**Academic Senate Agenda**

1908 Smith, MVS Decision Making Center

Tuesday, November 15, 2016; 2:30-4:30

Attendees (66): Adler, Mary; Aloisio, Simone; Anderson, Stacey; Aquino, Bryn; Awad, Ahmed; Balen, Julia; Banuelos, Selenne; Buhl, Geoffrey W; Burriss, Catherine S; Carswell, Sean; Castillo, Heather; Cook, Matthew; Correia, Manuel; Davis-Smith, LaSonya; Dean, Michelle; Delgado, Jasmine; Downey, Dennis J.; Sowers, Elizabeth; Flores, Cynthia; García, José; Gillespie, Blake; Grice, Brittany; Grier, Jeanne; Hampton, Philip; Hannans, Jaime A; Harris-Keith, Colleen; Hartung, Beth; Huang, Nian-Sheng; Hunt, Travis; Isaacs, Jason; Itkonen, Tiina; Jimenez, Antonio; Kelly, Sean Q; Kenny Feister, Megan; Lee, Sohui; Lopez, Margarita; Luna, Jennie; Mack, Carol; Martinez, James; Matjas, Luke; McColpin, Aaron; Meriwether, Jim; Murphy, Paul; Niemi, Charlene; Ornelas-Higdon, Julia; Patsch, Kiersten; Perchuk, Alison; Pereira, Monica; Perry, Jennifer; Pinkley, Janet; Rodriguez, Donald; Sanchez, Luis; Schmidhauser, Tom; Smith, Christina; Soenke, Melissa; Stratton, Stephen; Thoms, Brian; Tollefson, Kaia; Veldman, Brittnee; Wagner, Billy; Wakelee, Dan; Weis, Chuck; White, Annie; Wood, Greg; Wormald, Clare; Wyels, Cindy;

