



ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Meeting Minutes Academic Senate

Del Norte 1500

Tuesday, March 11, 2025

2:30-4:30pm

This meeting offers a virtual option through Zoom:

<https://csuci.zoom.us/j/81836938613>

Present: Alison Perchuk, Annie White, Antonio Jimenez, Billy Munroe, Cameron Harris, Chris Scholl, Chuck Weis, Cindy Sherman, Colleen Forest, Cynthia County, E. Nicole Vines, Gareth Harris, Ivona Grzegorzcyk, Jaime Matera, Janet Pinkley, Jared Barton, Jeannette Edwards, Lily Tamai (also proxy for Jose Alamillo), Jose Luis Callazo, Kevin Hayakawa, Kimmy Kee-Rose, Kristen Dobson, Lance Nolde, Manuel Correia, Mari Estrada, Maria Ballesteros Sola (also proxy for Tiina Itkonen), Marianne McGrath, Mary Adler, Matt Campbell, Megan Kenny Feister, Monica Pereira, Monica Rivas, Nancy Deans, Neomie Congello, Peter Krause, Ron Berkowsky, Sean Anderson, Sean Kramer, Susan Lefevre, Tabitha Swan-Wood, Taryn Hakala, Theresa Avila, Tom Clobes, Weldon Smith, Christina Smith, Georgina Guzman, Andrea Grove, Greg Wood, Michelle Hasendonckx, Phil Hampton,

1. Opening the Meeting
 - a. Meeting called to order at 2:47pm, after determining quorum.
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Motion to add item **“Resolution from History Department” to New Business Item 6d.**
 - i. Motion – Lance
 - ii. Second – Monica
 - iii. No objections and motion accepted by unanimous consent. Agenda amended and item 6d. added.
 - b. Motion to approve amended agenda
 - i. Motion – Chuck
 - ii. Second – Chris S.
 - iii. No objections and motion accepted by unanimous consent. Agenda approved.
3. Approval of the Minutes from February 25, 2025 (attached)
 - a. Motion - Chuck
 - b. Second - Susan
 - c. No objections and motion accepted by unanimous consent. Minutes approved.

4. Report from the Chair – entire report available on [Canvas](#)
 - a. Thanks to Matt for filling in as Chair and thank you to those who have purchased girl scout cookies and donating them to the dolphin pantry.
 - b. The call for Exceptional Service Award is posted on our Canvas Page
 - c. GE course review process: announcement from AP Office
 - d. Provost Search: deadline has closed. We received a robust pool of applicants and will be conducting interviews after spring break.
 - e. Two academic programs for a second reading: this body previously agreed to not approve new programs until we see AMP prioritization plan from Interim Provost. Senate Exec. has let this body decide how to move forward.
 - f. Instructional cuts: we will be losing people who have dedicated their careers to this institution. Staff, faculty, admin are affected by the layoffs. It's time to collaborate to make sure we are meeting the educational needs of our students.
5. Returning Business
 - a. [B.A. Spanish-English Translation Degree Program Proposal](#)) - Javier & Antonio presenting
 - i. Motion to deny approval
 1. Motion – Sean A.
 2. Second – Nancy
 3. Discussion:
 - a. Sean – I think this is a fantastic program, but how can we afford a new program if we're cutting at least 1/5 of my instructors? I don't see the path forward.
 - b. Ivona – approval doesn't mean implementation. Having approved programs makes it stronger to advocate for funds in future.
 - c. Alison – I'm in favor of denying approval. Concerns around consistency and procedure, we said we were waiting for prioritized AMP and we have not seen it.
 - d. Antonio – this program aims to increase enrollment in a cheap way. This program has received approval with a Fall 26 start date by the Interim Provost. I would request to table the proposal rather than deny.
 - e. Nancy – we think this is a good program. But we had decided as a body not to move forward until we have that plan. We are decimating programs we already have; we do not have enough units in A&S to have courses for full-time NTTF. This is irresponsible.
 - f. Javier – this would help bring back faculty we would have to let go. All professors except one have experience translating and interpreting. I agree with Antonio to table rather than deny.
 4. Withdraw motion – Sean A.

