ACADEMIC
SENATE

CHANNEL
ISLANDS

California State
University

Academic Senate MINUTES
Online Meeting
Tuesday, 29 September 2020; 2:30-4:30pm

1. Approval of the Agenda *

2. Approval of the Minutes from 8 September 2020*

3. Report from the Provost
Update on Provost candidates: Approx. 150 participants for each candidate; Links to feedback forms – closes at noon on Thursday; Think we have brought strong, diverse candidates that bring skills and experiences that will be beneficial to campus; Process will conclude in next couple of weeks.

President Beck met with Senate Exec a couple of times and Senate Chair, Greg Wood discussing ways to include involvement in budget and planning – will continue to meet to plan and discuss ways to do this and lay framework to develop long-term Academic Master Plan and process to do this – will involve the new Provost, want some groundwork this fall and meet with Senate Budget Committee to discuss as well. Will continue and hope to build process with more inclusivity and discussion.

Support Dr. Centino's observation and involvement in AB1460 work – My office is happy to work with Faculty Senate in any way – although a curriculum issue, we can help with administrative parts and information; I came from a campus with a strong Ethnic Studies – Provost Office stands ready to work with you.

Same with Cluster Hire – had conversations with those committed to this work, specifically Virgil Adams. This campus has a long history of doing searches in their own unique way – how will we proceed with searches in a virtual manner is important to lay foundation to ensure equitable process.

4. Report from Statewide Senators
(Grzegorczyk) Biggest discussion was budget – no planned furloughs for this year – following year, depends on budget – warning, this may happen. CO is seeking to use other funds to support the budget, but certain funds can only be taken as loans – use the money and then will need to pay back so need to be careful – will seek more federal funding; it is suggested campuses use reserves they have to support the situation.

Second, Ethnic Studies – Senate approved core competencies – Ethnic Studies requirements and how it is going to be. Approved Resolution to give more funding for implementation; One problem with budget issue is funding Ethnic Studies requirement coming.

Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the [Senate webpage](#))

Other Resolutions: Get out the vote resolution – support all student and faculty to go and vote. Discussion about mental health and well-being – Resolution to include staffing and services for students.

(Yudelson) Resolution to have 3 dedicated lecturers at Statewide Senate – 2nd reading in November at plenary.

5. Report from CFA
(Yudelson) Membership over ¾ CI faculty are members 77% which is 3rd or 4th in all CSU – please consider joining.

Meet and Confers In Progress: 1) Reopen campus – in terms of COVID and safety; 2) Early Exit Program – buyout for those who wish to retire from Univ. early. How much money and who qualifies to go is an ongoing discussion – early Oct settlement – negotiating of best possible deal for faculty / announcement should come from CFA, Provost President Beck possibly.

Jean Watkins, Students Services – hotel rooms for students – with membership fees, donating $500 per month towards this effort to ensure students are fed and housed.

Postcards will be available to be mailed to voters in several states to Get Out the Vote – ask for a little note and address. Contact John Yudelson. Thanks to entire E Board – CalFAC.org to sign up

(Centino) Announcement: Assembly coming up for CFA – welcome to join, reach out to Executive Board. AB1460 – big CFA issue / interested in learning more about implementation taskforce – reach out to any of the 10 on the taskforce. Ethnic Studies questions in general, the Ethnic Studies Council can answer questions Also, upcoming 3-part Teaching Series – Ethnic Studies. Will make flyer available: Oct 14th, Nov 4th and 19th. Geared to students, but we could all use a refresher.

6. Report from the Senate Chair Wood
Shared governance is so important – passed Senate Resolutions 19-01 and 19-06 last year. Spoke to changes in science as a metaphor for change and being nimble to new solutions.

Announcements: 1) Thank you for attending the Provost Forums – candidates were made more aware of the issues you bring up; 2) The Working Definitions are a discussion item – not a first reading item – should have been clearly labeled – will come back with a Resolution; 3) Keep sending the Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQ) – irtq@csuci.edu – senate@csuci.edu or email any officer. The questions and responses will be posted to the Senate Canvas page. 4) Email officers or Jeannette to get added to Canvas; 5) Friday 3-4 PM host Listening Hours – drop in ok, some come in for 5 minutes to say Hello.

Reports from the task forces:

Senate BLM Resolution Task Force (Marie Francois, marie.francois@csuci.edu)
Framework for Resolution seeking input from committee for first reading. 9/11 email sent
to committees and to Senate Lecturer Representatives and outgoing members of RTP and
current program and department chairs – feedback with link. Folder put in chat – Read
from Folder – deadline Oct. 11.