1. Approval of the Agenda
	1. C. Wyels called the meeting to order 2:32pm; C. Harris-Keith moved to approve agenda, J. Grier second, agenda approved with no objection, C. Wyels noted the revised version as presented;
2. Approval of the Minutes of Oct. 25, 2016
	1. J. Martinez observed under 4(g), refers to CCT, but should read as CCTC instead; S. Stratton made the correction; C. Wyels further noted that she made correction for P. Hampton’s title to read as Faculty Director of STEM Initiatives;
3. Report from the Provost’s Office
	1. D. Wakelee noted that President Beck, at a trustee meeting, asked for a statement to be communicated to Senate: “At CI, we embrace the fundamental values of equity and inclusion and commit to diversity as a source of renewal, vitality and strength. Our work is critical to the future of our country as we continue to serve a diverse, multicultural student body. I know that CI and, indeed, the entire California State University system, will continue our efforts in advocating for the interests of our students, faculty and staff. Please join me as we make clear the lasting American values embodied by our entire campus community.”
	2. D. Wakelee referenced these related challenges in the last week, reiterated that this gives us an opportunity to be part of a community that engages in civil discourse, and the opportunity to engage our students; noted that legal counsel from CO will be on campus Dec. 7 and again in S’17 to talk about the First Amendment; hopeful that this will help faculty, staff and students continue to work as a civil and inclusive community;
4. Report from Statewide Senators
	1. S. Aloisio report: referenced the Nov. 3rd meeting, which was all about budget; CSU is in process of making a budget request, and the Chancellor made clear that they are going to ask for $300M more than we currently receive from the Governor, which they’ll either obtain from the state or from a tuition increase (5% tuition increase); demonstrated via a slide that the Graduation Initiative (G.I.) is $75M of the budget request; another 3600 FTES brings in another $40M, plus additional tuition revenue, about $20M; S. Aloisio asked which of these lines could be used for tenure-track hires, and about $120M of this can potentially be used for this; summarized that the upcoming CI resolution is a request that at least half of the G.I. money be used for tenure-track hiring in support of CI tenure density initiatives;
	2. Faculty response and discussion:
		1. In reference to the 3600 FTES, C. Harris-Keith said she had heard that we didn’t have room for this number of students and asked, “Where are we planning to put them?”; S. Aloisio replied that as a system he thought that the CSU hit its target and grew by the number that it was funded for;
		2. B. Veldman asked a question related to efforts to convert existing lecturer faculty into tenure-track faculty; S. Aloisio answered that at present, there is nothing on the budget request related to any tenure track hires, which is the reason for the resolution; the Chancellor says that tenure-track hires are a campus level decision, and that CI could hire as many as we want, except that at the campus level faculty are told that CI doesn’t have the money; it’s a chicken/egg analogy and cycles every year;
5. Report from CFA President
	1. J. Griffin: summarized that CFA has taken a strong stance against the tuition increase mentioned; CFA was also happy to see that Prop 55 was passed; announced that March 17, 2017 will be the next “unconscious bias” workshop; shared that last week four board members met to discuss tenure density and stance against corporatization of our system; commented that the effort to graduate all students in four years is misguided;
	2. Invited faculty to a meeting this Friday, that faculty email to receive an invite for the free lunch, and also to think about helping with CFA efforts, as there is an open VP position;
6. Report from the Senate Chair
	1. Update on Current Searches: A search committee for the Dean of the School of Ed has been formed: faculty may contact J. Grier, J. Martinez and/or M. Pereira to ask for more information; Annnouncements are forthcoming for the open position for Director of Research and Sponsored Programs (formerly Tina Knight); P. Hampton and N. Chen are on that committee if you have any questions;
	2. Campus Disruptions/Upcoming Resolution: Referenced statements that were sent our yesterday amid reports filtering about campus disruptions; noted that we’ve just heard the statement from President Beck read by D. Wakelee; invited further discussion about this, as it may have value to create a statement that unites a faculty mission in protection of the learning environment; faculty senate today will be able to debate a resolution on this subject;
7. Continuing Business Items
	1. \*SP 16-01 Add Policy (SAPP; revised)
		1. Discussion: T. Itkonen summarized questions/comments in three areas received after the first reading: (1) semester durations other than 16 weeks; (2) language about paper copies always being needed; and (3) extenuating examples. Responded to these issues: (1) Other semester durations accommodated via a percentage now in the policy; (2) SAPP met with Records, who said there needs to be administrative override, and thus the paper copies; (3) decided to utilize blanket terms and avoid extenuating examples, so that programs are afforded the flexibility in decision making, rather than attempting to capture every circumstance in the policy;
		2. VOTE: 50 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstain; SP 16-01 was approved;
8. New Business Items
	1. \*Policy on Course Numbering (Curriculum)
		1. C. Wyels summarized that this policy is short and sweet, trying to standardize the course numbering system; C. Harris-Keith moved to discuss, G. Wood second;
		2. Discussion: B. Gillespie explained that this updates an old policy that was fairly ambiguous, so the Curriculum Committee sought to clarify a lot of the component details; G. Buhl commented with understanding that he’s talking about language from previous policy; then referenced number groups of 330-349 and 490-499 – noted that we’ve specifically got real estate for interdisciplinary courses, but asked if it is proper policymaking to do this, as it is already duplicated in SP 01-08; suggested that it might be smarter to say “these are what the numbering ranges mean”, suggested that we strike the two lines that are already in place from previous policy, which would make this one a more consistent policy; A. Perchuk asked that when looking at those same numbers, if we have enough interdisciplinary course numbers assigned, they appear to be pretty jammed in the 300-400 range; B. Gillespie offered to bring both points up at next meeting, may make more sense to be more general in this policy to back up more specific ones on the books; L. O’Connor asked if there is still a rule about reusing numbers, is it five years; J. Rizzoli answered “never”; L. O’ Connor commented that this could be challenging as we expand; J. Grier asked if there was thought given to the graduate teaching courses, i.e. to provide more specific numbering in the 500-699 range;

