

**Academic Senate
Broom Library 1360
November 10, 2009
Minutes**

Attendance

Mary Adler, Terry Ballman, Bob Bleicher, Marilyn Buchanan, Geoffrey Buhl, Renny Christopher, Manuel Correia, Beatrice de Oca, Colleen Delaney-Rivera, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Marie Francois, Andrea Grove, Ivona Grzegorzczuk, Debi Hoffmann, Tiina Itkonen, Karen Jensen, Antonio Jiménez-Jiménez, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, Daniel Lee, Steve Lefevre, Kathryn Leonard, Alex McNeill, Jim Meriwether, Brad Monsma, Andrew Morris, Luda Popenhagen, Elizabeth Quintero, Carl Reed, Jack Reilly, Paul Rivera, Don Rodriguez, Alex See, Tom Schmidhauser, Peter Smith, Stephen Stratton, Kaia Tollefson, Billy Wagner, Greg Wood, Cindy Wyels.

Furloughed Faculty

Laura Newton, Eric Toshalis.

Approval of the Agenda

- Agenda amended to add a report from the Statewide Senators
- m/s K. Leonard, T. Itkonen
- approved as amended

Approval of the Minutes of October 20, 2009

- m/s K. Leonard, P. Rivera
- approved

Intent to Raise Questions

In response to J. Elliott's question about hand dryers in the restrooms

- -Deborah Wylie responded:" OPC has researched electric hand dryers, and has installed two in the Bell Tower (near Advising). Electric hand dryers are generally considered to be more hygienic, less expensive to operate over time, and cause less impact to the environment. We researched numerous models considering criteria such as: length of drying time; power required to operate (both amperage and overall usage); first cost of specific models; and decibels during operation.
- Generally, most CSUCI restrooms do not have adequate power (equivalent to a hand-held hair dryer) in the restroom at all. Most buildings do not have adequate spare power for hand dryers. Additionally, the existing concrete buildings amplify the sound and vibration generated by the dryers, adversely affecting adjacent spaces (classrooms and offices).
- The cost to purchase the hand dryers ranges from \$300 for 30-second dryers to \$1500 for 15-second dryers. Faster dryers are noisier. In any case, we estimate the initial cost to install a dryer in an existing building to be approximately \$2000 each, including the

additional electrical work required. We continue to research the units, and are seeing significant product improvements. OPC hopes to expand the trials on hand dryers when budget, product mix, and criteria are more aligned.”

In response to J. Elliott’s question about using washable dining ware

- -Dave Nirenberg responded with the following: “As Director of Commercial Services for University Glen Corporation, my primary duties are the oversight of the campus food operations. I can assure you that maximizing sustainability in the campus dining facilities at CSUCI is a primary goal. I am a new employee to the CI university environment and am pleased and proud to have been appointed by President Rush to the campus Sustainability Task Force.
- There are challenging physical plant limitations at Islands Café. The facility does not have a dishwasher of appropriate capacity or design to accommodate a reusable dish, silverware and glass program. Additionally, the existing dish room location is far from the dining room further exacerbating the possibility of simply installing a new dish machine.
- Sodexo is committed to providing sustainable packaging. More than 80% of the plates, silverware and cups that they utilize in their operation are sustainable using corn, bamboo, and potato starch byproducts as their primary component. Additionally, although they continue to offer trays as a convenience to their patrons, they market a ‘go trayless’ program as part of their sustainable program.”

In response to A. Jimenez-Jimenez’s question about military recruitment on campus

- -Steven Roskovich, General Counsel for the CSUCI: “A campus may choose to prohibit military recruiters or ROTC programs, but it will lose federal funding. Not much of a choice. Federal funding is at risk if a campus “prohibits, or in effect prevents, the Secretary of Defense from obtaining, for military recruiting purposes, entry to campuses, access to students on campus, access to directory information on students, or that has an anti-ROTC policy.” This has been interpreted as meaning that federal funding will be lost if the Dept. of Defense does not have at least the same access to students as any other potential employer. The campus does not have to necessarily “promote” military recruiting on campus, but it cannot prevent it unless it wants to lose federal funding.”

Report from the Chair

-Chair Hartung had no report

Statewide Senator Report

-Billy Wagner reported on the recent Statewide Senate meeting. They passed several resolutions, one of which requests money be reinstated for the purposes of research and scholarships. Another resolution calls for the CSU to designate March 2, 2010 as a day without the CSU, they will ask campus Presidents to declare that a campus closure day or ask faculty to designate that day as a furlough day.

New Business

SP 09-02: Policy on Evaluation of Chairs

-m/s G. Wood, M. Francois

-B. Bleicher spoke about the policy indicating there was currently no formal policy for the evaluation of chairs.

-J. Kilpatrick offered a friendly amendment.

-J. Elliott inquired what the evaluations would be used for and where will they go when completed? B. Bleicher replied that the evaluation will go into the personnel file after Dean Vaidya completes his review.

-A. McNeill asked why the evaluations were conducted in the final year of the Chairs' term?

-T. Ballman responded that Chairs were evaluated in the final year because they serve different terms depending on their program, some serve two year terms and others serve three year terms.

