



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

Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
Del Norte 1500
Tuesday, October 28, 2014, 2:30-4:30

Attendees: Virgil Adams, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Susan Andrzejewski, Julia Balen, Selenne Banuelos, AJ Bieszczad, Geoffrey Buhl, Blake Buller, Sean Carswell, Nien-Tsu (Nancy) Chen, Stephen Clark, Tracylee Clarke, Bill Cordeiro, LaSonya Davis-Smith, Michelle Dean-Lorenzini, Colleen Delaney, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Cynthia Flores, Jorge Garcia, Blake Gillespie, Ivona Gregorczyk, Jeanne Grier, Georgina Guzman, Colleen Harris-Keith, Beth Hartung, Debbi Hoffmann, Pauline Hunter, Dax Jacobson, J. Jacob Jenkins, Karen Jensen, Priscilla Liang, Jennie Luna, Carol Mack, Christopher Mattia, Mary McThomas, Jim Meriwether, Paul Murphy, Colleen Nevins, Monica Pereira, Jennie Perry, Janet Pinkley, Janet Rizzoli, Christina Salazar, Sofia Samatar, Luis A. Sanchez, Tom Schmidhauser, Michael Soltys, Brian Thomas, Kaia Tollefson, Brittnee Veldman, Gregory Wood, Cindy Wyels, John Yudelson

Called to order at 2:33 pm

1. Approval of the Agenda
No objections. Approved as is.
2. Approval of the Minutes of October 7, 2014
No amendments. Approved as is.
3. Report from the Provost (Hutchinson)
 - a. G. Hutchinson congratulated those who put on Day of Dead celebration. Enjoyed meeting Mexican Consulate.
 - b. Went with Senate Chair to CO to discuss Graduation Initiative.
 - c. Moving along with hiring. Dates are Nov 6-7, 20-21. Different this year due to concern last year of DSCs writing reports then giving to AVPs then to Provost then to President and wondering what happens. Provost Council will meet with DSC to have conversation to understand context of recommendations. When things go to President and Provost meets with him, Provost wants to hear more from faculty before that meeting.
 - d. University Strategic Plan is in the penultimate draft form. President is reviewing. USP steering committee is going out to community. One in Oxnard. Tomorrow at Camarillo Library at 6pm. One additional, no date yet, in Santa Barbara. Hope a revised strategic plan will be in place by Spring 2015. Steering committee will make sure faculty are aware.
 - e. Budget forum had about 70 people in attendance. Start of conversation on budget and strategic planning. If you have questions, Provost will address them at another forum. Hope is that, early December, strategic resource

planning task force will be meeting to discuss with cabinet some of the strategic priorities the President has put out. Looking for more involvement from the task force. Provost Council will be meeting with Fiscal Policy committee and sharing all the divisional requests. Provost looking forward to moving forward with Academic Affairs strategic plan. Wants to look at structure: what is working well and what needs to be reorganized. Will continue to work on improving the academic master plan with Bill Cordeiro and others on the Academic Planning Committee.

4. Report from Statewide Senators (Aloisio and Yudelson)
 - a. S. Aloisio said no meeting since last meeting. Statewide Senate meets next week. Urged Senate to take a look at the agenda and let him and J. Yudelson know if you have questions. Chair said agenda is online.
5. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
 - a. Given by J. Yudelson. Ratification meeting and vote for tentative agreement (available on CFA website). Statewide board is recommending a yes. CFA members can vote. Non-members can sign up so they are eligible to vote.
 - b. G. Wood asked how CFA members vote. J. Yudelson said it will be online. More information will be coming out.
6. Report from the Senate Chair (Grier)
 - a. Has been in Long Beach a couple times. First was with Senate Chairs at CO. Lots of things going on at other campuses. Two campuses have gone to CO asking for mediation. Big topics discussed were 120-credit limit for engineering degree. Other campuses going through reorganization. Chair created a survey for other Senate Chairs. They are responding about membership, frequency of meeting, etc. Task force on CI campus has two subgroups, one looking at becoming a representative Senate and another looking at structure.
 - b. Chair attended along with the Provost, President, and VP for Student Affairs a meeting in Long Beach about the graduation initiative. Created a dashboard for each campus. Set targets for each campus based on growth and expected growth for various populations. Talked about strategies and what could potentially be strategies for CI. G. Hutchinson said this is a tool. CI data begins at 2009, forward (challenging). Looking for 6% increase in graduation rate by 2025. 3% achievement gap. Need to get the tool out to Senate. Chair and Provost will bring to Senate to discuss. Provost will send out link for review. Tool is also available to students so they can see what degrees are popular, length of time to complete, and the number of units required to graduate (>120). Need to teach students how to use it. Need conversation about how to use tool in planning and improving graduation rates and closing

achievement gap. Chair said different strategies were discussed. Some research thus far reveals that students have too many options for timely graduation.

- c. Priorities as Chair has them are marrying the 1) academic planning process with 2) budget and 3) hiring processes. Goal is to bring as many people together to these conversations to figure this out and keep communication open. Chair will be sending out progress reports and asking for meeting attendance. Academic Affairs structure has implications on Senate, etc. Last meeting, question was asked about data. Chair working with Provost to get that data to Senate. Things are moving, but not as quickly as needed. Chair asked for patience and participation and communication about adding to or reprioritizing the list.

