

**Senate Meeting Minutes**  
February 18, 2016  
3:00 – 5:00, Student Center Ballroom A

**Abstract**

Chair Report. Agenda – Approved. Minutes delayed. President Report. Provost Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Vice Chair Report. Revision to the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion policy approved. Student Affairs Report. Associated Students Report. Statewide Senators Reports. EPC Report. FSAC Report. SAC Report. CFA Report. Staff Report.

**Present:** Richard J. Senghas, Carmen Works, Tom Targett, Catherine Nelson, Deborah Roberts, Sakina Bryant, Joshua Glasgow, Karen Thompson, Florence Bouvet, Jennifer Mahdavi, Laura Krier, Sunil Tiwari, Mary Ellen Wilkosz, Matty Mookerjee, Lauren Morimoto, Suzanne Rivoire, Rheyna Laney, Michael Pinkston, Hope Ortiz, Ruben Armiñana, Andrew Rogerson, Elaine Newman, Brandon Mercer, Ana Tongilava, Katie Musick, Ed Beebout, Ron Lopez

**Absent:** Michaela Grobbel, Matthew James, Jennifer Roberson, Michelle Jolly, Michelle Goman, Melissa Garvin, Laura Watt

**Proxies:** Tammy Kenber for Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Mark Fabionar for Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Ben Ford for Sam Brannen

**Guests:** Paula Hammett, Richard Whitkus, Melinda Barnard

**Chair Report – R. Senghas**

R. Senghas reported on the Council of Academic Senate chairs meeting the past week. One item that will require campus involvement concerned bringing the campus intellectual property rights policy in line with system policy. They discussed the quantitative reasoning requirement issues and heard that many campuses were concerned that this was a pathway that focused on statistics and had minimal focus on algebra. This was limiting the disciplinary options when students arrive at CSU campuses. They discussed the conflict of interest issue at Fullerton regarding textbooks. He was able to speak to L. Lamb, the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources about the Presidential Search process. He suggested that in the future those on the campus search committee should be able to contact references directly. He noted that the policy regarding Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters was out of date and he would be bringing that forward to governance committees for review. He reported that faculty leadership met with Dr. Sakaki during her campus visit.

**Approval of Agenda – Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes – Minutes delayed.**

## **Consent Item: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – Approved.**

### **President Report – R. Armiñana**

R. Armiñana said “all was quiet on the western front”, but the eastern front may be different. A member said there were three items in the recent STAR newspaper that were jarring. One had to do with the lack of counselors in Counseling and Psychological Services, one was the CFA op-ed about faculty salaries, and one was the article about Lobovision and its cost of \$300,000. She expressed concern about the priorities on the campus and asked the President to address these issues. The President said resources had different categories and could not move between categories. The money for Lobovision was part of the Student Center construction budget and thus had to be used for construction. For Psychological Services, he saw a need there and said they were looking at creative ways to finance the need and perhaps combining CAPS with the Health Center. Regarding the faculty salary issue, he said there are playbooks for both parties which were playing out appropriately.

### **Provost Report – A. Rogerson**

A. Rogerson said there was 18 tenure track searches currently and also searches for 9 visiting faculty. He said about 50% of the searches were closed. He had asked the Deans for their numbers of essential hires. Currently, that number was 14, but he knew it would increase. He was just gathering numbers now and the new President would have to weigh in on that. A member asked if it was possible for faculty to drop students on the waitlist who do not show up for class. This was a particular problem for high demand classes. A. Rogerson said he would look into the issue. A member asked if there was an operative definition of “essential hires.” A. Rogerson said they were asking what departments could not put on their program if faculty members were not replaced. He offered that he was open to other definitions. A member noted that interim candidates seemed to often obtain the position they are in permanently when the search is completed. She asked if there could be a process that would include faculty for these interim appointments. The President said no. Interim appointments were temporary, if the incumbent competes on a equal level with all other candidates, then that was fair.

