Academic Senate
Del Norte Hall 1500
February 25th, 2014
2:30pm-4:30pm
Meeting Minutes

Attendance
Virgil Adams III, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Sean Anderson, Harley Baker, Frank Barajas, Julia Balén, A.J. Bieszczad, Bob Bleicher, Merilyn Buchanan, Karen Carey, Sean Carswell, Stephen Clark, Manuel Correia, Beatrice de Oca, Nancy Deans, Colleen Delaney, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Therese Eyermann, Marie Francois, Jorge Garcia, Jeanne Grier, John Griffin, Venessa Griffith, Ivona Grzegorczyk, Beth Hartung, Debi Hoffman, Tiina Itkonen, Dax Jacobson, J. Jacob Jenkins, Karen Jensen, Kimmy Kee-Rose, Gary Kinsey, Jill Leafstedt, Kathryn Leonard, Carola Matera, Rian Medlin, Jim Meriwether, Jennifer Miller, Liz Miller, Brad Monsma, Paul Murphy, Lindsey O'Connor, Nitika Parmar, Monica Pereira, Janet Pinkley, Luda Popenhagen, Don Rodriguez, Christina Salazar, Sofia Samatar, Tom Schmidhauser, Elizabeth Sowers, Steve Stratton, Britney Summerville, Christy Teranishi Martinez, Kaia Tollefson, Kim Vose, Dan Wakelee, Amy Wallace, Greg Wood, Cindy Wyels.

I. Welcome
Meeting called to order at 2:37pm.

II. Approval of the Agenda
Motion to approve by J. Balén. Motion was seconded by I. Grzegorczyk.

III. Approval of the Minutes of February 4th, 2014
Approved without objection.

IV. Report from the Chief of Staff
T. Eyermann introduced and welcomed the new Director for Institutional Effectiveness, Michael Bourgeois. M. Bourgeois introduced himself and described upcoming events for institutional research including "Data & Donuts". Upcoming initiatives include building a data warehouse of institutional data, supporting WASC efforts & student efforts. Finally, he noted that his office location is in University Hall.

V. Report from the Provost
Provost gave an update on University Strategic Plan meetings. The task force is meeting weekly at 8am and is making good progress; they will present revisions to the Strategic Plan at the upcoming PPPC meeting. There will also be open forums to collect input from faculty, staff, and students. Provost also gave an update on budget planning process, noting the hope to be engaged in planning process earlier next fall. The provost will be turning in request items to Finance by 2/27. Asked for input on requests, and will be sharing them with the Provost's Council and Fiscal

Policies for feedback. Finally, the budget recommendations will be presented to Cabinet later on in the month.

Provost presented a PowerPoint (see appendix) on recruitment projects. Presented recruitment analysis from 2007-2013. Tenure Density on slide 2 does not include library, counselors, or coaches. Provost noted there is a table of CSU wide data, and that CSU Channel Islands has the lowest percentage of tenure-track faculty at 37.5%; versus 58.2% systemwide. Provost is looking into improving that ratio.

Provost continued explaining that the data presumes an FTES increase by 8% each year. After 2014-15, a hiring increase of 2% each year is assumed. The Provost addressed the attrition line item, commenting that attrition rate ranges from 5-8% and only reaches 8% in 2021. Attrition also includes predicted sabbaticals.

I. Grzegorczyk asked why we assume a low average of meeting 50% in tenure-track faculty hiring by 2018-2019? Provost answered that a modest and conservative approach was taken and that the aggressive model was unrealistic. I. Grzegorczyk also asked why numbers go up and down on Faculty Recruitment line on slide two? Provost is explaining that we are trying to meet 50% ratio by 18/19. K. Leonard compared the lecturer percentage in the rest of the country is 50% and that the CSU is 58% and that this is something that needs to be considered in the Strategic Planning process. Provost will work to create a more aggressive scenario and resubmit.

S. Aloisio asked about the student-faculty ratio (SFR) for the CSU, commenting that the ratio seems like it's going up aggressively and that classrooms are not getting bigger in terms of physical size. J. Leafstedt asked if this information is going to be presented to Fiscal Policies. The Provost answered yes, adding that she is also working on getting a 3-year divisional hiring plan for Academic Affairs. M. Pereira asked if there is a hiring plan that includes librarian, counselors, and coaches. The Provost answered that her office ran the report to follow the same criteria as the Little Hoover Commission, which excluded those faculty; however, actual hiring plans will include them.

S. Stratton asked if the FTES include university staff and administrators and the Provost answered no. M. Francois noted that total faculty time is expressed as full time equivalent. How does assigned time increase our capacity? Provost answered that is exactly what report shows. Provost wrapped up this portion of the presentation by telling everyone to send their feedback, notes on omissions, and suggestions for variables to Rian Medlin.