7. Intent to Raise Questions

- a. Presentation with answers from last Senate (available online)
- b. G. Wood asked, in the context of 17 tenure track hires, how many people is the university hiring? And do these figures include replacements? Meaning: the 17 tenure track hires do not include replacements: if a tenure track leaves, we only grow by 16.
- c. A. Bieszczad asked about the extra tax that home owners at UGlen pay that is collected on behalf of the Site Authority by the county together with property taxes. It is a substantial amount, close to double the property tax. For those who don't know, in California, property taxes have been capped at 1% by law since 1978 when Proposition 13 "People's Initiative to Limit Property Taxation" passed. It has just passed 10 years since A. Bieszczad has been a home owner at UGlen, so he has paid of \$30,000 to support the university. Yet, there is no acknowledgement of any kind for his generosity. A few years ago, there was a discussion in the Home Owner's Advisory Committee that directed this matter to the university administration, apparently in vain. Now, A. Bieszczad looks at the page honoring contributors of significantly lower amounts whose generosity he admires independently of the amount, yet unless he chips in another \$500, his name is not listed there or anywhere else for that matter. He is already giving the university \$3,000 a year, so he feels like he is a bit forgotten in the mix.
- d. M. Adler asked what the possibility is for the University to move to a secure, online format for RTP submission and review.
- e. J. Meriwether stated that when the Academic Senate created the California Institute for Social Business (CISB) via SP 09-05, and the Institute for Global Economic Research (IGER) via SP 08-15, the clear intent was that these were to be self-sustaining Institutes. The language of SP 09-05 says that "the CISB cannot expect and will not request any financial support from the University" and that "if external funding estimates are not met, the CISB will not require

or request funding from the University for its maintenance or development." Funding would be from a public/private partnership that secured an endowment of \$12-15 million. SP 08-15 explains that by IGER's fourth year "the Director will raise funds in conjunction with University Advancement to support increased faculty and administrative workload," and that "After the fourth year, [the] Institute should be self-sustaining." The questions: 1) are any State/General Funds being used to support these Institutes (salaries/benefits, operating expenses, etc.), and if so what is the amount (in the current year and the cumulative total)? 2) What is the amount in the CISB Endowment, and how much has been raised by IGER?

8. Continuing Business Items

a. SP 14-03 Math Stats Minor (Curriculum)

Second reading item. I. Grzegorzczuk spoke to this. Committee that proposed it put forward an amended document as a friendly amendment due to brown bag discussion. Word "interdisciplinary" was removed. Electives do come from other programs, usually introductory, and can get students from other majors interested in the topic. Added two electives from IT and ESRM. Option for students in Computer Science to take Data Mining course instead of COMP 408. Added COMP 105 as a prerequisite. Number of units increased to 24. Some Computer Science faculty added to the proposal. G. Wood pointed out required lower division requirements should be revised to (6) instead of (3) due to adding COM 105. Asked if committee is requesting any hires to teach for the courses listed. I. Grzegorzczuk said no, all can be covered by people on campus except 408, which would be someone from industry. M. Adler asked for clarification on the OUT wording. I. Grzegorzczuk said this sentence is stated above and will be deleted where indicated with "OUT." Chair clarified track-changes wasn't used. B. Bleicher said there is a need for this skill in the local area and students would be immediately employable. No objections to voting.

Approved: 41 Denied: 5 Abstained: 3

9. New Business Items – 2:45p Time Certain

a. Academic Master Plan (Academic Planning Committee) – Motion to discuss by C. Wyels. Second by M. Pereira

B. Gillespie and B. Cordeiro (co-chairs of APC) spoke to item. B. Gillespie introduced document sent via email to Senate Exec last Tuesday. Document was previous year's AMP. Changes are as follows: Art MFA withdrawn by Art's request and Psychology MA being added as a result of Senate voting to approve last Spring. B. Cordeiro clarified Curriculum Committee are all members of the APC as well as some administrators. Meeting last week resulted in consensus that APC process doesn't work as-is. AMP document has to be sent to CO by President. Dates on document don't have relevance.

Short form puts program on AMP, and can create problems. APC not sure they agree with the charter. Curriculum is the purview of the faculty. AMP is beyond that.

I. Grzegorzczuk – asked for clarification on the right-hand column of the AMP document. B. Cordeiro said its part of the program review.

C. Wyels commented that trying to envision next steps with the discussion about APC not having a charge. Discussion not happening due to timing this year and didn't happen last year. How is this going to be solved? B. Cordeiro said CI needs a better planning process for APC. B. Gillespie said there are different aspects of planning APC is working on. It's accurate to say it's not exactly clear given the current climate what the voice APC has in the ongoing discussions about the planning process and how we should be planning.