Ethnic Studies (AB 1460) Implementation Task Force (Jeanne Grier,
Jeanne.grier@csuci.edu and Monica Pereira, monica.pereira@csuci.edu) will meet on Thurs
– assembled and ready for first meeting.

Anti-Racist, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Standing Committee (Greg
Wood, greg.wood@csuci.edu) Lots of people meet on Thursday – hope to have language for
first reading at next senate meeting.

Cluster Hiring and Equity Handbook Task Force (Virgil Adams, virgil.adams@csuci.edu)
Provost Say noted, in holding pattern until after Provost Candidates finished – Oct 9
meeting with Provost; will include Faculty Affairs Committee

7. Continuing Business
a. Africana Studies Minor *
(Wood) on table for discussion
(Mitchell) reintroduce the discussion. Since 1st faculty – sponsoring faculty pleased with
responsiveness, gathered questions and observations – had a brown bag sponsoring faculty and
staff. Have had series of meeting with sponsoring faculty and with larger brown bag –
widespread and mostly standard reasons we named it "" list of items that will be a continuing …
minor – spirited discussion of administrative home for the minor and decided, no further
discussion at this time until minor approved.
(Anderson, Sean) is there a possibility of adding Service Learning in New Orleans as an optional
upper division elective?
(Mitchell) adding into / as soon as it is voted in - we can make all kind of changes / couldn't
change at time – once approved, can talk to each department about what they would like to bring
to the minor – so absolutely a possibility
YES 88
NO 0
Abstain 2
Passed without dissent

b. Senate Policy - Policy on Academic Senate Elections *
(Wood) Introduced – 2nd reading
(Perchuk) Policy that the Committee on Committees drafted last year – current committee
decided to put forward – further discussion – did not receive any feedback from the community

Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the Senate webpage)

(Adams) Thank committee for policy – stand opposed to it – reasoning #1 for those not here in early days. Do not need to know the vote counts – you jeopardize people – disheartening for those to find out they do not have support – beg the junior faculty for approving this – will suffer same mentality

(Wood) option to make an amendment.

(Harris) Why we are setting out procedures in a policy document?

(Perchuk) Committee on Committees has found there is no guidance to operate the elections – no guidance as to who reports to whom, what information we may or may not require from candidates – felt that laying it out in policy would smooth out the process – brought to our attention in Exec and last meeting that some aspects were procedure and not policy – would have welcomed additional suggestions but did not hear from anyone in community in regards to that – we think it is policy. Ensure standardization – hold committee accountable.

(Wood) In absence of a policy, it is up to Committee on Committees to run elections how they see fit / drafted something to – speak to Virgil's point – remain with vote counts to not be shared.

(Campbell) currently on Committee –without guidance, the committee can do what it wants – means each election could be different from the next – up to whim of elected committee members – we are looking for guidance from Senate about how Senate wants their elections to take place – there were accusations in the past made to Committee on Committees about impropriety – do not want to see it again in future – can lead to lack of faith of process – something set to follow, whether we report them or we don't. If this doesn't pass, it just stays the way it is – please amend away.

(Salazar) lecturer representative – one of the things I am not in a position as someone to think on their feet to propose an amendment – encourage to propose amendment – is it possible to create a sort of (not another committee) a policy committee, feel that in all cases at CI, policy is lacking and gets into a trap where we do not know what guidance to follow and get ourselves into trouble – hear Virgil's strong concern about voting being tied to them – very recently Committee on Committees got into trouble – had some problems in this regard due to a lack of guidance on this – benefit from greater guidance – policies vs amendments.

(Buhl) In favor of this – hear one objection – Statement should also include tallies … one sentence in a policy is needed – we should visit that statement as a body but in favor of the proposal.

(Francois) Friendly amendment – strike last sentence – first bullet reporting election results.

(Perchuk) will not accept as friendly – contentious – needs to goes to the community

(Wood) if you strike that, there is no advice for current or future committee – suggestion – simply know to if we want them reported or not – "will not report" then vote.

(Francois) point taken – change recommendation to say Committee on Committees will not

Motion

(Wood) effectively insert "not"

(Burris) second

(Perchuk) added possible language in chat – if not reporting to full body – need to report instead, information shall be shared with the Chair of the Senate.

(Anderson, S) thanks for work – do like to hear the tallies – understand about some programs – knowing they have a decent number of votes may encourage them to run again – but if do not know the tallies could – would rather have all the information than not to have it.

(Mitchell) as someone on past Committee on Committees – charge of impropriety – charge was a displeasure with the results not impropriety –no one on the committee has ever.

(Hoffman) – I can attest to the vitriol and displeasure we received.

(Wood) direct comments to the amendment – reporting results.

