

Academic Senate Meeting
Tuesday, April 14, 2009
Martin V. Smith Decision Center, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Minutes

Attendance

Virgil Adams, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Harley Baker, Julia Balén, Terry Ballman, Geoffrey Buhl, Catherine Burriss, Renny Christopher, Stephen Clark, Tracylee Clarke, Bill Cordeiro, Manuel Correia, Joanne Coville, Beatrice de Oca, Nancy Deans, Colleen Delaney-Rivera, Amy Denton, Jesse Elliott, Therese Eyermann, Steven Fleisher, Marie Francois, Scott Frisch, Jorge García, John Griffin, Debi Hoffmann, Antonio Jiménez-Jiménez, Liz King, Kristen LaBonte, Jill Leafstedt, Daniel Lee, Steve Lefevre, Kathryn Leonard, Jim Meriwether, Alex McNeill, Trudy Milburn, Alexandra Mitchell, Brad Monsma, Andrew Morris, Dennis Muraoka, Laura Newton, Dawn Neuman, Ed Nuhfer, Luda Popenhagen, Sue Saunders, Peter Smith, Stephen Stratton, Elnora Tayag, Ashish Vaidya, Billy Wagner, Amy Wallace, Ching-Hua Wang, Bill Wolfe, Greg Wood, Cindy Wyels.

Call to order

-2:35 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

-m/s-H.Baker, M. Francois

Approval of the Minutes of March 17, 2009

-m/s-K. Leonard, C. Burris.

-approved

Intent to Raise Questions

In response to question raise by Simone Aloisio at the last senate meeting on 3/17/09.

-S. Aloisio asked if President Rush would sign the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment, and if not, why not.

-Members of Senate can refer to the full text of Dr. Aloisio's question in the minutes of 3/17/09.

President Rush's response follows

"In the Intent to Raise Questions at the Academic Senate meeting of 17 March 2009, I was asked to "read and understand", the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment and to indicate why I have not signed it. Let me be clear from the outset. I have read and understood the Commitment and that is why I will not sign it at this time.

The Climate Commitment calls for carbon neutrality on campus. Because our fundamental obligation is to provide access for students with a State-expected target of 15,000 FTES, there is no way that we can remain carbon neutral until 2025. Moreover,

the costs incurred by subscribing to the Climate Commitment are beyond the scope of our ability to pay.

It is interesting to note that the Chronicle of Higher Education in its 6 March 2009 issue reports that "25% of the colleges that should have turned in their greenhouse-gas reports in September are still delinquent. Of the colleges that had a deadline in January, nearly half have yet to file." While most of these campuses are reported to be small or 2-year institutions, the underlying concern is not philosophical resistance, but economic reality. As the Chronicle goes on to state, "Formulating a plan to become climate neutral – one of the primary requirements of the Commitment – is much more complicated and will require far more resources." Without hesitation, I subscribe to the principles of sustainability and applaud the efforts which our campus has been making to create and foster such an environment, but I will not greenwash our efforts by signing a document simply for publicity while knowing, unequivocally, that we cannot possibly live up to the commitment.

The CSU is mandated under Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, to cut the State's greenhouse-gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees has directed CSU campuses to develop plans in response to this legislation. Our campus is participating in these good faith efforts, not the least of which is the adaptive reuse of this wonderful, old facility which requires sensitive attention in order to support our University programs and to meet the sustainable requirements of AB32.

Additional efforts might also include making climate neutrality and sustainability an integrated part of the curriculum, developing policies that support the purchase of ENERGY STAR certified products, and reduction of waste on campus. In fact, the University already is a strong participant in recycling and at 80%, far exceeds the required 50% waste stream recycling requirement. Notably, Channel Islands' efforts have helped ensure that the County of Ventura has met its pollution requirements – due to our high average.

That said, I did sign the Talloires Declaration: University Presidents for a Sustainable Future in March of 2007. The principles articulated in this commitment are ones which we can work to realize and to expand. I am also pleased with the progress of our campus response to my call for a Task Force on Sustainability and the conscious integration of environmentally sensitive principles and practices in the development of all aspects of our University.

I believe that a closer reading and a deeper understanding of the subtle implications involved in the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment would indicate why the signing of this particular document would be a hollow gesture for us at this time rather than a meaningful step forward. We have established environmental sustainability as a strategic initiative in our Strategic Plan 2008-2013 and pursued that with a thoughtful and thorough draft to "elevate sustainability as a core value and identity for CSUCI on campus and the region" through the good offices of our Task Force on

Sustainability. I find this approach to be, clearly, more valuable and productive than activities which generate heat rather than more light.

Refusal to sign one particular document does not lead to the conclusion that I or we are less committed to the goals of sustainability. It simply signifies that I and we are more committed to integrity in all of our actions.”

New Question

-J. Elliott inquired about the possibility of moving Commencement to the evening, in the future, in order to avoid the heat related issues cause by having it during the day.

Report from Provost Dawn Neuman

-Provost Neuman reported that she is in discussions regarding online degrees and distance education with the main emphasis being on access and blending learning.

-The General Education task force has done some interesting work and will be coming forward with discussions about GE.

-She is working with a group on revising the Academic Plan. With the recently hired Athletic Director, they are looking at possibly packaging some of the smaller programs together to make them cost effective.

Report from Senate Chair

-Chair Hartung reported on the Statewide Senate Chair’s meeting she recently attended in Long Beach, noting some of the topics of discussion were the budget, online degrees, and extensive discussion about evaluations of teaching and administration of teaching evaluation instruments, including on-line evaluations.

-Chair Hartung thanked everyone who has volunteered to run for one of the open Senate committee positions.

-Chair Hartung also thanked everyone who has attended Senate meetings on a regular basis this year, your attendance is appreciated.

Pilot Study Report from the SRT Task Force

-T. Ballman reviewed a power point presentation about the SRT results. Twenty-one of the 23 CSU campuses use their own evaluation forms. She reviewed the questions that she particularly liked on the new SRT form. She introduced the other members of a panel who were part of the pilot study:

-C. Delaney-Rivera stated she preferred the new form because it required students to be more reflective in their answers.

-N. Deans, lecturer in Chemistry, participated in the study, she preferred the new form because she felt it emphasized to the students that they need to take responsibility for themselves, she saw some responses where students admitted they needed to make more time for her class.

-S. Fleisher, lecturer in Psychology, also participated in the study and said he preferred the SRT because it provided more information than the original SETE.

-J. Leafstedt commented that it did not work for her student seminar course.

-H. Baker pointed out that was one of the strengths of the SRT because it can be crafted differently to meet the different needs of various classes.

- D. Hoffman asked those who participated in the study if there was anything they did not like about the SRT.
- N. Deans said there needs to be additional fine tuning when looking at how the results would apply to lecturers.
- J. Elliott inquired how the data would be reported in RTP files. He also inquired about the flexibility of the form for alternative types of courses. When will the form be finalized? When will they need to decide about online administration?
- R. Christopher reassured everyone that when files are reviewed they will take into consideration when the evaluation instrument was changed and if your scores begin to differ significantly from the scores previously received with the SETE, they will take that into consideration as well.
- A. Jiménez-Jiménez reminded everyone that the fact that it is our instrument is a big advantage, he has had trouble using the current SETE to evaluate his team-taught courses and his international courses.
- A. Denton followed up with J. Elliott's question about how this will be dealt with in regards to RTP. She would like to know when will these questions be decided? Will the SETE be done away with right away if the new procedure is approved? What is the timeline for implementation?
- A. McNeill clarified that if this instrument were approved, it would be used instead of the SETE. He feels there is a lot that needs to be clarified before voting on this.
- Chair Hartung suggested everyone consider it and forward any concerns to her prior to the next meeting.
- There were questions about how different departments would use different instruments.
- R. Christopher clarified that at some universities, the various Colleges kept their own personnel files and customize their own instruments, however, we only have one Faculty Affairs office and are only able to implement one instrument at this time.

First Reading Items

Senate Resolution 08-01 Student Ratings of Teaching Instrument

-m/s

Senate Resolution 08-02 Ratings of Teacher Instrument; Delivery of Evaluation Instruments

-m/s-S. Aloisio, G. Wood

-Faculty Affairs will distribute information about cost implications for the next meeting.