### **Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – T. Kenber for L. Furukawa-Schlereth**

T. Kenber had no report. A member asked about the report going around campus with the results of the asbestos testing and asked when that report and response be communicated to the campus. T. Kenber said she had not seen the report, but knew the testing had taken place and expected a communication from the campus within a week or two. A member asked for specifics in the report for Stevenson Hall. B. Ford quoted the report – “Levels above 100,000 per square centimeter are considered high and in the range of a significant accidental release from an abatement site” He said a couple of the air handlers in Stevenson were significantly above 100,000 per square centimeter. A member said she was asked to bring forward the continuing concern about the cleanliness of campus bathrooms and the lack of custodians. A member asked about the progress of the pavilion at the Green Music Center. T.

Kenber said she thought it was a go and would ask L. Furukawa-Schlereth to report on that. The President said they were waiting for the legal authority to proceed. He thought there would be ground breaking in early June and the project would take six months.

### **Vice Chair Report – C. Works**

C. Works reported that S&F decided to have the Chair of the Faculty or designee to represent the faculty on the Distinguished Alumni Committee. Two faculty were appointed to the AVP Search for Academic Programs – Carmen Works and Lauren Morimoto. The nominations were open for the general election and she listed the positions needing nominations. S&F also discussed how to get the new committee, APARC, up and running. She reported on the search for the Director of the Faculty Center. This search was on-going and the previously appointed faculty for that search would continue until a candidate was hired.

### **Revision to the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion policy – Second Reading – E. Beebout, P. Hammett**

The Chair cautioned the membership against making motions for text clean up of the policy and asked for them to focus on the more substantive issues. E. Beebout said he appreciated all the input that FSAC had received during this process. He thought they had met their original charge to reduce workload and streamline the process. P. Hammett discussed the concerns and recommendations brought forward at the first reading. She asked that the changes below be added to the current policy revision.

Concerns	Actions	Affected sections
1. Wording about when the policy goes into effect	Change "in the review cycle" to: "at the beginning of the academic year..."	p2, LA.3
2. Self-assessment -- "continuing strengths"	Delete "continuing"	p 3, LB.3.b.ii and p5 I.C.4.a
3. Be consistent in order of list items	Swap positions of iii and iv for parallel construction	p. 3, I.B.3.b

4. School-level reviews for 3rd and 5th years	<p>Consulted with school RTP members; consensus that school reviews are-valuable in 3rd and 5th years. May affect ability to shorten calendar for 3rd &amp; 5<sup>th</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change to "Department and School RTP Committees and the Deans."</li> <li>• Change chart at end of policy to "Department, School &amp;</li> <li>• Dean"</li> <li>• Change revised draft calendar under 3rd &amp; 5th</li> </ul>	p.8, I. G. I. c.
5. Candidates with 1 year service credit receive two short reviews before a full review in 4th year (short, short, long, short, long). Concern that candidates need more.	<p>Discussed changing to pattern of short, long, long, short, long.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from tenure-track candidates and PDS, is to simplify and make it easier for candidates early in the process.</li> <li>• Candidates with 1 or 2 years service credit both get two full reviews</li> <li>• Plenty of opportunity to give feedback in short reviews</li> <li>• Greater benefit to the candidates not to have to prepare full files.</li> </ul>	No change
6. Minor text changes missed in previous draft	<p>Clarified "2nd / 2nd at SSU"</p> <p>Grammatical change "which" to "that"</p>	<p>p 10, I.G.5.b</p> <p>p 10, I. I.5</p>