The Provost transitioned into current recruitment updates, showing recruitment stats for current recruitment. The Provost noted that the Search Committees have completed their hard work. She also gave an update on the AVP for Enrollment Services Search. Campus has been working with a search firm and there are upcoming airport interviews.

VI. Report from Statewide Senators
No report.

VII. Report from CFA President (Griffin)
J. Griffin updated everyone that the bargaining team is still in session. On Tuesday, 3/18 a member of the bargaining team will be on campus. John will send out an email with more information. On 3/17 they are planning a Count Facuccino event at the library from 8:30am-10:30am. Nancy Deans will be attending faculty rights seminar next week in Sacramento. There is also an equity conference this Friday and Saturday 2/28-3/1; emails have gone out. Finally, there is a CFA Assembly in April at LAX with over 200 delegates from throughout the system.

IX. Report from the Senate Chair
Chair Grier announced the new Senate newsletter. Please send any feedback to chair. Chair noted a call for faculty feedback on Statewide Academic Senate resolutions. Please check out the [dropbox link](#) and send any feedback by end of February- Chair will collect data from our campus. Chair shared announcements from two groups on campus. Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs conference will be on campus; presentation was sent out via the Senate newsletter. Also Housing and Residential Education (HRE) is hosting a Fondue with the Faculty on 3/18 from 4-6pm in Santa Cruz Village, noting that revised times are different from newsletter.

Committee on Committees election email are coming up soon; the lecturer call has gone out already. Call for Senate officers will go out within the next couple of weeks. Chair gave an update on creating the policies on death of a student. A small group is still working on that policy and the policy will be making its way to cabinet.

Chair gave an update on Terminology of Long and Short Forms

A.J. Bieszczad asked what happens with a short form when it is rejected by another authority other than the senate body? Does it get removed from AMP? Chair answered that we do not have a formal process for it. A.J. asked a follow-up question: if there is no short form, can a program be on the calendar? Why work on long form and waste resources if program may not go forward? Suggested process of a short form that is forwarded to administration; then having the long form coming afterwards. Chair answered that we are in the midst of revising our process, noting that the chairs of APC and Curriculum could not be at Senate today, but would like to have meetings in the future to resolve issues.

K. Leonard commented that the long form involves a lot of effort and also puts faculty in the awkward position of being supportive of program when our campus may not be ready for it, noting that she would like to see a way to communicate program timing and readiness for program before long form. J. Elliott noted that short form gives indication that work is ready to be done in creating long form, and long form comes to Senate when program is sound and ready for implementation.

Discussion on "wish dates" on the short form, prioritization, and the definition of "near future." D. Jacobsen noted that administration prioritizes forms, and that dates are implied, but fiscal situation has changed implementation. G. Wood asked whether a Senate approval vote on a Long Form tacitly says that level of faculty is adequate. J. Leafstedt asked if is there a committee/group that is revisiting the forms, and where to send comments and questions. Chair noted that she could collect comments and questions, but that receivers would be some subset of APC/Curriculum. A.J. Bieszczad suggests task force.

Discussion on what "ready for implementation" means. M. Pereira asked if the President could implement a program that Senate has not passed. Discussion. J. Meriwether noted that approving programs fall within shared governance; within purview of faculty.

X. Intent to Raise Questions

A. Responses to Questions Raised at the Prior Senate Meeting of February 4th

1. J. Meriwether:

Background: Question was prompted by Chancellor White's State of the CSU address and the stated Chancellor's Office priority of increasing hiring of tenure track faculty in order to help students achieve their degrees. (see attachment- displaying table of ratio of tenure track to lecturer faculty in the CSU as well as PDF of Little Hoover Commission study).
To begin to reverse the long-declining ratio of tenure track to lecturer faculty:

Question:
1) Using the same methodology as the Little Hoover Commission document, could we have an updated snapshot (for Fall 2013 as opposed to October 2012) to see where we are now?

2) Two years ago, Senate passed a resolution (SP 11-06) to improve tenure track to lecturer faculty ratio. Could that hiring plan be updated so that we have a vision now of how we might improve our ratio? Jesse Elliot asked about methodology. Footnote at bottom of document notates methodology.

1a) A.J. Bieszczad amended the question to indicate a desire for the results to be publicized. J. Meriwether accepted this as a friendly amendment.

