CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

	ACADEMIC SENATE **MINUTES** **APRIL 25, 2019**	**ASD 19-47** *Approved 5-9-19*

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**PLN-130**

Present: Badal, Basil, Brunelle, Bruschke, Buck, Casem, Ceisel, Chandler, Childers, Dabirian, David, Fidalgo, Fitch, Garcia, Gradilla, Hesgard, Jarvis, Kanel, Matz, Mead, Meyer, P. Oliver, R. Oliver, Patton, Peissig, Perez, Preston, Rodriguez, Shahi, Shoar, Stambough, Teckchandani, Thomas, Tiwari, Valdez, Virjee Walker

Absent:　Barros, Brown, Heiner, Holland, McLain, Powers, Stohs, Torres, Wagner, Walicki, Walk, Wood

I.　CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Gradilla called the meeting to order at 11:33 am.

II.　URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III.　ANNOUNCEMENTS

➤	A Threshold Concepts Workshop From Wells to Wormholes: Writing Within and Across Disciplines Register for the event at:　http://www.fullerton.edu/wac/	Friday, May 3, 2019 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM, PLN-130 (flyer in Dropbox folder)

- ➤ (Matz) COMM week is currently going on in the TSU. Today is the last day, if you would like to join the conversation we would love to have you.
- ➤ (Buck) Dr. Jochen Burgtorf from the History Department will be giving a lecture tonight at 7:00 pm at the Fullerton Public Library. His lecture will be on "Crusaders and Refugees in the Medieval Near East".
- ➤ (Patton) I would like to give a shout out to graduate and undergraduate students in Anthropology, Evolution Anthropology, and the Psych Program, they have been instrumental and have organized a regional meeting and we will have several universities represented with both faculty and students. The event will take place at the Chino Hills Community Center.

IV.　TIMES APPROXIMATE

> **11:45 AM**
> **Subjects:**　　**1. ASD 19-31 Revisions to UPS 100.000 – Academic Senate Constitution**
> 　　　　　　　**2. ASD 19-32 Revisions to UPS 100.001 – Academic Senate Bylaws**
> **Presenter:**　　**Dr. Sean Walker**

ASD 19-31 Revisions to UPS 100.000 - Academic Senate Constitution

M/S/**P** (Walker/Kanel) Motion to approve ASD 19-31 Revisions to UPS 100.000 - Academic Senate Constitution. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

- ➤ M/S/**P** (Walker/Casem) Line 139, motion to add language at end of the paragraph to read: "Part-time faculty members appointed to more than 29 units total in the fall and spring semesters of their senate term would be considered full-time and are not eligible to serve". Motion passed as unanimously.

Back to main motion

ASD 19-32 Revisions to UPS 100.001 - Academic Senate Bylaws

M/S/**P** (Walker/Casem) Motion to approve ASD 19-32 Revisions to UPS 100.001 - Academic Senate Bylaws. Motion passed as amended.

➢ (Walker/Stambough) Lines 215-220, motion to strike Section 4 because this language is in the Constitution. Motion passed unanimously.

Back to main motion

➢ (Mead) Lines 453-454 add the wording "probationary and tenured faculty" and remove the wording "full-time Unit 3". *Considered friendly.*

➢ (Walker/Kanel) Lines 313 - 315, motion to modify the text to read: "If the Chair or any member is in doubt, division, and/or a roll call vote may be requested by any member prior to the next item of business being taken up by the body". *Considered friendly.*

Suggestion:

(Dabirian) The State Capitol does it an easier way by using electronics. Before every vote they have a choice to do either a roll call vote or an electronic vote. An electronic vote is when there is a board that displays yes, no, and abstain, the board displays everybody's constituency along with their name and it automatically counts the votes. If you wanted to do roll call at that time, you would announce this vote is going to be done as a roll call vote and you could do both and it's quick, fast, and everybody gets to see every constituency. We could probably do this here is you all want to do this because it's fast, easy, and would eliminate any questions. So I would like the body to consider this, we should move into the 21 Century and start using electronics more efficiently.

Back to the main motion

Recommendation:

M/S/**P** (Kanel/Bruschke) Motion that one of the committees, either the Faculty Affairs Committee or the Constitution Committee, take a look at some kind of formal policy that would prohibit any retaliation towards any person sitting on the Academic Senate or any Academic Senate Committee for the way in which they vote. If someone was to feel they were being retaliated against for it, they would have a policy in place to go and grieve that. I want to give a strong message to everyone on this campus you cannot retaliate for how people vote on the Senate floor. Motion passed unanimously.

➢ (Stambough) In terms of the right committee it would be tough, it's not the Constitution Committee and since it's not an all faculty senate so it wouldn't be Faculty Affairs. Maybe it would be Senate Executive Committee, some of this would be employment law which is really different. You are bringing in a ton of different things, so perhaps it could start on the Faculty Affairs Committee, but it would obviously have to be looked at by a broader body because it's not just jurisdiction over faculty because we have student and staff members, so it would have to go to some sort of employment law with respect to that. So maybe Faculty Affairs Committee would be the place to start, but it would have to get referred to another committee, multiple referrals off to Exec.

Q: (Gradilla) Senator Kanel, would you mind if we took this up in Senate Exec?
A: (Kanel) I would really appreciate that.

➢ (Bruschke) I hope we could also ask the Senate Exec to refer Senator Dabirian's suggestion about electronic voting to the appropriate body.

V.   APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1   ASD 19-43 Academic Senate Minutes 4-11-19 (Draft) - *forthcoming*

VI.   CONSENT CALENDAR

M/S/**P** (Fidalgo/Mead) Motion to approve Consent Calendar. Motion passed unanimously.