(Adams) –to amendment – like the amendment – no problem with having a set of procedures – need to develop a way to trust each other. Do understand Sean, you are a big fish and so is Alison – for those with big personalities, it doesn't hurt but for those that don't have

(Feister, S) would someone give a quick summary of what has been said so far?

(Perchuk) typically in US election tallies are given – easy way for the community to see how elections turned out – provide useful information understand if they were 2 votes from the winner or 55 votes – now have candidate statements –moving away from strict popularity contest – basic reason is that how we run elections in democracy.

(Wood) reiterated Virgil's comments – we could lose anonymity.

(Adams) that is exactly it – national election still have that. Some votes are so contentious – can tell if you did not get the support from your program – junior faculty is not voting – not anonymous.

(Niemi) as junior faculty, I have a question. if we keep the tally work can the junior ask for the tally instead of making it public?

(Perchuk) no, they way the amendment to the policy has been put forth is that "we shall not report…" sharing with Senate Chair.

(Niemi) can we add that faculty would like to know can ask?

(Wood) amending an amendment – Roberts Rules, if passes, could be another amendment

(Salazar) I am not clear - Question for Virgil, which information would tie a vote to an individual person – not clear how it happen that they would know who voted for who

(Adams) – possible for vote count to come out so few that you don't have enough votes from your program – obvious that you did not get support from larger

(Campbell) talking about extreme outcome – someone gets 2 votes and in program of 5 people – cannot know the person specifically was – never have 100% participation --; last election 44% did not participate – it only that kind of situation – decide how worried you are.

VOTE
47 YES
28 Opposed
14 Abstain
amendment passed

(Wood) amendment passed – back to policy

(Delaney) general support for policy – former member and chair make a friendly amendment – Anthropology would like to remain in the Behavior and Social Sciences, but are currently in Math and Science

(Perchuk) accepted friendly amendment

(Perchuk) Library should be eliminated from other place

(Grier) for Local Curriculum Committees the choice for programs will come up in a year or two – every three years programs have a chance to reposition themselves. Also need to change Global Languages and Cultures – not Spanish – per Stephen Clark

(Perchuk) accepted.

(Clark) I cannot support the policy w/o the change – election results are hallmark of democracy – taking to extreme by "hurting feelings" part of being a part of political body is putting yourself out to get rejected – we have to put on big boy and girl pants – transparency is hallmark.

(Wood) not explicitly – Roberts Rules – in general all election results are reported – have to read vote totals in Senate because of our bylaws – Roberts Rules.

(Niemi) would like if passed, would like to have opt to find out what the vote was – amend the amendment.

(Wood) you can make an amendment – Chair could give candidates the totals.

(Perchuk) point of having vote tallies is that you can find out – imagine now, does the Committee on Committees prepare a separate statement for candidates – idea was to provide guidance. The body just decided the community is not.

(Campbell) then results out there because can share out.

(Burris) I think that it is important to keep our size in consideration but also try to be flexible – Scott Feister put something in the chat about hiding results less than a certain margin – create an amendment – would not interpret current language that would keep the Chair from sharing the results – but could be reasonable solution – but not reasonable for Chair workload.

(Adams) we made the change – trying to build collegiality, some things we just don't need to know – actual vote counts no added value to that.

(Wood) Vote policy as whole?

(Sherman) School of Business – some way – tallies, imply or state we are saying X # of votes – what if we, you can figure out %=# of votes, would a percentage of the vote – stood for election for a committee and did not get elected, that can be hard sometimes – it would be good to know what the vote was – since we didn't like tallies – go to percentages.

(Wood) amendment?

(Sherman) Motion to amend to state, "but will report percentages over 5%"

(Perchuk) will have to go to vote.

(Sherman) But instead report percentages.

(Perchuk) second

(Clark) going back to Virgil's last comment – there are just some things we don't need to know – haunting to me, after studying dictatorships …

(Yudelson) vote was the will of the Senate – vote would not be released – seemed to me that the will of the Senate was to not – end run around the will of the Senate that voted there should be an idea of anonymity – against because against the will of the Senate.

{discussion to make amendment correct}

(Buhl) if we are requiring the number of ballots cast and the percentage, then everyone will know.

(Harris) need to choose at least from tallies and percentages and move on – how do we examine our institutions?

(Wood) Vote called to amendment

VOTE

42 YES

29 NO

14 Abstain

Amendment passed

(Wood) Back to policy

VOTE

62 YES

18 NO

7 Abstain

Policy as amended passed

c. Senate Resolution - Election Participation*

(Grier) Provost sent comments about contractual issues.

