
   6. H. Castillo invited everyone to come to Malibu this coming Monday, which is Halloween, she is teaching the dance for Michael Jackson’s “Thriller” to everyone who joins, prior dance experience not necessary;
   7. J. Elliot announced his Wednesday musical lunch hour, every Wednesday after Senate (every three weeks) located in the Student Union building from 12-1pm;
   8. D. Rodriguez announced that a professor is coming from Costa Rica; currently working on designing an exchange agreement with the national university there; if you are interested in participating or have any thoughts, please email D. Rodriguez to arrange a meeting with him; also, this coming Tuesday ESRM is providing a movie screening by Leonardo DiCaprio entitled “Before the Flood,” illustrating the dramatic climate changes around the world;
   9. J. Balén announced that the transfer success summit is coming on Nov. 4th, also searchable online for additional details;
4. Adjourn
   1. Motion to adjourn by G. Wood, second by B. Veldman, meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.

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