(See attachments, Little Hoover Commission document and Faculty Ratios)

2) K. Leonard:

Background: The Math department has a faculty position out for search this Spring semester. There are 200 applicants and a very short timeline for reviewing 3-4 candidates. Candidate review packets are often in varying order and somewhat incomplete. Packet has an application, a cover letter, a CV, and a teaching statement- but no research statement or letters of recommendation.

Question: What do we need to do in order to get well-organized candidate file packets that include the full range of information needed in the hiring process?

I. Grzegorczyk amended the question to thank Search Committee and commend that Committee on the high quality of questions contained in the application. Friendly amendment.

The Hiring Programs are responsible for putting together the position description and the requested materials for the applicants. Requested materials can be designated as Required or Optional, which may lead to the inconsistency of applications. In order to have better organized applications, programs can develop position descriptions and requested materials that are more instructive to the candidate in preparing their files. As far as letters of recommendation, currently PeopleAdmin does not have a function to upload these documents. However, with the Common Human Resources System (CHRS) coming on board soon, the CSU is going to implement a new e-recruitment tool which should hopefully have more functionality in this area. If not, within the position description it can be specified that Letters of Recommendation are required/optional and provide a designated person to receive them.

Rian Medlin
Director of Faculty Affairs

B. New Questions

1) J. Meriwether: Last spring, Provost Dawn Neuman made a written pledge that "Any of the programs that are revised into an on-line modality will be considered by the curriculum committee." That statement was sent to all of the academic AVPs -- Gary Berg, Karen Carey, Bill Cordeiro, Gary Kinsey and Amy Wallace/Steve Stratton -- and as well was sent to the incoming provost, Gayle Hutchinson. The statement was made in the context of the Chair of the Academic Senate pointing out that as a campus we needed to develop a policy by which, if we wanted to offer an online academic program, we would comply with campus curricular processes.

It now appears that an effort to offer an online degree program has been sent to WASC without adhering to the promise made. Even further, WASC itself sees online degree programs as inherently different than face-to-face, and thus requires separate approval. Despite these things, no proposal has been sent to Curriculum Committee nor to the Academic Planning Committee.

My question: why the failure, and how the administration plans to remedy the lack of consultation or any current and future proposals to offer an online degree program?

2) S. Anderson: After returning from sabbatical, I was stymied by new environmental controls in many classrooms. Touching the controls appears to do nothing. Some rooms are hot and some are cold. Can Facilities Services provide some guidance on how to use and interact with these controls?

3) Frank Barajas:
As a follow up to the Fall 2013 Daryl Smith symposium and the aspiration of at least one of our faculty colleagues to have a "safe space" to discuss issues of diversity, can the administration, in partnership with the President's Commission on Human Relations, Diversity, and Equity; Human Resources; the Center for Multicultural Engagement; and the Academic Senate, mediate a spring 2014 faculty colloquium on the recruitment of tenure-track applicants from historically underrepresented groups?

This discussion can be part of an initiative to institutionalize a series of conversations to develop an equity plan on the campus climate for historically underrepresented and marginalized groups.

4) T. Itkonen asked: In addition to the shuttle service from the North parking lot that runs in the evenings after 5pm, is there a shuttle service that runs throughout the day? Specifically, this could address the needs of injured people.

XI. Continuing Business Items
a) SP 13-07 MA in Psychology Short Form
Discussion was opened on this item. B. Bleicher mentioned that assessment services would be very important and that our campus could be a leader in providing that. A number of faculty spoke in favor of benefits of having graduate programs on campus. K. Leonard called vote. No objections taken to closing discussion.

Vote taken to approve SP 13-07.

Approve: 38
Oppose: 2
Abstain: 3

Policy passes.

b) SP 13-08 Minor in Philosophy
Floor was opened for discussion. A.J. Bieszczad referred to list of potential faculty to teach in that program, and asked why is computer science faculty excluded. J. Balén noted that the listed programs were involved in the planning process from the beginning. V. Adams noted that a

change needs to be made on the form, as the Philosophy minor is now housed in the Psychology program, not Sociology. M. Adler clarified if proposers will accept a friendly amendment to make that change. Program representatives answered in the affirmative.

Discussion over effort and of new programs having no resources. Math and English are paying 15-20% effort for both Julia and Jesse to teach in the program. The question was asked whether the FTE for Fall goes to Philosophy? I. Grzegorczyk disputed this and noted that whoever is teaching a class and paying for it keeps the FTE. J. Balén says negotiations are decided by AVP. Discussion on how FTES and courses for minor are decided per semester. M. Francois described the precedent of Chicano Studies minor. Discussion of differences between past and current long and short forms. B. Monsma conveyed a desire to be supportive and respectful of the proposers and the minor, yet also pointed out fundamental oddness of starting a program with no faculty in program and also of having a Psychology chair determine who will teach in a Philosophy program, having no formal academic training in that discipline.

