



ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES  
MAY 9, 2019

ASD 19-61

Approved 5-16-19

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-130

Present: Badal, Basil, Brown, Brunelle, Brusckhe, Buck, Casem, Ceisel, Childers, Dabirian, David, Fidalgo, Fitch, Garcia, Gradilla, Heiner, Hesgard, Holland, Jarvis, Kanel, Matz, McLain, Mead, Meyer, P. Oliver, Patton, Peissig, Perez, Powers, Preston, Rodriguez, Shahi, Shoar, Stambough, Stohs, Thomas, Tiwari, Virjee, Wagner, Walicki, Walk, Walker, Wood

Absent: Barros, Chandler, R. Oliver, Teckchandani, Torres, Valdez,

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Stohs called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

**II. URGENT BUSINESS**

No urgent business.

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

(Fidalgo) There is going to be a farewell party next week after the Marathon meeting at my house for Senators Fitch and Brunelle. Senator Fitch will be coming back to us as a FERPer, but Senator Brunelle is going off to Paris and disappearing. I will send an announcement to be distributed via email.

**IV. TIMES APPROXIMATE**

12:20 PM - 12:50 PM

**Subject: Q & A - Fiscal State of the University Spring 2019 Presentation**

**Presenters: Danny Kim, Vice President for Administration and Finance/CFO  
Stacy Mallicoat, PRBC Chair**

VP Kim and Stacy Mallicoat came back to continue with the question and answer session from the May 2<sup>nd</sup> AS meeting.

Before resuming the question and answers, VP Kim announced the May Revise came out which held the January proposal and there were additional adjustments that will impact us: 1) increasing the funding for the students in need and homeless from \$6.5 million to \$15 million, and 2) Project Rebound, which we have on this campus, increased from \$250,000 to \$1 million.

- (Brusckhe) I would like to recognize Senator Heiner who has been the champion as the current director of the Project Rebound Program.

Q&A:

(Brusckhe) This is more of a comment for our President. Now that we have the May Revise, we of course are the 23<sup>rd</sup> worst funded campus, I know you have been working on that on our behalf and I appreciate that. The story has always been we will not cut anybody else, but when increases come you would be first in line. There has been a \$542 million increase and I imagine you are about hear a lot of but that was earmarked for student success and faculty increases and we can't do that. It seems like if we don't get it now, it's not coming ever and a lot of that is going to happen between now and July 1<sup>st</sup> when the next budget rolls out. I would like your thoughts and any encouragement I could give to say it really seems like the time is now and we need to insist that you can't carve all that \$542 million up and say we still have to wait. If we have to wait it, will never be our turn.

(Virjee) Just to make clear the magnitude of this, it is \$300 million in ongoing resources and \$247 in one-time revenue specifically for deferred maintenance. The process that the Chancellor's office will go through in divvying that up is different for those pieces and of that \$300 million, \$45 million of that is for GI 2025, it has different elements to it. I will also tell you that these numbers are not new because they were in the initial

Governor's budget, so the Chancellor's office is already in the process of looking at how it's going to divvy up that money. I can assure you quite clearly that I have been doing exactly what you said Jon, which is pointing out that we remain the lowest funded CSU on per people basis and while we are not asking for a re-division of the pie, we are asking for a greater portion of the pie going forward. I don't know how successful I am being at that.

Part of this is 2% in enrollment growth and that 2% is not being divided across the system equally, some campuses are getting no enrollment growth, some campuses are getting larger enrollment growth based upon whether they are an impacted campus, based upon the need at that campus. I don't know that we are going to get the full 2%, which will set us behind other campuses that get the 2% or get more. I am arguing vigorously, as is Danny, with the Chancellor's office on that. It is yet to be seen whether there is going to be any revenue this year based upon increasing tenured density like there was last year, auguring vigorously on that piece, we are out for 70 tenure track faculty positions. I am pushing on this issue and I would encourage you to push on this issue. This is a body that is part of the System-wide Academic Senate, raise with the System-wide Academic Senate the fact that we continue to be the lowest funded CSU on a per people basis and that the Academic Senate as a system ought to look at the equity of that and pay attention to that. You have the same dynamic with them that I have. Nobody from the other campuses is going to want to give up money so that you can get money. When I make these arguments to the Presidents, no one wants to give up money from their campus so that we can get money. We have to put pressure on all fronts, I am putting it on the Chancellor and the CFO. I am talking at the President's Council about this and I encourage you to talk, to call, and write to the people you have contacts with to support this idea.

