

Academic Senate Meeting

October 20, 2009

Minutes

Attendance

Mary Adler, Terry Ballman, Bob Bleicher, Geoffrey Buhl, Renny Christopher, Tracylee Clarke, Beatrice de Oca, Colleen Delaney-Rivera, Amy Denton, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Marie Francois, Scott Frisch, Nancy Gill, Andrea Grove, Ivona Grzegorczyk, Debi Hoffmann, Tiina Itkonen, Antonio Jiménez-Jiménez, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, Daniel Lee, Kathryn Leonard, Alex McNeill, Jim Meriwether, Brad Monsma, Dawn Neuman, Laura Newton, Luda Popenhagen, Carl Reed, Tom Schmidhauser, Jaye Smith, Peter Smith, Steve Stratton, Elnora Tayag, Kaia Tollefson, Ashish Vaidya, Billy Wagner, Amy Wallace, Dan Wakelee, Greg Wood.

Approval of Agenda

-approved

Approval of the Minutes of September 29, 2009

-J. Elliott asked that his name be added to the Furlough faculty list.

-approved as amended.

Intent to Raise Questions

-In response to J. Elliott's question about copying costs: Fah Azarmsn, Cove Bookstore Manager, replied....."I would like to sincerely apologize for any inconveniences that this issue has caused for Professor Jesse Elliott, or any of our students. As a bookstore Manager, it has been my mission to satisfy our students, faculty, and our staff. The issue has already been resolved to the best of my ability. Xanadu was the very first custom publisher that we have tried for producing course packs or readers for our students. Their prices were not satisfactory to the bookstore's standards, as well as our faculty and students expectations. We have been contacting a few more custom publishers, i.e. LAD, University Custom Publishing. We are currently awaiting several price estimates from the above publishers before we determine who can offer the most reasonable prices for our students, for the next semester. Prior to publishing the course package, for any faculty, the estimated prices will be shared with the professor to achieve complete satisfaction for our faculty as well as our students. Again, please accept my apology for this very unfortunate incident."

-In response to A. Jimenez-Jimenez's question about using 100% recycled paper on campus: Missy Jarnagin replied...."We have several reasons why we do not use 100% recycled paper. First is the price difference, it is more expensive, and of course the University wants to save money while still be sustainable. We are mandated to use the 30% recycled paper and we can get the best pricing on that. Another reason is the cost per copy would have to increase and that is not the route that has been relayed to the copy committee. We are already struggling to recover our costs with the \$.05/copy; buying more expensive paper would require us to raise prices, not lower them, which is what we are trying to do. Our Procurement does work very hard to get the best pricing available and follow all applicable laws. Currently the least expensive

option is as follows: 30% recycled paper is \$28.42/carton for 2-10 pallets with 40 cartons/pallet; 100% recycled is \$35.61/carton for 2-10 pallets with 40 cartons/pallet.”

New Questions

- J. Elliott asked if there were any plan to use hot air hand dryers in the future or washable cups, plates and utensils in the cafeteria.
- A. Jimenez-Jimenez asked about the Army recruiting efforts on campus. Is this something that we want to promote on our campus?

Report from the Provost

-The Provost reported she was working diligently to get a better handle on our budget issues such as those related to Indirect Cost Recovery and CERF funds. We're close to having a practice in place for Indirect Cost Recovery, allowing us to know more accurately how much income we have and to ensure that Indirect Funds are made available for best possible use. A similar system is being explored for tracking CERF funds. The Provost will report progress in these areas again, after further work on them with Dean Vaidya. Regarding the 2010 budget, some other CSU's are in worse shape because they have been asked to drop their enrollments while we have been allowed to remain flat. The Provost's plan is to use the Senate Fiscal Policies Committee for advisement on funding priorities, and it is to this committee that she will report at the end of each year how funds were spent. She emphasized her desire to have faculty input about funding priorities, particularly in times when she has to move quickly when new funds become available. The Provost is happy to talk to anybody at any time about budget issues, but Fiscal Policies will serve as her sounding board and as the group to which she is accountable. This new process will replace the previous ARC committee which consisted of mostly administrators.

Report from the Senate Chair

- Chair Hartung attended the Statewide Senate Chairs meeting last week where the main topic of conversation was the budget. The CSU will be requesting \$100 million be returned from the state but they do not realistically expect to receive it.
- Channel Islands will receive \$400,000 in stimulus funding to be used for additional courses.
- Of the 21 Senate Chairs present at the meeting, 11 of those were looking at program eliminations at their campuses and 12 are looking at program consolidations. All of them reported workload issues and four of them were considering votes of “no confidence” for various administrators.
- A faculty trustee has still not been added to the Board of Trustees.