\*Tenure Density Resolution (Senate Exec)i. C. Wyels called for motion, C. Harris–Keith moved, Megan Kenny Feister second;

ii. Introduction to the resolution: S. Aloisio summarized that it essentially has two aspects; given that it’s presently unclear how the Chancellor’s Office is distributing the money from the G.I., they’ll likely ask campuses to make proposals for this; our three prioritized initiatives are advising, course sections, and the graduation targets; this resolution states that half of the request made and half of what we receive will be used to address the tenure density issue; if we receive a proportional amount, it would be about $1.8M; we could make a case that tenure density is the most important need to help students hit their graduation target; this would translate into roughly a dozen new tenure-track hires, which would then still leave us half of the pool to support our advising needs and G.I.;

iii. Discussion: M. Cook asked if statewide had already passed a resolution with the individual campuses being asked to follow suit; S. Aloisio answered that CI is taking this approach as the first campus to do so, and then other campuses are to follow; this resolution can leverage conversations with CO; C. Burriss asked if there’s a way to incorporate staff hiring to support tenure-track hires, concerned about workload backlog without corresponding staff support; J. Grier recalled that we had passed SR 14-02, we should check progress on that resolution and be aware of all funding sources available; B. Veldman raised the issue of conversion of lecturers to tenure-track faculty, G. Wood suggested that converting lecturers to tenure-track is not in conflict with the resolution’s goal to improve the tenure density on campus;