- (Bruschke) I don't think the Chancellor feels I have not been pressing him hard enough. You have our full support and I will do everything I can.
- (Virjee) I would like to see a statement from the System-wide Academic Senate that says there are inequities in the per pupil payments to campuses and some of our students are suffering in order to subsidize other students and that is not right. I have never heard of anything like that come from the System-wide Academic Senate.
- (Bruschke) The System-wide Senate has asked for far less out of the Chancellor and had that not go anywhere, but I will do everything in my power to produce that document.

Q: (Patton) This question is for Stacy, in your report you bring up tenure density multiple times, it shows up as a budget priority, can you speak to what the committee discussed about that? What's a sweet spot? What's a good healthy tenure density and how close are we to that? Are there any goals being set for our campus in what tenure density should look like?

A: (Mallicoat) I think the conversations we had within the subcommittee on this was very preliminary and even just starting to look at what the data about tenure density looks like campus wide. The types of recommendations and things you are asking for, we didn't get that deep into it yet but we kind of just talked a little bit about what is tenure density and what are some of the strategies we could do to improve it. One of the things that is coming out that we did talk about was if there was an opportunity to take some of our lecturers that are part-time and convert those into full-time positions. We just kind of started to scratch the surface on that topic, but it's remained a theme of highlighting how important it is so even though we weren't able to really delve in and create specific recommendations we wanted to make sure it was very clear we thought it was a key item to continue to talk about.

- (Patton) As we are not preparing to go after new hires is there any guidelines about what a cut off should be for programs for consideration for submitting a proposal for hires? If we have a programs with 100% tenure ratio, they don't need to hire, those sitting at 40% might. So as we are going forward making decisions on hiring is tenure density being considered?
- (Mallicoat) That is a broader question for the Provost's office.
- (Virjee) There are a couple of ways to look at this issue, and John you are identifying some of them. They are within the departments/colleges, but they are also for us as a university as a campus wide issue. Where does our tenure density sit and what is a healthy mix for tenure density? One place to go with that comparator is how do we compare to other CSUs? There are several views out there about what is an ideal metric for tenure density. What I can tell you is we don't reach those ideals at this point. I hope someday we are able to worry about are we at a tipping point for tenure density, but rather than worry yet, what we are worried about is increasing our tenure density because we know we are not there yet, we aren't even close. We need to increase our tenure density, we are just about at the average of the CSUs, but not quite and I don't want to be at the average I want to be above that and I know our Provost does too. That's why we are searching for the 70 this year to try and make a dent.

Q: (Gradilla) I would like to see a larger discussion around the PRBC's priorities that they listed out. We currently do not invest in the Diversity & Inclusion Initiatives that need to be funded that involve faculty leadership. One of the things that I have been discussing a lot in the HRDI Fellowship Program is that we know in the research literature over the last 30 years, student success is always tied to when faculty are engaged with the students. I would like to see our spending priorities reassessed, and I think a complete audit and re-evaluation of how we have been spending money would be greatly appreciated. When I got here 15 years ago, I used to have funds to take students to conferences. Now no one will give me money to take them to an academic conference so they can see their discipline in the national scope. I need money to take my students to see the world because we have first generation students that need to see the world.

Lastly, we serve first generation students, but we no longer have remedial writing courses. Our learning center does spend a stitch of time on teaching students how to write. Where is the writing support? They are teaching them learning skills, but no writing skills. My students get the runaround at the learning center that no one teaches writing, that's your professor's job, we are teaching you learning skills. First generation students don't have anywhere else to turn, and we are teaching a lot of students. Our support services need to be supporting us and that includes a learning center that has dedicated staff and is funded to teach writing.

- (Oliver) We have a writing center, we have mentors that help. We have writing across the curriculum, we have workshops, so I need to talk with you about who are the students. I think it is important that we are able to identify where our resources are. We do have one college, HHD and they have a writing tutor, they have a writing person right there. I would like to ask Dr. Fontaine to speak to this.
- (Fontaine) We have had a Writing Center on this campus close to 15 years, we have a Learning Center and the two of them are distinct, but I certainly agree there can always be more support for writing. We no longer offer remedial writing but there are courses that have replaced that. Because of the changes from EO 1110, I'm not going to argue in support of all of those changes, but I don't want you to think that the departments of English and Math are not supporting the students. The Writing Center is right in the corner outside the door, so please feel free to visit. I used to train the tutors, so I am a little shocked that some of you are not aware we have a Writing Center, maybe we need bigger signage.

There is a difference between the Learning Center and the Writing Center. The Learning Center is run through Student Affairs and they may indeed focus more on learning strategies and I don't know the messages they are getting. The Writing Center focuses strictly on writing. I can say that I am always concerned about the number of students who come to the Writing Center for support and whether or not there is adequate tutors. Is it funded in a way that we could do as much tutoring? There have been changes recently, even in the CBA, that are going to make it a little more difficult in the short run for us to have adequate tutoring, GA's and SA's, but that is something we are working on. So I certainly agree there may be students who are turned away, because there are more students than tutoring hours.