5. Withdraw second – Nancy
- ii. Motion to table proposal both Returning Business items 5a and 5b until May 1st
 1. Motion – Sean
 2. Second – Ivona
 3. Discussion:
 - a. Antonio – thank you for withdrawing denial motion. If this comes back later in the semester, it won't be in effect until 2027. It needs to be approved a year ahead of implementation. Reminder that the courses will be online and will attract students outside of our local region. Students would also take UEDGE courses.
 - b. Marianne – as a chair of a dept that has a program in limbo, I see the need and small impact it would take to push this degree program into place. I also understand our procedural needs.
 - c. Mari – are there other colleges or community colleges with this program?
 - i. Javier – no, we are unique in the region with this program as an undergrad degree.
 - d. Megan – with concerns on enrollment, isn't this a decision for the Spanish dept? They would have to decide who they will staff and when. I want to tentatively raise consideration to approve the proposal. What else are we doing to fix enrollment, if not these low-cost moves?
 - e. Sean K. – if Senate approves, can you say that this isn't until the 27 catalog?
 - i. Javier – I don't have an answer. Interim Provost said it is approved now for Fall 26 start date.
 - f. Interim Provost – my meeting with APPC is this Thursday. AMP implementation is ready, I want to present it to APPC first. Yes, the body can say it could be implemented Fall 26 or Fall 27.
 - i. Alison – thank you Provost. This body has requested the prioritized AMP and wouldn't approve new programs until we receive it. I hear an indication it will be available soon. Can you tell us where this proposal is in that prioritization plan?
 - ii. Jessica – scheduled Fall 2026 launch so long as we get approval from this body this semester.

- g. Cindy – we know enough about the program and when it would be implemented. I'd like us to get back on track, there is a motion on the floor.
 - iii. Motion amended – Motion to table proposal both Returning Business items 5a and 5b until April 1st
 - 1. Motion – Sean A.
 - 2. Second – Ivona
 - 3. Any objections?
 - a. Objection – Antonio
 - 4. Vote – Yes: 25, no: 10, abstain: 4
 - iv. Motion passes. Items tabled until April 1st.
 - b. Minor in Bilingual Education (see attached)
- 6. New Business
 - a. Bylaws Revisions (see 4 documents attached) - Alison presenting
 - i. Alison shares PowerPoint.
 - ii. Discussion:
 - 1. Jose Luis – can you clarify “one position one vote” vs. “one person one vote”?
 - a. Alison – let’s say for example that I am in the Senate with two voting seats. If we have “one individual one vote”, then I could only hold one of those seats or I could only cast one vote, and I would have to weigh the competing interests. If we have “one position one vote”, I can hold two seats. And I can vote with one interest in one, another interest in the other.
 - 2. Kathleen – is it possible to get or see references to other univs that have a “one position one vote” policy?
 - a. Alison – we can give guidance to view other Senate’s documents.
 - 3. Sean A. – I have a request to outline the expectation of voting. There are an unusually high number of abstaining votes.
 - a. Alison – can you send possible language to the senate appointments email and include where in the document that would best fit.
 - 4. Chuck – as a reminder to senators, every amendment that happens on the floor requires a vote.
 - a. Alison – and the documents are interlocking. Change introduces inconsistencies.
 - 5. President Yao – related to Sean’s feedback, it was required when you abstained to state your conflict of interest.
 - b. [Policy on GE Course Requirements](#)
 - i. [Revision Memo regarding Policy on GE Course Requirements](#)
 - ii. [Powerpoint for Senate Presentation of GE Course Requirements](#)

- iii. Motion to accept
 - 1. Motion – Monica
 - 2. Second – Megan
- iv. Marie shares PowerPoint.
- v. Discussion:
 - 1. Sean A. – in the fall we had 3 different proposals.
 - a. Marie – in fall, you passed the SLO policy. This is the second. Third one on missions is still in development.
 - b. Sean – I thought that the talk was in compliance of GE overhaul. Sounds like we are extending it by a year.
 - c. Marie – brand new students will all be on a new catalog. For continuing students, we are holding them harmless with the memo.
- vi. Motion accepted by unanimous consent.
- c. NTTF Policy to Revise NTTF Titles (see attached) - Nancy presenting.
 - i. Motion to accept
 - 1. Motion – Monica
 - 2. Second – Mari
 - ii. Nancy shares PowerPoint.
 - iii. Discussion:
 - 1. Annie – colleagues asked me to relay this information: the process wasn't clear on how to determine ranks. Are other CSUs doing this? Does the CO know about this request? Are we the first in CSU to do this? Can there be a second brown bag for faculty that teaches during the day? The report is very lengthy, will there be a summary with the main points?
 - a. Nancy – the process is range elevation. We can talk about the other points.
 - 2. Cindy – my question is financial considerations and if they've been thought out - printing cards, etc. It is still unclear how the title changes.
 - a. Nancy – I understand the issues. The timeline is like tenure process. We just match it with the range elevation. Maybe we can add an attachment to the policy. Making a note about financial implications.
 - 3. Kathleen – I would encourage you all to read through the document. If campus can afford to create a logo, a few business cards would be handy. I would encourage us to be the trailblazers. First CSU to have direct self-placement, now most campuses have that.
 - 4. Alison – I concur. It's entirely appropriate, recognizes colleagues, helps students who need recommendation letters with titles on them.