I. Grzegorzczuk – specified long form is required by CO, so not much flexibility there. B. Cordeiro clarified long form is required for implementation. WASC processes required for all masters programs. AMP lists all short forms. I. Grzegorzczuk said short form was to announce plans for program. B. Cordeiro agreed and said problem is short form has area for "additional resources needed" and most say "none," then the long form comes along and there isn't ability to implement due to resources.

Chair asked if part of the process is to look at those still in the queue. B. Cordeiro agreed and clarified that there are 17 items on the list that haven't been implemented. APC is in discussion with those program chairs.

A. Bieszczad asked how the current process works (short form goes to president?). B. Cordeiro said no, it comes to Senate then gets on the AMP. A. Bieszczad asked who ultimately decides if a program is approved. Right now, it is one person (President). B. Cordeiro confirmed the President makes the ultimate decision about whether a program is implemented on campus or not. B. Gillespie confirmed that A. Bieszczad is articulating what faculty are saying is part of the problem with the process. It is a separate question from the AMP document.

G. Hutchinson said this is a challenge and thanked the faculty involved in managing the problem. Strategic prioritization is where faculty and administration need to go next. Budget development process needs to be driven by strategic process. Faculty need to think about prioritizing program proposals and degree offerings based on their budget requests over multiple years. As a division, Academic Affairs needs to look at what comes out of APC to engage in prioritization process.

Chair mentioned that there is an internal document with FTES, minors, and credentials. That is a planning document. The AMP document being presented is a separate document. G. Hutchinson pointed out that using the FTES to justify bringing on programs is not as valid as it was when the campus was smaller. Now, need to plan over several years, keeping resources in mind.

B. Cordeiro mentioned that the AMP is a list of short forms. It is easy to get on this list.

J. Elliott asked, even if faculty come up with priority before submitting long form, is there a way to get something from the President to push the faculty forward on the process? B. Cordeiro said there is no way to guarantee without planning involved. Chair clarified President cannot say yay or nay without seeing the document. Need to have something to send in December. President mentioned to Jeanne that he is interested in a revised Academic Master Plan from the faculty.

G. Wood pointed out that there are many dates that have already passed. By approving the AMP, the Senate is tacitly saying the campus has the faculty to support the current programs and growth. B. Cordeiro said no, and the only thing new is the Psychology masters.

A. Bieszczad said faculty and administration process is not collaborative. Spending time to develop long forms that are denied is a waste of time. G. Hutchinson said there is collaboration and the President is working with faculty, but it comes down to strategic planning. Look at what is proposed and what is accepted and in what order to bring those programs on. In addition to that, the President reserved the right to make a suggestion for a program he would like to see, but it required faculty buy-in, involvement, and engagement. G. Hutchinson said if there wasn't collaboration in the past, there is now.

J. Meriwether asked for clarification on his interpretation that there are three possibilities: APC isn't going to meet because they have no charge, need to overhaul processes, and need to get academic priorities and programs straight. How is the campus moving forward, because these are all different? B. Gillespie stated that his priority as co-Chair is to change the process so APC becomes more involved in planning. Include faculty in the process and what the flaws are and where what APC envisions fits into the "moving parts."

G. Wood pointed out there is a trade-off between reinforcing the current programs and creating new programs. Senate resolution on tenure-track hiring should be addressed first. By passing AMP, Senate is tacitly saying everything is ok. B. Cordeiro said the AMP is already passed. It's on the Board of Trustees' website. Disagree with implication of Senate passing the document. The document will be going from the campus to the CO via the President. APC isn't sure if they are a Senate committee or what their role is. Chair said it will depend on the restructuring. B. Gillespie said Senate can perhaps pass a resolution asking for clarity.

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

Faculty Affairs Committee – C. Harris-Keith said looking at revising policy referred back to them by Senate



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Fiscal Policies – no report given

Student Academic Policies and Procedures – S. academic disqualification policy

Curriculum Committee – K. Jensen said the committee is working on course proposals and changes. They request that, if there are corrections, and a member of the committee contacts you, to please get back to them in a timely fashion (within a week).

General Education – G. Buhl indicated that the GE committee is continuing to review courses that were submitted by the October curriculum deadline.

Committee on Committees – no report at this time

Committee on Centers and Institutes – no report given

Professional Leave Committee – D. Hoffman said met yesterday, meeting again tomorrow. Will forward recommendations on. Chair clarified it's about sabbaticals.

Mini-Grant Review Committee – working on call, hasn't gone out yet

11. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

- a. V. Adams – search committee wanted to remind everyone campus visits are Nov 6-7 and to sign up for interdisciplinary sessions.
- b. CME J. Balen workshop next Spring (March 6). Partnership with ISLAS for faculty workshops still available. Check website.

12. Announcements – Chair pointed out they are in the newsletter now

- a. New support person starting Nov. 4th for Senate and IRA (Dave Daniels).
- b. 4:15 Broome 1360 – information on CFA contract and what it means for everybody. Cookies involved. Dave Bradfield from DH, member of bargaining team, will be present to answer questions.
- c. Chair – next Senate meeting not on regular cycle due to Holiday. Tuesday of Thanksgiving week. Please attend!

13. Adjourn – motioned by C. Harris-Keith at 3:49pm