**Motion to adopt these changes as a set. Second. Approved.** A member asked for clarification on the number of peer evaluations. P. Hammett said for peer evaluation, the policy stated at least one and up to two. A member said he had heard concern from a faculty member who had not received enough feedback in his RTP process. Could a faculty member ask URTP to weigh in, no matter what the recommendations were? P. Hammett said FSAC did discuss this and wanted to encourage the department RTP committees to put substantive and meaningful comments in both types of reviews. The member continued by requesting one document for tenure and promotion in all cases. M. Barnard responded that by asking for early promotion, the reappointment process would still need to be followed, so that required two documents. The member asked if a full document in the 5<sup>th</sup> year could stand in for this process. M. Barnard said that in the 5<sup>th</sup> year, URTP does not review the documents and if this was done for early promotion, the faculty member would have to be tracked individually. P. Hammett said FSAC did have

long discussions about this. A member noted that short and long reviews did not seem to be very different currently and asked if there could be more distinction or more simplification. P. Hammett said FSAC thought it was cleaner for candidates to just be able to look at what applies in their circumstance. A member was concerned about the limit of two peer evaluations and asked why the limit was set, given that the SETEs were practically meaningless. P. Hammett said in FSAC's thinking this had to do with workload issues. A member clarified that both the faculty member and the department could ask for another peer evaluation. **Motion to change at least one peer evaluation to two peer evaluations. Second.** There was discussion centering on the value of peer evaluation and workload concerns. The Chair asked for a pause to give time for a report.

#### **Student Affairs Report – M. Fabionar for M. Lopez-Phillips**

M. Fabionar reported that the proposal for a campus Dream Center had been drafted and would go to several committees for input and then on to the President. He noted that CAPS had a number of support groups running this semester. He passed out a handout.

#### **Return to RTP policy revision**

There was further discussion about whether more peer evaluations advantaged candidates. It was suggested that encouraging language be added about using more evidence to talk about teaching effectiveness. The maximum number on peer evaluations was questioned. A member questioned whether teacher reflection on teaching was appropriate for the RTP venue. E. Beebout noted that peer evaluations vary wildly and it was more important to create a culture where departments provided thoughtful and meaningful evaluations. **Motion to call the question. Second. Approved. Vote on motion to change at least one peer evaluation to two peer evaluations. Failed. Motion to amend that periodic review include one peer observation from the current review cycle and two peer observations for a performance review in the current review cycle. Second. Vote on motion – hand count yes = 12; no = 7. Approved. Motion to revert back to department and dean review only for periodic reviews. Second.** The proposer thought that school RTP committees could do peer reviews instead and reminded the members that evaluators did not need to come from the candidates' department or school. A member argued against the motion stating that a broader review helped the candidates, would benefit the periodic review process and would also help departments in cases where department priorities and Dean priorities differed. **Vote on motion = Failed. Vote on entire policy including amendments = Approved.**

#### **Associated Students Report – B. Mercer**

No report. A member asked how the student issue open forum went. B. Mercer said the open forum went very well. R. Ernst attended to answer questions about Lobovision. They hoped to do more open forums.