Q: (Walker) How are we doing on reserves? It does look like from the graph that we have over the last several years gone down a little bit in tenure density, but we have also done a lot of new hiring. I am wondering from a department perspective and from a college perspective, when we lose a full professor, I know we get back the money for the replacement of a part-timer but I don't know where the rest of that money goes.

A: (Kim) To answer the first question about the reserves, you may recall from my presentation last September where I showed the carry forward balances and I identified all the reserves. That number I presented holds the University-wide reserves. Our goal was around \$20 - \$25 million. One year we dropped to about \$10 million and our projection for this year was roughly \$23 - \$24 million. Based on our look now, we are going to sustain that number. In terms of the overall campus level carry forward balance, that includes all the funds in the colleges, the operating budgets, some of the projects like the McCarthy Hall construction project. Some of those that are already in the works will be reflected in those numbers. I will provide an update based on actuals this fall, but right now based on our quarterly projections, it looks by year-end the campus level will be fine. We will be close to what we anticipated last year.

Where the money goes when people retire is a little bit complex because the decisions for faculty hires are made within Academic Affairs and ultimately in the colleges, and I am not sure how much involvement from the departments because from college to college it is different. Our strategy has always been when we have tenured faculty retiring or leave the university that we replace those positions. At a campus level we try to achieve a net zero. That doesn't mean the funding is net zero because the campus always ends up funding more, which probably has to do with a higher salary rate and other factors. We are actually looking into why it's not zero sum. Tenure density does fluctuate. It depends on how you count.

Q: (Perez) This question is for Stacy. Regarding the three tiers you went over, how were the tiers operationalized? On Tier 2 student mental health was classified with staff hiring and retention, and I am concerned that student mental health is labeled as Tier 2. How is tier 2 classified in that way because you can ask anyone in CAPS and it is tremendously underfunded?

A: (Mallicoat) I think it is important to acknowledge that the Tier 1 and Tier 2 is an understanding that we are acknowledging there is not enough money to go around for everything. But as far as the strategy with PRBC, we listed out about 10 different items in 10 different categories and each member of PRBC got three votes to cast of what they thought were their top priorities. What you see here in Tier 1 were the items that received the greatest number of votes. We were very clear in our letter to the President that something like student mental health, while here as a Tier 2, we acknowledged that it is an incredibly important issue for our campus, one that we would not be able to solve on its own and one that we would not be able to solve entirely on the resources available. Putting any of these things as Tier 2 isn't to say that we think they aren't important, just that we acknowledge there is a limited amount of money to go around.

- (Perez) That makes sense and I appreciate that, but my concern is the practical outcome is that Tier 2 kind of things don't get funded. I'm not saying its PRBC's responsibility to figure out statewide/nationwide issues, but I had to voice that concern especially for that particular problem.
- (Kanel) We are having a Task Force, and I have been asked to serve on that with CAPS and we are going to be looking into that this year and I will report back to the Senate if you would like.

Q: (Mead) At our last meeting, all three of you mentioned a deficit of about \$4.5 million for this academic year, but what I didn't pick up is what is the source of that deficit? Is this a shock? Is it a structural issue and is it going to be reoccurring?

A: (Kim) The cause of the deficit is really simple although underlying reasons make it a little more complex. The simple reason is the revenues that we anticipated in which the budget was based on for that year fell short because enrollment was down. The question is why did enrollment go down and there are lots of reasons, one is people are graduating faster. We graduated a record number of students last year and that contributed to that and we talked about an increase in Average Unit Load. We have more part-time students converting to full-time status or they are already at full-time status and they are taking more units than previously, so all of those things are contributing to our revenue short fall.

In terms of the other question if it is structural or not, we are looking at our projection for next year, we are looking at our admissions and the decisions that are being made, and tracking our students who are registering. So next year as we project our revenues we are going to have to be mindful about any shortfall that we may have.

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

M/S/P (Brunelle/Walker) Motion to approve ASD 19-43 Academic Senate Minutes. Minutes were approved unanimously.

### 5.2 ASD 19-47 Academic Senate Minutes 4-25-19 (Draft)

M/S/P (Fidalgo/Walicki) Motion to approve ASD 19-47 Academic Senate Minutes. Minutes were approved unanimously.

### 5.3 ASD 19-54 Academic Senate Minutes 5-2-19 (Draft) - *forthcoming*

## VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

Per Chair Stohs, the Consent Calendar was approved.