(Say) We cannot "you" as faculty – speak to what staff can or cannot do – can recommend but each bargaining unit has own CBA staff not exempt – as faculty should not imply – excuses staff of contractual obligations – would have to be dealt with at their own bargaining. However, "would support the system pursuing this as a system wide initiative" would not setting false expectations for staff.

(Wood) that was how I read it is that we are only supporting

(Say) concern about this – you can say it. Support the designation, you can actually do something about that – cannot do something for staff

(Perchuk) Agree to amend to: supports a system wide (Last Be It Resolved)

{amended}

Resolution VOTE called

67 YES

7 NO

3 Abstain

Resolution Passed

8. New Business

a. Discussion Item: Working Shared Definitions By President's Advisory Council on Inclusive Excellence*

(Alamillo) Introduced: Definitions drafted by President's Inclusive Excellence Advisory Council 2017-1028, following brown bags and discussions and in 2019. Passed by President and sent to Senate Exec last year. Shared definitions that faculty on Inclusive Excellence Council / working on Resolution – will be sent Oct 18. Want endorsement from Senate on the definitions. We are open to having an additional brown bag if Senators think needed but would like as Senate to

adopt values that they represent and can hold us all accountable on Inclusive Excellence, Equity, Diversity and Collegiality.

(Wood) resolution will come and will be an item in the future – this is a discussion. Open for comments and questions.

(Harris) Thank you – desperately needed – none of operational – does not include any budget / talk about operationalizing on campus but when comes to funding we don't do it. Calling for it would be useful in this doc or a related one.

(Deans) question collegiality – don't disagree that we should have a statement – concern from other campus that have collegiality statement and are used in disciplinary actions.

(Cook) can you add more to that – where are those definitions drawn from?

(Deans) campuses have in faculty handbook, policy, different ways – CFA has had to deal with grievances of disciplinary action of implied violation of collegiality– arbitrary – all want a collegial environment, but when used a weapon of discipline or retaliation.

(Yudelson) second what Nancy stated – CSU Fresno President inserted work collegiality and use as whip statement from AAUP – work is used to stifle discussion and conflict – in terms of word of collegiality, human ways the admin can simply say you are not being collegial and use as blunt instrument.

(Davis) understand the debate – can actually be up for discussion – hope we can at least agree on the other terms – pivotal moment as we are creating policies and statement – difficult to do w/o common language – need common language and terminology – all speaking about the same thing – if we need to pull a terminology out to further the discussion – do not want one terminology to hold us back.

(Wood) resolution in theory – can endorse certain definitions.

(Baker, D) category – disability, add neuro type.

(Volkan) inject about collegiality and RTP process – first colleagues that came from other places wanted collegiality in a document to specifically keep from granting tenure – limit people who may be taking viewpoints that are not – like the idea, maybe add a sentence, will not effect in way shape or form effect the RTP process – measuring for RTP process can be quite intense.

(Tollefson) asked students what means to be a teacher – can't have a conversation about racism, but can't without knowing enables us to have the conversation – in support of including collegiality – having that definitions does not mean to be collegial – gives us the ground to stand on to have argumentation and dissent – important to keep in. Resolution being drafted there is language to not use these definitions – intended to give us - this discussion is important / clarifying to not use punitively

(Meriwether) don't think I thought about it in terms that were raised by Nancy and I thank you for that – would like to live in Kaia's world and see these – do realize that even on our campus, unless there is language that specifically prohibits admin from using this or some way that goes into your file, otherwise it does become a tool.

(Wood) many different power differences, maybe language could recognize those differences?

(Nevins) background – sat on Presidents Commission on Diversity and Equity 2012-15 we attempted to define many of these terms and could not get there – personally exited off because of frustration – get to a point to define some of these for a basis of discussion – looking for those

instances where they are misused in our hierarchical situation – they are intended to provide a basis of conversation and getting to equity. Thank you for bringing forward.

(Downey) thanks council –this is important work. Inclusive Excellence, the word not being defined --- think about Inclusive Excellence how well we value engage – recognition is critical for the success of the institution.

(Anderson, S) Thank the committee and all those who put work in and hear concerns – worried that we seem to be going down so may rabbit holes – important to have these definitions – this is a definition to move forward – if concerns, address separately – yes, also know some folks that got tenure – collegial, but were not / but not having a tool to speak to our values

(Francois) inclusion is not a stand-alone definition – logic for that?

(Wood) will have a resolution and will have a reading on the resolution.