First reading items: CCI: SP 09-01: Policy for Establishment and Continuance of Centers and Institutes

- m/s, D. Hoffman, J. Elliott. D. Downey presented the policy. This is a draft of a document to be used to define centers and institutes and the process for reviewing new proposals for both. The Committee on Centers and Institutes pulled the policy together from looking at other policies across the state; they are seeking feedback from everyone.
- J. Elliott commented that the center definition restricted centers to being mission based, which he did not feel was appropriate and used the Martin V. Smith Center as an example. He believes the distinction of center vs. institute is too vague and limiting. He wants clarification on what constitutes a letter of support from the program. He also objected to the submission of the annual

report requirement, feeling it would create feelings of uncertainty about the status of the center; he recommends instead authorizing centers for three year terms. He questioned the requirement that every center would need a letter of support from all campus programs, wondering what would constitute such letters (e.g., from the chair, or from a majority of program faculty).

-I. Grzegorczyk pointed out that we have several centers on campus such as the Osher Institute and the Center for Excellence. She believes the word “center” does not mean anything special and that in order to distinguish them, they should be called “mission based centers.” She thinks that although many centers were started with outside funding, lack of funding should not prevent programs from establishing centers or institutes. Further, she stated that names can sometimes be dictated by the granting institution; we use lots of different names and it would be better to have our policy written in such a way as to support rather than discourage people in creating new things. She also believed Section A was very restrictive and requested that students be included.

-M. Adler is concerned about the sentence that refers to centers not damaging the image of the campus. She would like that rephrased in a more positive way, the same recommendation for the language regarding funding.

-M. Adler asked about the discontinuance of a center, who is the recommendation submitted to and is there an appeal process? She advocated for including an appeal process, a check-and-balance system for internal review, so the power of review would not rest with one committee.

-D. Downey replied that all recommendations would be submitted to the Academic Senate as the committee itself wields no power.

-M. Adler suggested that the revised policy be presented to the Senate Executive Committee before it goes back to Academic Senate; Chair Hartung confirmed that process.

-J. Elliott questioned where the power of ultimate decision would lie, with Academic Senate as well as Provost. He requested clarification in that language. He also stated that the requirement of an annual report and an annual decision of recommendation to continue or not could create potential instability in centers, if they did not know from year to year whether they would continue to exist. He questioned the additional work load of an annual review, not only on the part of the CCI but on the centers themselves, wondering how often such review needed to occur. D. Downey stated that the CCI understood that annual review is part of the current process already in place.

-I. Grzegorczyk questioned what the phrase “needs that shall side-track our development” means. She also stated that a timeline needs to be included for approving proposed centers and institutes, in recognition of the time constraints that people applying for grants must work within.

-Provost Neuman suggested a different way to think of centers and institutes. Some people define a center as a unit that is not autonomous, while an institute is more formal and autonomous.

-Chair Hartung thanked everyone for their input and the CCI for their work on this first draft.

Second reading item: SR 09-02 (A) (B) SRT Report Format Resolution

-J. Elliott recommends not including the additional comparison data.

-A. Denton agreed with J. Elliott; she prefers version A and feels the additional comparisons can be dangerous and not meaningful.

-A. Jimenez-Jimenez believes that the more information that is available, the better. He stated the numbers themselves are not dangerous; it is how you interpret them. More information gives us more evidence for whatever arguments we want to make. Further, in years like this one when we

have furloughs and students are required to do more independent work, general scores may be lower than in other years. Having comparison data will allow us to see those larger trends.

-A. McNeill asked what constitutes a program in the sense that it is being used here. Is “program” defined by prefix? By similar courses? Chair Hartung replied that the word program is intended to capture what would be called departments on other campuses.

-R. Christopher stated that previously with SETEs you had the individual scores and then the comparison for the whole university. With this instrument, we can compare the same items plus add the program data as well. She also added, to clarify the response to A. McNeill’s question, that we have a data table that puts an academic organization into aggregates, which are the program areas. Something like Physical Science, which only appears two times in a semester, would be rolled forward into the aggregate.

-A. McNeill asked who decides the aggregate.

-T. Ballman noted that including comparative data is a very common practice at other universities. It gives context to the numbers presented. She also said that the richer data would provide context for looking at numbers in programs that are more difficult. Without comparative data, every level of review will determine what those numbers mean, to determine whether the results are good or bad.

-M. Francois asked how team-taught courses would be addressed. Nathan responded that separate evaluations would be available for each instructor.

-A. Denton asked a FAC representative to share why they had decided not to include the additional information. B. Bleicher responded that they felt it would be like comparing apples to oranges.

-B. Wagner said that we all know that all courses aren’t the same and all programs aren’t the same, and that if data do reveal some average in the program or university, we can’t compare them; but it’s about knowing where we are in the ballpark, which is a good thing. He also noted that if we give up the right to have these data included in our evaluations, he would worry if the data would be accessible later by others at other levels of review. If this were the case, he advocated for including the data in our reports.