### 6.1 ASD 19-59 Voluntary Program Discontinuance - Spring 2019

## VII. CHAIR'S REPORT - written report distributed 5-7-19.

[1 page report](#)

## VIII. PROVOST REPORT - written report distributed 5-8-19.

### [1 page report](#)

Q: (Mead) You mentioned in the Provost Report that on April 30<sup>th</sup> you met with the WASC Committee on reaccreditation. You mentioned in the report that the review team commended us on several areas and presented us with four lines of inquiry. I was wondering, the nature of the commendation, was it a formal one or were they truly impressed and the areas of the inquiries, are those not yet public?

A: (Oliver) We will be posting the lines of inquiry publicly. I sent them to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the Cabinet.

- (Swarat) We are working with IT so there can be a credential requirement, but it will be at the same place you find the institutional report.

Q: (Mead) So it was intentionally vague?

A: (Oliver) Yes. There are four buckets in the lines of inquiry and my idea with the Provost report was to keep it to a page or less, but you will be able to see all of them.

- (Swarat) On commendations, they commended us for making significant investment in several areas that were not so great in the last review. Things like investment in student success, assessment, dissemination of student goals and outcomes, and our effort in enrollment management to meet our students' needs and to ensure we function within our budget.

The four buckets of the lines of inquiry were 1) investment and quality assurance, 2) student success, 3) diversity & inclusion, and 4) sustainability.

- (Oliver) One of the areas they commended us on was investing major resources in recruitment and retention of faculty in support of the University's programs. A lot of the commendations were on resources that we have put into things. In addition to the commendations and the lines of inquiry you will also see the people they want to meet with.

## IX. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT

No report.

## X. ASI REPORT

No report submitted.

Chair Stohs thanked the Student Senators for serving on the Academic Senate.

## XI. CFA REPORT

CFA supports the Governor's allocation. We are [proposing](#) additional funding, \$62 million would be used to increase access for 8,571 students; \$35 million would be used to hire more tenure track faculty, and \$20 million would be invested in improving counselor-to-student ratios.

The standard recommended by the International Association of Counseling Services ensures that there is at least one mental health counselor per 1,500 students. Currently, only five out of 23 CSUs meet that professional recommendation. [Click here](#) to download a flyer about our budget advocacy.

## XII. NEW BUSINESS

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

M/S/P (Fidalgo/Tiwari) Motion to approve ASD 19-40 Revisions to UPS 300.022 - Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at CSUF. Motion passed as amended.

Emily Ericson gave the overview of the changes made by the Assessment Committee.

(Kanel) I move to strike the wording "at California State University, Fullerton" from the title. *Considered friendly.*

Q: (Childers) The document refers to student learning outcomes in the title of the document, line 9 refers to program learning outcomes, and line 62 refers to program learning goals and I believe these are all intended to be the same thing.

A: (Erickson) In terms of the student learning outcomes, that is the overall student learning outcomes at the university, the broad goals of assessment. When we use program learning outcomes, we are specifically referring to departments and their respective programs and their learning outcomes and to acknowledge that. As far as the program learning goals, it's talking about the assessment plan, its future thinking. I don't see any problem with changing that to outcomes to keep it consistent so it doesn't look like its three different things.

M/S/ (Fidalgo/Brown) Lines 57-59: motion to strike the current wording and replace it with the following:

“Assessment of student learning can enhance the University’s ability to implement its mission and goals, thus the University shall support and recognize faculty workload. Faculty with specified assessment duties shall be supported through a reduction in a faculty member's direct instructional assignment (i.e., reassigned time). Programs shall not bear the full cost of required assessment activities.”

M/S/P (Walker/Meyer) Motion to refer the “Fidalgo/Brown” amendment to the Assessment Committee to study the impacts and the best way to implement it.

Back to main motion

- 12.2 ASD 19-48 Revisions to UPS 230.020 - Policy on Faculty Office Hours
- 12.3 ASD 19-49 New UPS 2XX.XXX - Classroom Observations
- 12.4 ASD 19-50 Revisions to UPS 210.020 - Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
  - 1. UPS 210.020 - Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
- 12.5 ASD 19-51 Revisions to UPS 410.104 - Undergraduate Subprograms: Concentrations
- 12.6 ASD 19-55 Revisions to UPS 300.050 Recognition of Superior Student Performance
- 12.7 ASD 19-56 Revisions to UPS 330.124 Leaves of Absence for Graduate and Credential Students

### **XIII. FIRST READING**

- 13.1 ASD 19-41 New UPS 210.XXX - Nepotism & Conflict of Interest in Employment M/S/ (Walker/Kanel)

### **XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

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