(Davis) please remember this is a living document, new terminologies present themselves every day – we want to continue to add to this list.

b. Senate Resolution - Continuity Amid Disruption by COVID-19: Use of Student Ratings of Teaching and Mode of Instruction in Academic Year 2020/21*

(Wood) Introduced

Grier Motion to Discuss

Colleen Harris Second

(Wood) continue resolutions from last spring – CFA reps on Exec drafted these two resolutions, put forth for more information

(Yudelson) Line 35: suggest / consider adding SP 12-10 deals with lecturer evaluations, 12-08 which we are trying to suspend, there are no – if suspend 12-10 as well, will not be evaluation for lecturer fac. To keep fair.

(Anderson, S) strongly disagree with suspending evaluations of anyone – in spring change was mid-stream, we have had a – I need to be able to evaluate my folks and these are valuable tools – I need the ability to know and understand – know of a situation of person is struggling very hard and the quality is not up to par and I have no way to objectively evaluate –

(Wood) this is for student evaluations and next for peer evaluations

AT 430PM

(Grier) Motion to extend by 10 minutes

(Francois) Second

VOTE

45 YES

11 NO

2   ABSTAIN

Extension Passed

(Deans) respond to Sean – we were all hired as face-2-face instructors – most of us were hired to teach face-2-face, regardless of amount of time to prepare – it is not a normal situation, most of us are working extremely hard just to try to keep up – to think that I would be evaluated on this

---

Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the Senate webpage)

work doesn't make a lot of sense – lecturer faculty / particularly those without 3year contract, you are deciding on whether faculty gets reappointed – remote distance learning, not fair – I support this.

(Anderson, S) I hear you, I still need to evaluate the quality of instruction – need mechanism, objective tool to ensure our students

(Deans) you think you will get that?

(Anderson) these are the only tools I am able to use, I would like other tools.

(Perchuk) hearing both Sean and Nancy – essentially Chairs be able to understand how faculty are in the classroom, how students are receiving that presence in the classroom – include capabilities of remote instruction – what Nancy is pointing to, vital point – under general and equity – given summer to prepare and also given $1500 stipend which does not compensate – back in my first year working 100 hours a week – had we decided as University to put resources to give faculty paid course release – then we would have a different conversation.Cal State handled better than other systems – but agree with resolution as not fair to evaluate faculty on what could not be their best work.

(Salazar) applies to both – perhaps there is a way to amend – so that Sean can use some criteria to assess his faculty members – my strong concern coming from so quickly on the heels of equity – serious ...; under quarantine – feel strongly, single parent with special needs child, do not need to be in a classroom, but help me if I did – for us to be evaluating people under such inequitable situation.

c. Senate Resolution - Continuity Amid Disruption by COVID -19: Tenure Clock and Peer Evaluations in Academic Year 2020/21*

Perchuk Motion

Francois Second

(Julia) statement from Faculty Development Advisory; support having faculty add another year to the clock – suggestions about amendments – peer observations take up a significant amount of time (wasted labor) res states faculty may exclude observations, does not state excluded without prejudice – worry that reviewers will inadvertently

(Deans) address peer piece –not a problem with it - do not know what peer observation means for remote teaching / what does that mean when teaching remotely.

(Wood) many asked to make announcements. We will formally end the meeting– welcome anyone to stay for and make announcements.

Motion to Adjourn

Seconded.

Reports from Senate Committees (*As Needed*)

Reports from Other Committees/Centers on Campus

Intent to Raise Questions (ItRQ)

*Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the Senate webpage)

For the Good of the Order

Adjourn
(*Note: Senate business cannot continue past scheduled end time without motion*)
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Fall elections concluded – results shared; email from Senate
2 no nominations –elected lecturer rep to senate
PLC 1 member
Presumably Senate will put

Burris – will try to disseminate / adverse reaction to another student's video as a response because of flickering lights – something that is a huge urgent issue, in case anyone has students submitting gifs and videos – those susceptible are even more susceptible – add warning

Soto Mayor – rep at COAST have a call for funding for undergrad research – post information in chat – have a page to get updates – next call deadline Nov 20 Contact me or Dan for more details

Report from APPC – Jared; election of Francois now has full membership. local committee forming – may hear from LCC Chairs – finalizing forms for recent ES requirements. Staff finalizing items – compliance with new Ethnic Studies
Special taskforce to expeditiously address – goal iron out process, develop
Direct all questions to Jared Barton
Received email about 2nd in lecture series

Budget Town Hall on October 8 at 1 p.m. Updates, such as the Zoom link will be posted onto the SRPC website at https://www.csuci.edu/strategic-resource-planning/budget-forums.htm

Greg will ask Provost for extension on feedbacks – last candidate finishes at 4pm and was supposed to be 24 hours after last candidate

*Material to review prior to the meeting (available via the Senate webpage)