6.1   ASD 19-44 CSUF AS Library Committee ECC Resolution
6.2   ASD 19-45 Revision of UPS 261.000 - Faculty Emeritus Status

Q: (Patton) I want to bring up a question about Emeriti Status. In the benefits, one of the benefits that I imagine faculty who are deciding to apply or who are in this category would like to continue their research. I see it list under benefits they still have their library privileges and other things. I don't think we necessarily need it, but I'm assuming they also have the right to run grants through the university as a member of the university. So you cannot go for any grants to fund your research in retirement?

A: (Walker) To be eligible for PI's, you would have to be an employee. So if you were not an employee you would not be eligible to be a PI. If you were FERPing you could potentially be eligible to be a PI because you could be an employee.

- (Patton) Many other places that I have been to, the organizations that do external funding like this have more liberal policies where we have people that have honorary status that want to run grants through. I don't know if that is worth a consideration, but as important as research is and growing so, I would like to think that I have a few more research years in me. When I leave, to think that I would have to go to the Santa Fe Institute to beg affiliation from them seems a little odd.

M/S/**P** (Walker/Casem) Motion to refer Senator Patton's concern and idea to the Faculty Affairs Committee for them to consider next year. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. CHAIR'S REPORT - written report distributed 4-19-19.

2 page report

VIII. PROVOST REPORT - written report distributed 4-23-19.

2 page report

IX. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT

No report.

X. ASI REPORT

No report submitted.

XI. CFA REPORT - written report distributed 4-23-19.

11 page report

XII. NEW BUSINESS

12.1 ASD 19-38 Revisions to UPS 102.001 - Faculty Development Center (FDC)

M/S/**P** (Casem/Stambough) Motion to approve ASD 19-38 Revisions to UPS 102.001 - Faculty Development Center (FDC). Motion passed unanimously.

12.2 ASD 19-39 Revisions to UPS 320.020 - University Writing Requirements

M/S/**P** (Matz/Oliver) Motion to approve ASD 19-39 Revisions to UPS 320.020 - University Writing Requirements. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

(Matz) With your permission, I would like to ask Dr. Janna Kim, who is the chair of the University Writing Proficiency Committee to address the changes we are making.

Dr. Kim gave an overview of the changes made by the University Writing Proficiency Committee to the document.

(Matz) Since submitting this document the UWPC have three additional amendments we would like to propose that we feel are friendly, they have to do with reference to another policy. *Amendments considered friendly.*

Q: (Meyer) The question I have is the writing course needs to be particular for that discipline, what happens in the case of a student with double majors that are at opposite ends, totally unrelated like theatre and mechanical engineering because I have one of those students? We are under the assumption that if they do one of the writing classes, either one, it counts.

A: (Kim) It counts for the baccalaureate upper division writing requirement.

Q: (Meyer) So they don't have to do two?

A: (Kim) No, I don't think so.

Q: (Stambough) A couple places in Section 2 particularly there is kind of switch between, one example is I'm looking at line 140 where rubric or rational was changed to rubric or set of standards. Effectively if I'm putting in a proposal what's the difference between putting in a rationale or a set of standards? Lets say I'm a faculty member who doesn't believe in rubrics and I want to use something else, what would effectively be the difference there? That change means what?

A: (Kim) Standards could be from the department. When looking at this, we asked what does that mean for a rationale for assessment? We wanted it to be more closely tied to the writing assignments themselves and we thought the rationale for assessment might be a little too broad.

Q: (Stambough) To clarify my question a little bit, what would be the difference of turning in a rationale or turning in a set of standards? And by switching it to a set of standards, is it effectively turning in a rubric or is it not?

A: (Kim) I don't think that when we proposed the change we thought that a rubric and a set of standards were the same thing. I think the rationale for assessment, a lot of us thought what does that mean? What we are hoping to do in the certification process is really streamline, support, and be transparent about what we are asking for. We thought that a set of standards was a bit more concrete than rationale for assessment.

(Perez) Regarding the issue of rationale verses standards, I would suggest wording like guidelines. Replace the wording "set of standards" with "guidelines" throughout the document. *Considered friendly.*

Q: (Walker) The wording "After the eight consecutive academic years…", it reads as if the Office of Academic Programs is going to notify you after eight years, which would mean your course would expire. I'm wondering what's the timeframe that the committee envisioned for the process to take place so that we could make a modification, so that the notification happens appropriately.

A: (Kim) We anticipate that there is going to be a timeline that would be publicly available and a list of courses that are currently certified with the expiration date listed next to it, so people would have ample time to know when their courses they use are set to expire. In addition, the University Writing Proficiency Committee and Academic Programs would let the units know at least one year in advance that their courses are set to expire.

Q: (Brunelle) All courses would be on an eight-year cycle and then they would have to be renewed? Can you clarify for me how that differs from the way it works now?

A: (Kim) Right now there is no review for writing of any courses.

Q: (Bruschke) Lines 148-149: it says if a course is denied recertification it would be allowed a grace period of three semesters. So if I am a graduating senior and now my course is not certified, what happens? I think grace period means it would still count for student credit for three years, I'm just wondering if there is a way that can be specified?

A: (Kim) Ok

12.3 ASD 19-40 Revisions to UPS 300.022 - Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at CSUF

XIII. FIRST READING

13.1 ASD 19-41 New UPS 210.XXX - Nepotism & Conflict of Interest in Employment

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/**P** (Dabirian/Casem) Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.