M. Adler also asked how the estimate of number of students was arrived at. J. Balén noted that the estimate was arrived at some time ago via student survey. J. Elliott noted that it is a conservative estimate, indicating a potential pool of current math students who take MATH/PHIL 230, as well as Philosophy of Mathematics- that includes a number of students who only need a few more courses to take the minor.

T. Itkonen called vote. There were no objections to ending discussion. Vote taken to approve SP 13-08.

Approve:29
Deny:10
Abstain: 6

SP 13-08 passes.

XII. New Business Items

a) SP 13-09 CODEL Long Form (Collaborative Online Doctorate in Educational Leadership)

K. Tollefson motioned to discuss. G. Wood seconded the motion. K. Tollefson introduced the form, noted that this program would involve a number of "firsts" for the campus. Spoke about benefits of service, revenue, and partnership with CSU Fresno, including faculty mentoring and shadowing. K. Tollefson also added that a representative from CSU Fresno could come to Academic Senate on 3/18.

A.J. Bieszczad noted common perceptions of online programs being of a lower quality than brick and mortar institutions, and asked if the proposers have done any studies of other institutions? K.

ACADEMIC
SENATE

CALIFORNIA STATE
University

CHANNEL
ISLANDS

Tollefson noted issues of equity and access, but also commented that most students in this program would be working professionals, and argued that engaging students broadly and in depth is often more possible in online versus face to face formats. K. Tollefson also added that the sponsors have conducted a needs assessment/ survey of area educators.

I. Grzegorczyk commented on how faculty will be supervising research. Sponsor commented that most of participants have been working in schools already. J. Leafstedt voiced concerns about capacity, but spoke about campus and pedagogical benefits of online format. Discussion of low-residency model. It was clarified that each cohort will come to campus every summer. S. Carswell commented that the one-week residency will be intensive experience of 60 contact hours and long days. Discussion of this residency model's similarity to other universities D. Rodriguez asked if program students will be able to work with faculty from both institutions on committee. It was answered yes. T. Itkonen also added that fieldwork is paired with courses.

F. Barajas spoke of large amount of local support for doctorates from a public institution can provide. C. Matera added that current CI faculty are being asked to be on dissertation committees at other universities and that these are important skills for our faculty to master. V. Adams commended the School of Education for doing a great job on this proposal and voiced his full endorsement.

B. Bleicher noted that UCSB is no longer offering Ed.D. (B. Bleicher). T. Itkonen and M. Francois spoke of proposed benefits to campus and community. M. Francois applauded the Education program for their effort. Feedback and questions should be directed to K. Tollefson. Item will return to next Senate meeting.

XIII. Reports from Standing Committees

- Faculty Affairs Committee

B. de Oca announced that FAC met yesterday and thanked everyone for their input regarding student seeking effectiveness instrument. The Committee has incorporated feedback and will be sending the policy to Senate Exec soon. The Committee is also working on assessment tool for online courses.

- Fiscal Policies

Chair noted that they will be meeting on Thursday 2/27.

- Student Academic Policies and Procedures

C. Wyels updated everyone that in line with the recent Executive Order, the Committee is working on revising policy of late drops including deadlines. Committee is also working on an updated policy on Academic Disqualification that applies to all different types of students.

- General Education

D. Jacobson updated everyone that the Committee met yesterday, 2/24 and is currently reviewing courses.

- Committee on Committees

C. Delaney announced that nominations are under way for lecturer faculty. Encouraged everyone to get nominations in by 3/4 deadline, noting that there will be an upcoming call for Senate Exec officers as well, with a deadline of April 1. Open call and lecturer faculty elections will be in April, asking everyone to pay attention to emails as they come out.

- Committee on Centers and Institutes

C. Wyels read a report from Nitika Parmar. The Committee has met and is reviewing reports, which they will present at next Senate.

- Professional Leave Committee

No report.

- Mini-Grant Review Committee

B. de Oca noted that notification packets have been forwarded for approval, and signed award letters will be sent out next week.

XIV. Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

- Search Coordinating Committee

G. Wood reported that three programs will be hosting on campus interviews March 20-21st. There are four positions and three groups, noting that the recruitment events follow a traditional format this time. For next round of searches, a survey will be going out regarding format. Provost is looking forward to feedback; please work with SCC in providing new feedback.

- Center for Multicultural Engagement/ CCE

J. Balén announced a screening of *Tapped*- a documentary on using bottled water- is coming up on 3/11. There also will be a documentary on slavery in April. Additionally, there are webinars and workshops for faculty and staff online on a variety of topics.