1. \*Resolution: Commitment to Equity, Inclusion, and Civil Discourse within our Diverse Campus Community
	* 1. S. Aloisio moved to waive first reading, J. Grier seconded; C. Wyels noted that if two-thirds approve, it moves to a second reading; if less than two-thirds approval, then it will remain a first reading item;
		2. VOTE to move to second reading: 48 Yes – 4 No – 4 Abstain; approved as a second reading item;
		3. Process: C. Wyels recalled Senate bylaws and that the chair is to remain impartial, then handed gavel to S. Stratton;
		4. Introduction of resolution: C. Wyels provided background on her time at CI; she came to this institution about 12 years ago, and those that know her work know that it is focused on under-represented students; providing this background because it’s good if we occasionally reaffirm our values and commitments, and a unified statement would do this and to make public a statement from faculty as to what we value; advised that as we move forward and think about the changes that may be coming, we need to be strategic, and it would be helpful to have guiding principles; for those reasons asked that Senate vote in support of the resolution;
		5. Discussion: J. Grier offered two minor edits, added commas after the “Whereas” identified, adding that she is in full support; J. Balen wanted to thank those who drafted this, for herself it has been a hard week, grateful to be back here today, we continue to do our good work, but we may receive challenges when implementing this, happy to discuss this further with anyone; A. White added that she wanted to show appreciation for the statement that was circulated, was grateful to have this to help stand as a united front in support of providing a safe learning environment; referenced her student’s young children’s journals and that it made the experience more real; K. Tollefson offered thanks as well, supported a vote in favor of it, added that documents like these may seem like symbolic gestures, but this is the ground that allows her to stand strong; C. Wyels spoke on behalf of J. Gonzalez, read his statement aloud; J. Ornelas-Higdon added her thanks and that especially for faculty who are more marginalized, it was very important to receive it;
		6. S. Stratton asked if there were any objections to voting; hearing none:
		7. VOTE: 54 Yes, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstained; resolution was approved;
		8. C. Wyels reminded that Chelsee Bentee and Brittany Grice are in attendance and are here to address questions on related matters;
2. Extended Announcements (up to 5 min. each) – none
3. Reports from Standing Committees (*As Needed) – None received for below*
* Faculty Affairs Comm
* Student Academic Policies and Procedures
* Curriculum Comm
* General Education Comm
* Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
* Committee on Committees
* Comm on Centers and Institutes
* Professional Leave Comm
* Mini-Grant Review Comm
1. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus
	1. Business and Continuity Planning Task Force – Jeanne Grier
		1. J. Grier had two reports, one is for the Business and Continuity Planning Task Force, this is the group that gets together regularly in case of campus emergencies (e.g. Springs Fire); this group also addresses how to get campus going again after such events; they do have plans in place, B. Hartung and C. Doll are also on this committee;
		2. Second report is for the Preparedness Working Group, put into place to make sure people on campus can exercise their First Amendment rights after events such as the election; met today, wanted to make sure all have the resources available, added that if you feel that you’ve been harassed, B. Grice is our Title IX officer and in attendance, also CAPS and EAP are great places to go for additional support; addressed another item in regards to bringing visitors from off-campus: frequently faculty have guest speakers, but be mindful when persons of controversy may be coming, this group can help campus be aware of protestors who may be coming to campus; cited example where campus police were aware of a group of protestors that came from Los Angeles, and that all demonstrations occurred peacefully;
2. Intent to Raise Questions
	1. C. Wyels referenced the fire alarm question from C. Smith displayed on screen, which had asked if there were times other than midterms where fire alarms / drills could be made; C. Wyels recalled follow up conversations with Maggie Torres at Campus Police, they’re setting the date(s) in October and will work with the Provost Office to identify favorable dates; we may still have some misses, but then it’s on us; B. Aquino asked if there could be two weeks of notice to help faculty prepare – D. Wakelee answered that to the extent that this information is available, we’ll certainly provide it; A. White recalled that on Tuesday night the fire alarm went off at 9pm – D. Wakelee replied that if there’s a fire alarm at 9pm at night, it may be a false alarm, but it’s not a test; C. Wyels read aloud remaining questions and responses, please see Senate meeting materials website for a complete list;
	2. M. Cook asked his question about policy on paying students (included on PowerPoint slides), where he was referred to two specific documents prohibiting us to paying students, but that actually, neither document says this, and in fact one says it is allowed;
	3. L. O’Connor asked what is the Disability Resource Program’s process for vetting student note-takers?  What training do they provide student note takers?  Do they have any quality control measures in place to make sure student note takers are doing a good job? Asking this in light of a recent conversation with a student who receives notes from a student note taker, but upon review the quality of these notes was very concerning; the student note taker has also stopped attending class; what should faculty do in these situations?
	4. K. Vose recalled that last year there was talk of starting a food pantry on campus, what is the status of the proposed food pantry for students? How can faculty and students contribute;
	5. J. Balen recalled that a few faculty have been talking about making CI as sanctuary campus, question is what is entailed in becoming a sanctuary campus;
3. Announcements (no more than 2 min. each)
	1. L. Davis-Smith cordially invited everyone to come hear Kenneth Morris Jr., great grandson of Booker T. Washington, speak about issues about social justice and abolitionism; Nov. 17th in MVS from 2-3:30pm;
	2. P. Murphy announced that this is International Week on campus with several music events this week, including the Daniel Lee Music Fest with a finale coming Thursday night in MAL 100 featuring a steel drum and mariachi band; J. Meriwether commented about the lovely singer that was outside his classroom during a Pop-Up Music performance;
	3. M. Francois announced that in this room on Dec. 2nd from 2-4pm there will be a talk on learning communities;
	4. H. Castillo announced that there is still room for proposals for Arts Under The Stars in Spring 2017, due by Nov. 21st if you have ideas on sharing your research with campus via performance elements;
	5. C. Wyels announced her fourth Senate Chair coffee meeting next Tuesday from 3-4pm;
	6. D. Wakelee announced that he is hosting coffee at 11am in the Provost Conference Room next Tuesday;
	7. J. Balen added that she’s been sending emails about a faculty writing connection, please send her an email if interested in being added to this distribution list;
4. Adjourn
	1. K. Tollefson moved to adjourn, C. Harris-Keith second, meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.