-A. McNeill asked why if the Dean is requested to use the CEC report in his evaluation is it only the Dean's report that goes into the personnel action file?

-I. Grzegorzcyk would like to know why only the Dean's report goes into the file? She is concerned about the Dean not following the recommendation of the committee in his report, she feels both evaluations should go into the personnel folder.

-S. Stratton asked if it was possible for the Chair to request both evaluations be placed in their folder? R. Christopher responded "yes."

-J. Elliott feels the repercussions should also be included in the policy in the event the Chair receives a negative evaluation.

SP 09-03: Academic Program Master Plan 2010-2017

-m/s B. de Oca, D. Hoffmanm.

-S. Lefevre and A. Morris spoke about the proposed updates to the AMP and the process once it is approved.

-There is an *Entertainment Studies* program that is currently being discussed in committee but it is not listed on the AMP yet.

-A degree in *Coastal Management* is also being discussed in committee right now.

-P. Rivera pointed out that the emphasis in Social Justice was listed in 2013 and the BA in Social Justice is listed in 2014, should they begin at the same time or should the emphasis be listed as a minor instead?

-B. Wagner pointed out that the BS in Science is listed in 2013 in the narrative and 2012 on the grid. S. Lefevre clarified that it will begin in 2012.

-A. Jimenez-Jimenez inquired about the Translation certificate and why it was not on the grid? S. Lefevre confirmed the certificate will be added to the grid to begin in 2011.

-P. Rivera expressed concern about only going forward with programs that had funding behind them, he feels that is not the way to build a comprehensive university. He requested a synopsis of how the decisions were made about when each of the programs would begin.

-S. Lefevre responded that last year the committee asked all program presenters to answer questions about their programs and how they relate to the mission of the university, the cost of the programs, etc. and the plan was developed based on those responses.

SR 09-03: New University Studies Program

-m/s-J. Elliott, K. Leonard.

-M. Francois thanked her colleagues on the GE task force, they have been working on this for the past two years. They have built on the work done by previous GE task forces. She proceeded to give the background on the development of the proposal submitted for approval. Former Provost Lucas had requested the task force be sure to incorporate the university mission and to include assessment in the proposal. The Chancellor's Office Executive Order on General Education was also a guiding document. The committee is now at a point where they need to make a decision in what direction to proceed. If everyone agrees they want to develop an outcome based GE but

only with the agreement of the entire faculty body. She requested everyone view the GE website and submit any comments to her.

-She then invited everyone to attend one of the Town Hall meetings scheduled to discuss the proposal. They are scheduled in the town center Conference room from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. on 11-10-09 and 11-18-09.

-J. Reilly asked about the requirement to hire an administrator for the new program and if with these financial crisis, it wouldn't be more prudent to instead assign a committee head to run the program. M. Francois responded that studies have shown the program operates better if there is consistency with the person in charge. J. Reilly inquired where the funding would come from, M. Francois did not have a response for that question.

-I. Grzegorzcyk thanked the committee for putting everything online. She is concerned that a lot of these requirements will be put on lecturers who are not interested in other requirements outside of teaching their class. She is also concerned about the additional bureaucracy this will create with the electronic portfolios, who will support that? Will IT support it? She is also concerned with how this will work with the STEM disciplines since they have such strict state requirements.

-S. Stratton responding about the costs of running the program, stating that we currently have the costs covered in other areas of the campus.

-K. Leonard likes the plan but is concerned about the possibility of her offering a course that is writing intensive who will review the writing portion? M. Francois says a writing rubric would be used in this situation. K. Leonard is concerned that her understanding of a writing rubric might be different than someone else's.

-A. Jimenez-Jimenez thanked Marie Francois for her leadership on this task. He asked if this plan would also work for students who are studying abroad?

-B. Monsma highlighted the benefits of the proposal adding that it would create a common experience for our students and something similar for our faculty. This mechanism also stores the information you are already collecting in your courses such as grading and evaluations for later purposes such as WASC.

Old Business

Substitution of SP 09-01: Definitions and Procedures for the Establishment and Continuance of Centers and Institutes

-Chair Hartung pointed out that D. Downey had made changes to the proposal based on the concerns raised at the last Senate meeting.

-D. Downey summarized the changes made.

-I. Grzegorzcyk pointed out that if the proposal was changed, there has to be a motion to substitute it.

-m/s M. Francois, J. Kilpatrick.

-M. Adler appreciates the changes and feels it will be useful to the Senate and others.

-K. Leonard called the question.

Vote taken

Yes: 32

No: 0

Policy Passed

Reports from Standing Committees

Committee on Centers and Institutes

-No Report

Committee on Committees

-No Report

Curriculum Committee

-They are impressed with data points

Fiscal Policies

-No Report

General Education

-No Report

Student Academic Policies and Procedures

-No Report

Professional Leave Committee

-They will have their first meeting next week.

Reports from other Committees

-A. Jimenez-Jimenez invited everyone to attend the events scheduled for *International Week*, November 16-20, 2009.

-A. Jimenez-Jimenez reminded everyone that the deadline to apply to be a Resident Director is December 1st, see him for more information.

-A. Grove announced that travel grants will be available, please see her for additional information.

Adjourn

-3:57 p.m.