- iv. Motion accepted by unanimous consent.
- v. Motion to extend 15 minutes
 - 1. Motion – Nancy
 - 2. Second – Monica P.
- vi. Motion accepted by unanimous consent.
- d. Resolution from History Department – Lance presenting**
 - i. Motions to accept
 - 1. Motion – Monica P.
 - 2. Second – Alison
 - ii. Discussion:
 - 1. Lance – this was written to encourage the President and Interim Provost to halt budget cuts and reduction in course offerings. This limits student access to required courses; it hurts students and long term NTTF. As the History dept. notes in the resolution, it contradicts our university goal to stabilize enrollment. Resources are being allocated to rebranding instead of enrollment. We request immediate and correct adaptation.
 - 2. Brian – I fully support.
 - iii. Motion accepted by unanimous consent.
- 7. Intent to Raise Questions
 - a. No answers to report, two are still in progress. Lina Neto has a response in progress. Sean A.'s question is still outstanding but being worked on.
 - b. No new questions.
- 8. Reports (full reports available via Canvas)
 - a. Report from President Yao – President Yao reporting
 - i. I will comment on the dialogue around budget, instructional budget, WTU allocation: the focus is on having the least impact on students with reduction of WTU allocation. Same concern shared with everybody here. It is part of planning processes, reducing instructional budget with declining enrollment. With previous Provost Mitch – with higher enrollment, he ensured flexibility, so students had courses they needed. Course schedules were not always built on demand. Goal was to put this in place so FTS numbers align with instructional budget and targets of those planning on campus. I am hoping to build out a model of the campus schedule with real time student demand data. It will show us if we offer courses students need and whether we are delaying them in graduating. There are nuances in this, it is far from ideal but trying to mitigate delays in degree completion.
 - ii. Questions:
 - 1. Ivona – follow up on LA times article saying our student population is same as 2013, but admin population increased 14%. Do we have plans to cut admin positions?

- a. Yao – of course MPPs are part of staffing plan. Part of \$11M cut and part of the plan moving forward. Largest increase has been in T/TT faculty. If we increase T/TTF, decrease hiring of NTTF. Lecture faculty has taken cuts and decreasing number of NTTF. We have 79% in T/TTF.
 - b. Ivona – our NTTF will be cut and yet I will not see any MPPs reduced. Our faculty support has been cut as well. If we cut lower end, we must cut higher end too.
 - c. Yao – Thanks Ivona, noted.
2. Marianne – could that data resource be shared with chairs?
- a. Yao – it is on the budget planning website. I'll send out to chairs.
 - b. Marianne – the ask of our dept will fundamentally change our program. We need guidance on how to approach this. What do I cut? What do I prioritize? Decisions made will be long lasting.
 - c. Yao – I am working with the Interim Provost and Deans. The challenge is a timing misalignment with Early Exit programs for staff and faculty at the same time we are building the schedule. We can get clarity after rolling out Early Exit plan. Hoping to provide as much direct support as possible.
3. Christina – echoing Marianne's point about GEs. Chairs are being asked to choose GE or courses that serve the major.
- a. Yao – the context is helpful. I hope real time demand data will be helpful.
4. Tabitha – I'm going to push back on the tenure percentage idea. In 2013 T/TT density was 37.5%, compared to every other CSU being close to or over 60%. Our idea that T/TT has raised so much or more than MPPs is a problematic argument, we were so low on T/TT density, and we needed to raise.
- a. Yao – I don't disagree, and I appreciate the feedback. Just a benchmarking datapoint with context. Not using that as a direct comparison to management.
5. Cindy – do we have an updated timeline of Early Exit program for those of us making schedules?
- a. Yao – we are at the bargaining tables. I'm not sure of the timeline process. Hoping to make progress soon.
 - b. Greg – we had our first meeting today. We asked for slight modifications, hoping to hear back Monday. Adding context to previous point – state funding to CSU has increased theatrically, which is how we can afford increase in TT and MPPs. The funding came to

us to increase TT, because our tenured faculty density was so low.

- b. Report from Interim Provost Lavariega Monforti – no report due to time.
Report on [Canvas](#).
 - c. Report from Statewide Senators – no report due to time.
 - d. Report from CFA President – no report due to time.
 - e. Report from Staff Council – no report due to time.
 - f. Report from NTTF Council – no report due to time.
 - g. Report from ASI – no report due to time.
 - h. Reports from Senate Committees – no reports due to time.
 - i. Appointments, Elections, and Bylaws (AEBC)
 - ii. Academic Policy and Planning (APPC)
 - iii. Senate Budget (SBC)
 - iv. Equity and Anti-Racism (CEAR)
 - v. Faculty Affairs (FAC)
 - vi. Student Academic Policies and Procedures (SAPP)
 - vii. Others
9. Adjourn
- a. Motions
 - i. Motion – Jose Luis
 - ii. Second – Weldon
 - b. Meeting adjourned at 4:46pm.