-B. Monsma reminded everyone that we need to allow for a narrative context in these evaluations. We commonly teach courses not only cross-listed, but taken by students out of their major. The composition of the student body is highly relevant to understanding numbers, and this model doesn’t provide any way of accounting for that. Narrative data would do that, and should be officially valued by RTP and PPC committees.

-B. de Oca feels we should be more concerned about whether we are accomplishing the objectives rather than focusing on numbers and ranking.

-C. Wyels said that in writing letters on behalf of colleagues for promotion and tenure review, she includes a footnote indicating that disciplines are ranked differently, nationwide. Including comparative data by program would help her to make that case.

-I. Grzegorczyk stated that without median average, we can’t judge of the mean reflects the distribution. She would like to see medians included in reports. Nathan responded that inclusion of medians is not a possible option.

-G. Buhl said that it is an assumption that higher numbers are better, but that higher numbers may reflect only student satisfaction and not teaching effectiveness.

-J. Meriwether noted that his concern has to do with use and misuse of data in an evaluative situation, in the RTP process. He went through RTP on a campus that had no comparative data,

which was frustrating for him. He would have appreciated the additional context that comparative data would have offered.

-There was much discussion about the pros and cons of including the additional data.

-S. Stratton called for the question, seconded by T. Clarke.

Vote taken by show of hands

Yes (A): 17

No (B): 15

Version A passes

Straw poll: to amend Section E in SP 08-12, University RTP Committee

-Chair Hartung gave the background and reasons for the proposed change.

-I. Grzegorczyk stated it was unfair to the faculty being evaluated if the evaluator is not familiar with their specific field.

-B. de Oca stated that the PPC was responsible for the ultimate review and evaluation. B.

Hartung said that each level of review in the RTP process is independent of earlier reviews.

-R. Christopher clarified for everyone that Associate Professors are not able to review faculty applying for full professorship.

-B. Monsma raised concern about the workload this places on full professors. He was uncomfortable voting without knowing how the change would translate to distribution. He would like to see a way to solve the problem that doesn't require full professors to be on the RTP committee forever, which drains the potential of those faculty members to contribute to the campus in other ways.

-C. Wyels recommended requiring a minimum number of full professors serve on the committee.

-A. McNeill noted that the fixed number of full professors means they will be tied up in PPC and RTP service, which is an artifact of where we are as an institution. He reiterated C. Wyels' suggestion, that we require a minimum number of full professors on the RTP committee.

-S. Stratton stated that the way the policy currently reads, theoretically, there could have been one person reviewing all the requests submitted this year and that would not have been fair to anyone.

-R. Christopher said the situation we are in is as a result of our new campus status. On most campuses the majority of faculty are full professors, we are uncommon because are new and have few full professors. Eventually we will grow out of this problem but it won't be for a few years yet. She recommended a possible solution, using a PPC for one type of review and a second PPC that would only review those applying for full professorship. She noted that the question really being asked is, do we want to bar anyone but full professors from serving on the RTP committee? And an additional question would be, what do we do about those areas where no one would be eligible?

Straw pool-Only full professors shall serve on RTP

Yes: 12

No: 8

-The feeling of the group today is to send this back to Faculty Affairs Committee and ask them to craft language on reconstituting the membership on RTP.

-A. McNeill requested that Faculty Affairs craft several potential solutions.

Report from Standing Committee Chairs

Committee on Committees

-No Report

Committee on Centers and Institutes

-No Report

Curriculum Committee/Academic Planning Committee

-A. Morris and E. Tayag will be co-chairs this academic year.

Faculty Affairs Committee

-B. Bleicher stated they would be forwarding a policy on Chair Evaluations soon.

Fiscal Policies Committee

-No Report

General Education Committee

-C. Delaney-Rivera reminded everyone to submit their courses in soon as the deadline is fast approaching.

Student Academic Policies and Procedures Committee

-No Report

Professional Leave Committee

-No Report

Announcements

-R. Christopher announced the Reading Celebration Event this year, the speaker will be Nobel Peace Prize winner, Muhammad Yunus. He will be on campus February 26, 2010, in conjunction with the opening of the *Social Business Institute*, please incorporate his book, which is available free to all everyone, into your course reading assignments.

-I. Grzegorczyk invites all students to apply for the Noyce Scholarship; a total of \$900,000 is available to students and the deadline is Friday, November 6th.

-UC Berkely is organizing a “Saving Public Education Conference” on October 24th.

-N. Gill reminded everyone to wear their Channel Islands t-shirts on Wednesdays and they might get a \$5 gift certificate.

-J. Yudelson, CFA President, reported he'd hosted a town meeting to discuss the Budget issues, the previous week, with over 200 attendees. He asked the group to support AB656, *The California Education Fund*. Statewide CFA leaders will be visiting all campuses in November to discuss contract re-openers.

-A. Grove invited everyone to attend the Town Hall meeting on Tuesday, October 27th, at 4:30 p.m. in MH 100.

Adjournment

-4:22 p.m.