Second Reading Items

Article IV By-Laws (Quorum)

-Chair Hartung clarified that passing the motion today would permanently amend the By-Laws and reduce quorum to 40%.

-J. Elliott stated he was opposed to this motion because it would send the message that we do not need as many people to attend Senate meeting. He suggested instead allowing faculty to "opt-out" of being a Senator for a semester, if they do not plan to attend, in order to lower the quorum numbers.

-G. Wood pointed out that many times, when we've lost quorum, we've been below 40%.

-S. Stratton stated that most faculty have more than enough opportunity to attend Senate meetings if they wish and faculty essentially vote by not attending.

-K. Leonard offered a friendly amendment, seconded by T. Clarke. The amendment would allow faculty to “opt-out” if they were unable to attend Senate.

-B. Monsma expressed concern at faculty being forced to give up their voting rights if they were unable to attend due to teaching assignments, he suggested instead allowing faculty to vote absentee.

-A. Jiménez-Jiménez said the fact that we know when the Senate meets should allow most faculty to adjust their teaching schedules so they can attend. He believes it is a social responsibility, we are all responsible for the items being discussed, he reminds everyone that we are still building a University here.

-G. Wood is concerned how absentee ballots would be counted when amendments to policies are made on the floor of the Senate.

-There was discussion about what would happen when a faculty member chose to “opt-out” for a semester and then was able to make a meeting, would they be allowed to vote at that meeting?

-J. Griffin pointed out that absentee voting would not solve the quorum issue, there may still not be enough bodies to conduct business.

-S. Stratton reminded everyone that even when we had a *University Hour*, we still had trouble meeting quorum at times, he feels people are voting with their feet.

Vote on K. Leonard’s amendment taken by secret ballot

Yes: 16

No: 25

Amendment fails

Vote on lowering Senate quorum

Yes: 29

No: 11

Abstain: 1

Passed

Vote on items going forward on policy template taken by show of hands

-Approved unanimously

SP 08-14 Sabbatical Leave Policy

-M. Francois reviewed the recommended changes

-B. Wolfe asked what would happen to points that had been previously accrued through the existing policy? M. Francois clarified that those points would no longer exist if this new policy is approved.

-R. Christopher reviewed the background of this proposal, adding that if approved, the final decision would be left up to the Professional Leave Committee, whereas the current policy leaves the decision up to the Provost.

-B. Wolfe stated he was in favor of seniority being a consideration because if merit is emphasized, who decides what is meritorious? He added that with a seniority system, you at least know you’ve gained something.

-Provost Neuman stated she would rather the faculty decide what is meritorious.

-J. Kilpatrick expressed concern with the current point system and people applying just to accrue points, not necessarily because they are meritorious.

Vote on policy taken by secret ballot

Yes: 20

No: 13

Policy passed

SP 08-15 Policy to Create an Institute for Economic Research

-C. Delaney-Rivera offered a friendly amendment to add “global” to the name, seconded by D. Lee.

-New name will be *Institute for Global Economic Research*

Vote taken by show of hands

Yes: 30

No: 0

Abstain: 1

Policy passed

Report from Standing Committees

Committee on Committees

-A question and answer session for candidates for Senate offices has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 21st, at 2:30 p.m.

Curriculum Committee

-The committee will be looking at “stale” courses (courses that have not been offered in three years).

-The Curriculum Long Form will be revised.

Announcements

-Chair Hartung announced that the Camarillo Regional Park, a 370 acre property, has been given to the University to maintain as a natural park and outdoor environmental science classroom.

-J. Yudelson reminded everyone that local CFA chapter elections would be held the following week.

-J. Garcéa invited everyone to attend the *Noche de Fiesta*, scheduled for Wednesday, April 15th, at 6:00 p.m.

-J. Kilpatrick invited everyone to attend “Once in a Lifetime” play being performed by the Performing Arts students beginning Friday, April 17th. Performances sponsored in part by *Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics*.

-J. Balén reminded everyone to sign up for the *SAFE* on campus training workshops scheduled on April 15th and April 24th.

Adjourn

-4:25 p.m.