## **Statewide Senators Reports – D. Roberts, C. Nelson**

D. Roberts reported on the statewide Faculty Affairs committee. They worked on the background check policy. She noted the recent article in the LA times where an ex-felon who was hired as faculty gave his perspective on the background check policy. They also discussed RISCAs funding and she said \$2.5 million was restored in this year's budget. However, this amount did not come close to the funding needs for faculty. They would continue to work on this. She reported that the Academic Freedom Task Force was put on hold by the Chancellor's office as they were waiting for CFA to weigh in. The Faculty Affairs Committee proposed a task force of the Senate, the Chancellor's office and CFA, which would allow the issue to move forward. C. Nelson reported that the Quantitative Task force would meet in Sacramento the next week. She would report back on that and they hoped for recommendations by the end. She also attended the system wide Commission on Online Education meeting. They talked about the numbers of online course and programs in the CSU and how to ensure quality education in online courses. There were concerns that some faculty were posting their courses online and not interacting with students very much. In the Academic Affairs committee, which she chairs, they talked about transfer issues and heard many reports on CSU involvement in grant activities which include transfer students. They were also trying to figure out if creating more disciplinary councils in CSU would be beneficial. The Chair noted that L. Lamb talked about the background check policy at the Council of Senate Chairs meeting. She had told them that only one person, so far, was denied employment and that was due to lewd conduct with a minor. She said most of the time they are looking for felony convictions that are relevant. She said they found that many campuses were doing too many background checks and was alerting the campus to exactly what was required. The background checks only went back seven years. D. Roberts said that what the Chair said about the faculty member not hired violates confidentiality. A member noted that community colleges always do fingerprints and background checks due to being part of the K-14 system and being connected to elementary schools. He said there was a uniformity among all the community colleges and thought if the CSU had uniformity, it would not be such a problem. He also noted that a man who is convicted in his youth for a sex related crime, can be haunted by this for the rest of his life. A member noted that the entire Academic Affairs committee has had questions about the whole process of the background check policy and L. Lamb's approach in the process. M. Barnard said she was the one that looked at background checks. She said she really just scans them for red flags and even those are not discussed. Her one area of concern was when she sees DUI convictions and a faculty member wants to take students out on a field trip. She had to make sure the field trip form was completely and accurately filled out. She noted that the policy did not hold anyone up from entering the classroom.

## **EPC Report given by R. Senghas**

R. Senghas reported that EPC would be sending forward revisions to the Kinesiology Masters program as well and discontinuances of two Kinesiology concentrations.

### **FSAC Report – E. Beebout**

E. Beebout reported that FSAC finished their work on the Educational Enhancement Awards. They will notify the faculty that will receive this award next week. They also decided to work on guidelines or recommendations for faculty office hours. A member noted that the research was showing that SETEs were unreliable and he noticed a significant drop in student responses when the SETEs went electronic. He asked if the University could address this issue. E. Beebout thought M. Barnard was tracking the issue. He said FSAC recommended time in classes for SETEs. M. Barnard said the response rates vary from 100% to 0%. What they have found useful was having students do them in the class, explaining why they are important, and using email to follow up. She noted that the faculty contract really limited what the university could do and if there was change needed, the contract needed to change. A member asked for FSAC to bring the data about SETE response rates to the Senate. M. Barnard asked for her to be specific about her request. A member noted that at her graduate school, they held grades until students did the SETEs. R. Senghas said he had sent to FSAC the information about participating in the Affordable Textbook Initiative and being able to receive \$50,000 for that effort for the campus. He hoped they would provide a campus response.

### **Student Affairs Report – R. Lopez**

R. Lopez reported that SAC continued to discuss the housing deposit issues for low income students. They were visited by N. Hendry and L. Morimoto and found that the process was very complicated. They were asking for more information about the disqualification issue and wanted more breakdown of the data. He argued that the University should attempt to try again to receive the grant for the CAMP program which served first generation students from migrant families in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. He thought this would be helpful to the Dreamer's project on campus and help cast a wider net for these students and encourage sustained effort.

### **CFA Report – E. Newman**

E. Newman reported that the strike dates would be April 13 – 19. If the fact finding, does not provide an agreement, then all 23 campuses will strike those 5 days. She had been going around to all the departments and was hearing support for the strike and the Union's request for the 5% cost of living raise and the 2.5% step increase. Strike pledge cards were now available. She encouraged the faculty to not do any faculty work during the strike, to cancel classes, tell students not to come to campus, not to hold office hours, not to schedule any committee work, and put an automatic email message out. She said faculty could talk to the students about how a wage increase would improve the quality of their education. On February 24, they would hold a nuts and bolts meeting for lecturers and they would also focus on lecturer questions about the strike. A member asked what CFA's plans were if there was no settlement after the strike. E. Newman said dramatic escalation was warranted, but not specifics plans were known yet.

### **Staff Representative Report – K. Musick**

K. Musick noted how difficult it was to represent the Staff, since they were not a committee. She was starting to meet with some folks informally and felt that would help her in the future.

### **Adjourned.**

*Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes*