



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES  
MARCH 2, 2017**

ASD 17-32

*Approved 3-16-17*

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

**PLN-120**

Present: Armstrong, Barr, Basil, Bates, Bonney, Brusckhe, Buck, Casem, Chavis, Dabirian, DeMars, Dries, Evanow, Fidalgo, Filowitz, Fitch, Fujita-Rony, Gradilla, Hagihara, Jarvis, Kanel, Maddox, Matz, Mead, Meyer, Mickey, Myck-Wayne, Patton, Perez, , Powers, Puri, Rodriguez, Sargeant, Self, Stambough, Stang, Stohs, Tavakolian, Tsang, Walicki, Walker, Wang, Wood

Absent: Fischer, Garcia, Holland, Martinez, Oliver

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Bonney called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

A moment of silence was observed.

**In Memoriam**

➤ Jack Elenbaas, Professor Emeritus of History

**II. URGENT BUSINESS**

➤ (Walker) Resolution Recognizing the “mad” basketball skills of Senator Amir Dabirian  
M/S/P (Walker/Stambough) Resolution adopted unanimously.

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

➤	Academic Affairs/Academic Senate Retreat, Spring 2017	Friday, March 3, 2017 Marriott Hotel
➤	Memorial Service for Al Flores	Saturday, March 11 <sup>th</sup> @ 1:00 pm in the Kinesiology & Health Science Building

➤ (Gradilla) One of our undergraduate students Robert Mendoza who was a Kinesiology and Chicana/o studies minor recently got into a Ph.D program. One of the great things about his journey was that an undergrad he experienced academic probation and recovered and was pulled in by a support network. His GPA was not high, but the Kinesiology program here at Cal State Fullerton admitted him on probation and he was able to do very well and excelled in the program. He was involved in many high impact practices such as the Study Abroad Program to Greece. He was also involved in Graduate Studies’ Elevar Scholars—a program with mentorship and activities developed by Dr. Katherine Powers. He was admitted to Springfield’s, (on the east coast), Ph. D program with full funding..

**IV. TIMES APPROXIMATE**

**11:40 AM - 11:55 AM**

**Topic: Men of Color Study Findings**

**Presenter: Dr. Vincent Harris, Director of the Male Success Initiative**

Dr. Vincent Harris gave an overview on the following:

- Action Research Grant – Collaboration across campus:
  1. Office of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness
  2. Office of Institutional Research & Analytical Studies
  3. Office of Vice President for Student Affairs
  4. Office of the Provost

- Context & Data:
  - Cal State 6-year graduation rates by Freshman Cohort and Gender:
    - 40,235 students
    - 1,088 Black students
    - 431 Black male students
  - Chancellor's office and DOE reported numbers:
    - 846 Black students
    - 306 Black male students
- Participants 2015-16
  - 32 Black male students (e rounds of focus groups)
    - 1 in fall 2015
    - 2 in spring 2016
- Research Questions:
  1. Environment: Where I come from? First impression of CSUF?
  2. Barriers: What I face?
  3. Strategies: How I persist? Support I need?
- Call to Action – How do we help our Black male students overcome barriers at CSUF?

Q: (Bates) I know this initiative is to help males of color, but what about the men of color? Do you have specifically things to help students who identify as men in other spectrums and not just the traditional male?

A: Yes, within MSI we use the terms students who self-identify as men of color because that encompasses all the students who self-identify as men under the umbrella of manhood. However, this data shows we have to direct that service support to men of color and domestic (U.S. born) men of color are a variety. So essentially any of our students, particularly our men of trans experience are definitely involved in the level of support that MSI will support our students with.

Q: (Kanel) One of the frustrations I have about all of this is that we are located in Orange County, which is predominately white, and Latino. I wonder if you have talked with the men who identify of color if they feel the same way about living in Orange County in general that they do on our campus. Do they understand that this campus is somewhat reflective of Orange County because that is the nature of the public universities that we do reflect the community that we serve? Is that talked about?

A: I can refer to the data collection individuals. While they are coming to the front, I will say from the students I have spoken with that there is a reality that the area that we can recruit from is predominately a certain type of population demographic. However, I also encourage from my office, MSI, to think about our students who are here and in spite of the realities of us being in Orange County, how do we not adopt that as CSUF mentality. Particularly within the Male Success Initiative office, they are present, they are here, and the reality is if they are going into different industries. It might replicate Orange County; it might replicate Southern California. However while they are here, my responsibility is to make sure they feel supported in spite of those barriers, but some of those barriers don't have to exist on our campus even in spite of us being in Orange County. Some of the data might talk more about their experiences, and I bring up the researchers to share that data.

What we found in the data was that our men of color who participated in the groups had different experiences. Some of them had grown up in Orange County, and this wasn't anything new to them. Some of them came from other places and were like "wow", is this what all of California is like or is this just an OC thing. Others have come from surrounding areas and said this is an area we have to learn to cope in but we'd like you to meet us half way in doing that. So the responses were really across the board, but in general there was an acknowledgment that Orange County is very white and our campus appears that way to them as well.

Q: (Patton) On the second bar graph, you have three different time frames of the six year graduation rate, and it's the middle bar that's a dip, it looks like its recovered pretty well in the last one. I did go look at your other presentation and it looks like the difference between our campus and other campuses is the lack of that dip. Does your data indicate that something changed during those two times, because the overall directions is very similar, or is it that we are dealing with small numbers and the capacity of the data that this may be an artifact or something else?

A: For the past couple of years our graduation rate increased a substantial amount, more than 10 percent increases. This is a reflection of our campus-wide trends. So this data increase between 2008 cohort and 2009 cohort reflects our collaborative efforts campus-wide to be sensitive to the cultural diversity of students. The national picture is very consistent with this trend and black male students are lowest in demographics. We look at the national trend and in looking at the 700 public institutions (that graph is not in this presentation), the trends are the very same.

Q: (Patton) If you take a look at the first one and the second one, it says boy we have a problem, but then it looks like it got fixed. Is one of the conclusions the efforts we are making on campus have been successful and we are on track to mediate these bumps.

A: The pilot for MSI was started in 2013 and as of 2015-16 year it's officially become a unit. However, that is very relevant. These barriers have existed, but the process and the support has been occurring in small pockets in silos across the campus that might have shown a peak in support. However, that consistency needs more frequency, and I think that is going to help us get to where we need to be with the current data and when we anticipate our four to six year graduation rate from now.

Q: (Fujita-Rony) One of the earlier slides had a very large difference of numbers can you explain this?

A: The reason why the two sets of black student numbers are different is the top numbers are self-reporting ethnicity, the bottom number is official reporting number which we report to the State, Chancellor's office, and Department of Education; depending on their definition of African American Students. A lot of African American students reported as multi-race or Hispanic students. There was a different ethnicity classification that came out from the Department of Education in 2009.

(Puri) Can we go back to the bar chart? The economist in me needs to correct the interpretation of this data. I think the point of the graph is the disparity between the graduation rate for black students and others and white students, the disparity in what one-year change to next year means. The point is even if you look at the highest bar, which is for 2009, the black men graduate at 40 percent rate compared to any other group that you might look at. Hispanic men graduate at a little over 50 percent, white men graduate at a little under 60 percent, and Asian men graduate at about 65-68 percent. So even if you look at the higher bar, there is a huge gap between the graduation rate of black males and other groups.

Q: (Kanel) I really would like a specific. What do you think they mean when they say meet us half way? I want to understand what you mean by that.

A: What the literature shows is our students come in with an existing life and those existing barriers can often times feel like a burden, and those burdens can often times look like being more involved within their family to support them financially. Which mean that if they have to adjust missing class, but the professor has a very stringent syllabus policy, meeting our students half way is an example of that. But we can't meet them half way if we don't approach them at all and we don't know they have these situations in their background. And this is particularly salient when we think about our men of color, especially the Latino and black males, they are working more hours to support their family because they are the male figure in the household. That is a small example of meeting our students half way but it definitely is comprehensive and complex in different parts of their life.

This project was set out to study men of color on this campus, so we actually studied black male students, Latino male students, and I have a plan to study Asian male students as well. We are in the process of analyzing the Latino male students' data then our researchers can tell you more. The themes, while some of them are shared, the severity of it is more pronounced for this particular group we are presenting here. At some point we will be able to come back and offer that information.

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1. ASD 17-21 Academic Senate Minutes 2-16-17 (Draft) *forthcoming*

## VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

M/S/P (Walker/Sargent) Consent Calendar was approved unanimously.

6.1 ASD 17-18 Proposed New Courses - Spring 2017

6.2 ASD 17-23 Resolution in Support of Current H-1B Employment

6.3 ASD 17-27 Revision to UPS 105.000 - Consortia, Concords, Multi-Campus Programs

### 6.4 NOMINEES TO COMMITTEE

**NOMINEES TO STANDING COMMITTEES****UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE**

Nominees: Richard Laton (NSM)

Confirmed 2/16: Michael McAlexander (COMM); Andre Zampaulo (HUM); Teresa Crawford (EDUC);  
 Laura (Yue) Liu (MCBE); John Patton (SOC SCI); Katherine Bono (HHD);  
 Barbara Miller (L/A/C/E); John Short (ARTS); John (Kenneth) Faller (ECS)

**NOMINEES TO SEARCH COMMITTEE****ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC OPERATIONS**

Nominees: Emily Erickson (COMM)

Confirmed 9/29: Kim Norman (EDUC); Volker Janssen (HSS); Sam Behseta (NSM); Adelina Gnanlet (MCBE)

**DIRECTOR OF THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CENTER**

Nominees: Nilay Patel (NSM); Ron Oliver (EDUC)

Confirmed 11/29: Amy Cass (HSS); Shelli Wynants (HHD); Katrin Harich (MCBE); Lindsay O'Neill (L/A/C/E)

**VII. CHAIR'S REPORT – written report distributed on 2-27-17**

In the spring semester VP Eanes often is heard to say, "May is not a month." Her observation seems justified if we remember that by the third week of May we already are enmeshed in final examinations with graduation following immediately. If this is the case we find ourselves at the 2 March meeting with only two months left in the semester and a week off in the middle of that span. The semester seems to vanish before our eyes.

**2 March 2017 Academic Senate Meeting**

Our agenda for the 2 March meeting remains essentially what it was on the 16th with some important additions. First we will hear a report of the work being performed on our campus as part of the Men of Color Project funded by the Chancellor's Office. This important undertaking explores the experiences of male underrepresented minority students at CSUF and should be of interest to everyone concerned about the success of our students. We also have added three UPS documents for consideration and discussion: UPS 260.104 Granting Difference in Pay Leaves, UPS 330.232, Policy on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages by Students and Student Organizations, and UPS 100.600, Establishment of University Departments. UPS 105.000, Consortia, Concords, Multi-Campus Programs will be on the Consent Calendar along with the Resolution on H-1B Visa holders.

**Report from the CSU Council of Chairs**

On 22 February the chairs of the CSU Academic Senates had their quarterly meeting in Long Beach. At that meeting ASCSU Chair Christine Miller reported on a number of topics. Of particular interest is her discussion of two task forces, one of which is presently at work and the other as yet to be formed. The Tenure Density Task Force has delayed issuing its report in order to strengthen the documentation the members think is crucial. The report will not be, for the most part, a hortatory document articulating broad principles but a pragmatic assessment of the actual cost - system wide and at the campuses - of increasing tenure density. Additionally the report will consider the evidence for the value added to student education by the presence of tenured and tenure-track faculty. The task force also tackled the questions of how to define tenure density. As a side note, the chairs generally favored a metric based on FTES served. Regardless of the task force findings, it is clear that any increase in tenure density would require funds that do not appear to be forthcoming.

The second task force is a General Education Task Force being created by the ASCSU in a proactive effort to provide a faculty response to the outside demands for clarity and justification about General Education (GE). The task force was prompted, in part, because of questions by both the governor and the board of trustees about the efficacy and purpose of GE, in particular ACR 158 challenging upper division GE and anecdotes about the progeny of powerful people being unable to decipher the demands of the current GE programs on some campuses appear to have fired this quest. Those supporting the formation of the GE task force, which likely will recommend that all campuses engage in a self-study of their programs, see the problem as one of inadequate communication of the reason for GE. Confronted with the insistence that colleges train students for jobs, the defense of GE should reframe the issue as educating students for a career in which GE performs a crucial service. Demonstrating that GE actually is a coherent program that supports the major will be essential. Chair Miller emphasized that the work of

GEIAC will continue. Meanwhile SDSU already independently has embarked on a two-year review of its own GE program.

Faculty Trustee Steven Stepanek also reported to the chairs. He noted that the CO has emphasized that these are uncertain times, that the DACA students need our support, and that we must move forward with the Graduation 2025 Initiative which, Trustee Stepanek underscored, contemplates additional tenure track hires. These hires would require funding beyond what the governor appears willing to provide. A further concern is that we may be lucky if the governor's budget does not cut back funds for the CSU because of concerns about needing a reserve to cover health care funding. Stepanek also noted with respect to the Graduation 2025 Initiative that the Chancellor is more concerned with closing the gap, and that the legislature is the entity focused on the graduation rate. Success of the initiative depends on the additional funding requested by the system. One other subject Trustee Stepanek raised and that some CSUs already are looking into is the use of Metamajors as a way of directing so-called undeclared or undecided students. These metamajors could include such options as Global Studies, Law and public policy, STEM or Humanities. While metamajors might raise GE issues of double counting, they may be more effective for freshmen who have not yet settled on a major as providing a little more structure for their exploration of subjects. He provided the example of pre-nursing as a metamajor which if a student did not get into the nursing program, may already have facilitated creation of a Plan B.

The chairs had a long and fruitful discussion on issues of workload for both faculty and department chairs and that conversation will be continued at our 20April meeting and reported on after that event.

### Miscellaneous

There appears to be some uncertainty as to whether the Constitution Committee was formed for 2016/17. The answer is yes. As posted on the Academic Senate website the members of the Constitution Committee are Vince Buck, Jane Hall, Diana Guerin, Ed Trotter, Sean Walker (the five former chairs specified in the bylaws), Matt Jarvis and John Hoffman all of whom I thank for their willingness to serve.

We look forward to a productive Academic Affairs/Academic Senate retreat.

## VIII. INTERIM PROVOST REPORT

- Notifications were sent out last week to faculty who applied for sabbatical. The Professional Leaves Committee reviewed 86 applications. Based on CBA the campus is required this year to award 47 sabbaticals. After talking with the President and the Chief Financial Officer, we added two more position, so 49 sabbatical leaves were granted this year, in addition to five academic year sabbaticals which were given out. I would like to thank the Professional Leaves Committee who did a very thorough job of reviewing these applications and the staff of the Faculty Support Services who managed the process.
- There were 42 tenure track faculty search positions allotted this year. As of March 1<sup>st</sup>, 35 offers were accepted, 3 were declined. We are on a very good path of recruitment and expect a high yield this year.
- I have been scheduling meetings with department chairs and department faculty members this year. This semester I have scheduled 10 meetings at various departments in different colleges that I will be going to and directly listening to faculty members about their concerns and also talk to them about the priorities we are following in Academic Affairs.
- Update on three of the searches in Academic Affairs:
  - We have posted positions for Faculty Affairs & Records (FAR), application deadline is March 16<sup>th</sup>.
  - We just approved the final list of faculty membership for the AVP for Academic Operations search, they will hold their first meeting next week to get that search underway.
  - The Director of Faculty Development Center (FDC), we are restarting that search, we had a failed search last semester. The search committee is being finalized and the kick-off meeting will be held very soon.
- Update on WASC:
 

The President sent out her memo a couple of weeks ago creating the steering committee and several other sub committees. The first meeting of steering will be next week on March 8<sup>th</sup> to get the process started. The subcommittees will then start work on self-study and institutional report and they will be working through the summer and next fall. A draft report will be presented to the campus a year from now in spring 2018 and that report is due to WASC in fall in 2018, with a visit to take place in fall 2019. We are on track in terms of the timeline for the WASC process and the work we need to do.

- Graduation Initiative 2025 & Student Success:  
We have created a Graduation Initiative Advisory Group and several Task Forces to identify roadblocks in students' progress. These task forces are reviewing numerous data. We created a qualtrics survey link that we sent out to the campus; we have received some suggestions, areas of concerns we should be exploring and they are working on that. I just came back yesterday from Academic Council, which a group of system Provosts and this was the biggest topic. There are several issues and areas of concerns throughout the 23 campuses that were topic of discussion that we will be looking at as well. I will be sharing the details with you in the coming weeks.
- The AA/AS Retreat is tomorrow which is also focused on Student Success, to get your ideas and feedback on things we should be doing on the campus.
- The Strategic and Enrollment Management restructuring that we have been working on for quite some time is mostly finished. In January they moved the Admissions Unit to Student Affairs Division so they could work with recruitment, outreach, and admission; which makes it a cohesive unit. VP Eanes and I have been working on and both of us should be sending a memo out to you early next week outlining the work that has already been done, what the goals of this restructuring are, and what we plan to do in the short term as well as longer term. The memo is being finalized and should be out early next week.

Q: (Jarvis) How many separations were there from the University to go with the 35 plus hires?

A: I don't have the information at this time; the separations become final at the end of summer or before the fall semester. We will get you the data on last year's separations and that will tell us how many expected net additions there will be to tenure track positions.

Q: (Patton) Will next year's pool be the same, bigger, or smaller? Any anticipation on how many new positions we will have?

A: I just spoke with VP Kim last week to determine how many new tenure track searches would be taken next year. The budget does not look good at all. There is zero growth in enrollment dollars, which is the biggest line dollars and that is what is used for new tenure track hires. I have asked Deans to come up with their request. We will take the first look at that next week. I'm hoping we will have the same number of searches next year as this year, it will be confirmed after I speak with the CFO.

Q: (Myck-Wayne) If you don't use all 42 and there are a remaining 7 departments that are really low and had successful searches and have extra people, is there any change they can hire on this year so they don't have to use the cost of hiring next year and the time and effort of staff and faculty?

A: There are 42 searches that were permitted last year; all of them were allocated to departments and colleges. Departments and colleges that are going through the recruitment process right now, they are in between candidates. 35 searches have been completed, the remainder are in progress and I'm hoping they would be. But quite often we run through the hiring season and we make multiple offers, one after another, and they don't get filled. We don't know how many are going to remain unfilled, but by the time we get to that point I don't know if other colleges are finished completing their cycles or not so that we can allocate that position to someone else. I will keep that in mind to see if other departments can take advantage of that, but usually it's too late in the spring semester to make offers at that time.

## **IX. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT**

No Report

## **X. ASI REPORT (Bates)**

- The Board of Directors still have a vacancy for College of Education. Students do not need to be a part of the College of Education, they just need to be a part of a club that is affiliated with Education. Applications will be closing after spring break.
- Today we had an event for the Board of Directors, it was called breakfast with the Board. What we did there was got students' complaints and gave them free food for their complaints. We wanted to know where their issues were and it was really successful last semester so we did it again this semester. What we do is separate them based on the complaints and the area. If they are college specific, we give them to the college specific director, but if they are more about programming stuff within ASI, we give them to the programmers.

- We will be having our elections for next year's Board of Directors, our Titan Student Centers Governing Board, and our AS President and Vice President. Voting will take place March 14<sup>th</sup> - 16<sup>th</sup>.
- ASI is currently going through our budget season so we are looking at our budget figuring things out.
- We are going to the CHES Conference to legislate at the state capitol next weekend. We are taking a delegation of 14 people to Sacramento to talk to legislators.
- The Board meeting on February 14<sup>th</sup> we donated part of our contingency fund to the emergency fund on campus. ASI donated \$8,000, Athletics donated \$5,000, and ASC donated \$5,000, so there is \$18,000 that Carmen in the Dean of Students office is overseeing. If students are in need the emergency grant is for \$500.

## XI. CFA REPORT

- Next weekend we have the statewide assembly where all the chapter leadership and key activist come together and we will be electing statewide leadership at that time. Each campus has five voting delegates.
- The bargaining team will have our first official meeting next weekend.

## XII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### 12.1 ASD 16-150 Revision to UPS 210.020 - Review of Tenured Faculty

M/S/P (Patton/Stang) ASD 16-150 Revision to UPS 210.020

From 2-16-17 AS Minutes: ASD 17-21

M/S/ (Patton/Stang) ASD 16-150 Revision to UPS 210.020 [MAIN MOTION].

Continued discussion from the AS 2-16-17 meeting.

(Chair Bonney) Reminded the body where we left off in the document

- M/S/P (Walker/Meyer) Amendment to change "review" to "periodic evaluation" throughout the document. Motion passed unanimously.  
Back to main motion
- (Bruschke) Line 32: Amendment to add the wording "or at the discretion of the faculty member". Amendment considered *friendly*.  
Back to main motion

## XIII. NEW BUSINESS

### 13.1 ASD 17-24 Statements of Opinion

- (Fitch) What is the intention of question #2? Aren't we all tenure and tenure-track faculty and research part of what we are doing? Or is there only some people who explicitly have that?  
A: This is just to get a general sense about balance within the RTP process within the workload in terms of the course load. In how we evaluate research, we should keep in mind that research is something that is part of the workload in terms of the units we have. To make sure in terms of the research part the expectations were not beyond what is possible with the number of units assigned.
- (Kanel) Would this be something that is put in UPS 210.000 or would departments be putting this in?  
A: This isn't policy, statements of opinion aren't a referendum. This is just whether or not this is something that should be considered for deliberative process in the following year. This question is just whether or not this type of issue should be something that bodies, including this body, but other bodies as well should consider for debate, discussion, for all of that. Statements of Opinion don't set policies, so there is no should off of that. This is just whether or not in the future people might want to take a look the question. How they take a look at the question is completely up to them; it could include the Senate, it could include committees look at UPS 210.000, it could include departments.
  - (Patton) I think the larger question is if people should be evaluated according to their scope of work?
  - (Mead) We either need to put a preamble into the question or make sure the pro/con statements are extensively fleshed out. Because as it is right now, it is a random question coming out the void and a deer in the headlights as I read it.
  - (Jarvis) I would move to strike it. I don't think we know what we want to ask about yet, so I would strike it until we come up with something that actually gets at what we are curious about.

- (Wood) I get the point of the question, but I think the language misses the mark. The language about the teaching units assigned to research really doesn't work for me. A lot of people do research that might be in overload, or it might be in kind, or it might be through an external contract and when I read this statement I say you want to devalue all of that work and I think it is part of the portfolio or something to be evaluated. I don't think that was the intention, but that's how it's read. The question need a little more polish.
- (Walker) The intent was to say, to think about how we were evaluating faculty and what are we requiring of them and how does that reflect the work assignments they have.

13.2 ASD 17-04 Revision to UPS 410.103 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: New Programs

13.3 ASD 16-154 Revision to UPS 100.601- Procedures for Department/Program Name Changes

13.4 ASD 17-05 Revision to UPS 411.100 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses

13.5 ASD 17-16 Revision to UPS 270.102 - Graduate Committees and Advisers

13.6 ASD 17-17 New UPS 4XX.XXX - Proposed Graduate Learning Goals

13.7 ASD 17-25 Revision to UPS 260.104 - Guidelines for Granting Difference in Pay Leaves

13.8 ASD 17-26 Revision to UPS 330.232 - Policy on the Use of Alcoholic Beverages by Students and Student Organizations

13.9 ASD 17-28 Revision to UPS 100.600 - Establishment of University Departments

#### **XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

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