XV. Announcements

- J. Leafstedt has started discussion series on Technology: Change and Opportunity. Invites faculty to give approximately a 20-minute talk plus time for conversation. Upcoming discussions include best practices for inverted/flipped model; M. Berman giving a talk on "Teaching in the Dark: Learning Through Risk and Vulnerability." Dates and more information are posted on the ISLAS website. Announcements will be coming.

- V. Bahena reminded everyone about the Fondue with Faculty event in Santa Cruz Housing. Housing would like to do more after hours events in the future. Fliers will be made available at the end of Senate. Also look at the ATOD presentation link in the Senate newsletter.

- J. Elliott announced the classical music concert on 4/23 from 7-9pm in Malibu 120.

- C. Teranishi Martinez announced "Art with Impact" panel discussion tonight regarding mental illness. Free food! 2/25 6-8pm in Malibu Hall.

- S. Aloisio announced the IRA deadline is on Saturday 3/1.

- J. Garcia announced that April is Math Awareness Month. The Math department will be hosting movies, seminars. Poster is coming in the mail.

XVI. Adjourn
4:20pm

Recruitment Projections

Division of Academic Affairs

Presented at Academic Senate Meeting, February 25, 2014

Tenure Density

	Tenure Status	Fall Instructional Faculty Full-time Equivalents (FTE)						
		2007	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**
CI	Tenure Density	42.1%	44.0%	43.5%	42.2%	39.6%	37.0%	37.5%
Systemwide	Tenure Density	61.1%	62.1%	66.1%	64.5%	62.0%	60.6%	58.2%

Future Faculty Recruitment Analysis

		AY 2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		
		Actual	Projection								
		5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	Assumptions										
FTES (estimated)	8.00%	4,470	5,000	5,400	5,840	6,310	6,820	7,370	7,960		
Faculty assigned time expressed as FTES	2.00%	310	347	354	361	368	375	383	391		
Total Faculty time expressed as FTES		4,780	5,347	5,754	6,201	6,678	7,195	7,753	8,351		
SFR	+1 SFR/2 yrs	22	22	23	23	24	24	25	25		
Tenure-Track FTE*		80	95	108	122	131	150	155	167		
Lecturer FTE		128	132	143	149	147	150	155	167		
FTEF		**208**	**227**	**250**	**270**	**278**	**300**	**310**	**334**		
Tenure Track Percentage		38%	41%	43%	45%	47%	50%	50%	50%		
Lecturer Percentage		62%	59%	57%	55%	53%	50%	50%	50%		
										Total	Average
Faculty Recruitment			15	13	14	9	19	5	12	70	14.02
Attrition	5% + 1%/2yrs		(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(9)	(11)	(12)	(31)	(6.20)
Total hires required to maintain target ratios			**19**	**18**	**20**	**16**	**28**	**16**	**24**	**101**	**20**

Recruitment Stats

	Communications (Health Comm)	Health Sciences Gerontology	Health Sciences Medical Informatics	Mathematics
Number of Applications	39	6	2	205
Number of Phone Interviews	17	3	0	12
Number of Applicants Recommended for On-Campus Interview	3 (Plus One Alternate)	3	0	4 (Plus Two Alternates)

Spring 2014 AVP for Enrollment Services Search	
Number of Applications	40
Number of Airport Interviews	6
Dates of Airport Interviews	March 1 & 2
Dates of On-Campus Interviews	Week of March 10 and March 17

Terminology

Understanding our Current Curriculum & Planning Processes at CI

"Short Form"

- Used to place a new program on the Academic Master Plan (AMP) as potential degrees to be offered at CI after review by the Academic Planning Council and recommended by Senate to the President

- The AMP should be viewed as a "wish list" and not a commitment for implementation

- The AMP is sent yearly to the Chancellor's Office by the President after his review, changes, and approval

- Short Form items may be moved based upon resources, faculty desire to proceed, etc.…

Voting on a Short Form

- A "yes" vote for a short form means faculty think this may be a viable program to be offered at CI in the future and is worthy of beginning the Long Form process

- A "no" vote for a short form means faculty do not want this major/minor/degree program at CI

Long Form

* Faculty in the program have expressed the desire to implement the program

* The Long Form goes to the Curriculum Committee and determines soundness of the curriculum

* Curriculum sends the Long Form to Senate to Senate for a vote

Voting on a Long Form

- A "yes" vote on a Long Form means Faculty believe this program is sound and ready for implementation in the near future. It is up to administration to decide when the program is implemented based on resources and other factors.

- A "no" vote on a Long Form means faculty either believe the program is not sound or ready for implementation at this time.