



ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 2017

ASD 17-21

Approved 3-16-17

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bonney called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.
A moment of silence was observed.

In Memoriam

- Robert E. Spenger, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry [died 1-20-17, age 92]
- H. Eric Streitberger, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry and Biochemistry [died 2-3-17, age 81]

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- (Fitch) The parking is working pretty good right now, but there are a lot of faculty and staff concerned over the announcement stacked parking is going to go away after the first part of the semester. Faculty unlike students have to continue teaching for the entire semester and many are very concerned about what is going to happen if stacked parking goes away.

A: Joe Ferrer, Parking Director, this week is the fourth week of classes and what's going to happen is the stacked parking operation in Faculty/Staff Lot F will be cancelled, but we are going to move it to the section of Lot E that is designated for Faculty/Staff. We will continue to offer it, just not in Lot F.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

➤	Academic Affairs/Academic Senate Retreat, Spring 2017	Friday, March 3, 2017 Marriott Hotel
➤	Night of the Pachyderm (during halftime)	Saturday, February 18 th vs. UC Davis @ 7:30 pm in Titan Gym
➤	Memorial Service for Al Flores	Saturday, March 11 th @ 1:00 pm in the Kinesiology & Health Science Building
➤	Change your password	

IV. TIMES APPROXIMATE

11:35 AM – 11:50 AM

Topic: ASD 17-02 Petition to Amend the Academic Senate Constitution

M/S/F (Fischer/Fidalgo) Motion to approve ASD 17-02 Petition to Amend the Academic Senate Constitution. [vote by hand]

Yes - 20
No - 18
Abstentions - 2

From approved 2-2-17 AS Minutes: ASD 17-14

M/S (Fischer/Fidalgo) Motioned to approve ASD 17-02 Petition to Amend the Academic Senate Constitution [MAIN MOTION].

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

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

- (Jarvis) Spoke on the following points
 - Representation and the purpose of the Senate:

Most legislatures in the world serve two primary functions: legislating and representation. While occasionally we can make decisions that improve one or the other of these, usually, improving both is tough, and many decisions force a choice to be made between those two functions. For example, were we to increase the size of the Senate, representation would likely be enhanced, but legislating would get tougher. Our primary focus in this debate is on the second function, but we should also keep that first in mind. On representation specifically, I have heard some remarks that seem to suggest that constituency seats are somehow inherently more “representative.” The focus on what constituency a senator comes from indicates a view that senators are acting at the behest of their constituents alone (or, at least, primarily). Nothing precludes a Senator from instead considering the benefits to the university as a whole. I note, for example, that many faculty often argue that we shouldn’t raise tuition, when a narrow conception of self-interest would find that would, at a minimum, be neutral for them personally. We talk in political science about delegate vs. trustee models of representation; a delegate does as their constituents wish, whereas a trustee acts as they see in the interests of their constituents (or the larger polity).
 - Apathy and running for the Senate:

Increasing the number of seats in constituencies would be likely to change the composition of the Senate. The at-large seats have not been won by a random cross-section of the university. However, I think it is far from certain that it would do anything for apathy, or increase the number of people running from historically under-represented constituencies. The logic behind that assumption rests on the notion that those who have not run for Senate seats have chosen not to do so out of some fear of losing (for the at-large seats have been available to them the entire time, in addition to the constituency seats). I do not find that assumption plausible. With 15 at-large seats, in any given year, a potential senator has been able to choose from two races: a constituency seat which can only produce one winner, and an at-large contest in which the top 5 vote-getters get seats. Thus, while there are 2 races, there are actually 6 seats possible for this potential senator to win. If two people are running for a constituency seat, they would start with a 50% chance of winning. If 8 people are running for at-large seats, each has a 62.5% chance of winning. Now, concerns have been raised that “name recognition” helps established campus voices prevail over new voices. This is very likely true. But, if a constituency senator has that name recognition advantage, their challenger is unlikely to beat them in a one-on-one contest. In the at-large context, 5 of your opponents must have that advantage to generate the same (low) chances of winning. Yes, the at-large seats draw from a larger population, but will each cohort have 5 at-large senators who want to run for reelection and have high name recognition? Seems unlikely.

Furthermore, I think the idea that people don’t run for the Senate because they are going through these calculations is implausible. Rather, we see certain constituencies over- or under-represented on the Senate because apathy vs. interest in the university community is not equally distributed, and we wouldn’t expect it to be. We didn’t accidentally become engineers, artists, or sociologists.
 - Name recognition:

If we are trying to solve the problem of people with higher name recognition winning, then why don’t we solve that problem more directly? If that’s the problem people have, then try to solve it by giving folks who run for the Senate more name recognition. For example, you could allow someone to send one email to the whole campus. They would be due by a certain date before the election, then everybody gets one email instead of just the little blurb that is kind of limited in scope. There may be other solutions that more directly attack the problem that I think folks have. But if I am wrong about what I think the problem folks have and they think it is representation, then I would say vote that way.
- (Stambough) A general comment on some of the conversations and some of the email that have been going around even on the results of the Statements of Opinion and what is the purpose of the Statements of Opinion. There is disagreement about what the actual number is, what the number mean, is there a majority, or is there not. In terms of the results off the Statement of Opinion, the most accurately way to describe it is there is a plurality in favor of what was on there, it wasn’t a majority. You can go through who the nonvoters were and who decided to skip that one and you can add all that type of stuff and you will end up with numbers that show not a majority but a plurality position. Most importantly, Statements of Opinion in our system aren’t referendum; that comes up later, it’s a later process. The purpose of a Statement of Opinion because they are placed in the ballot and you get a one paragraph pro and a one paragraph con, you get some people talking about it, other people just kind of looking at it, then its determined to be what’s supposed to be considered and what goes on the agenda. By having a Statement of Opinion were a pretty large plurality said yes this is something we want to consider is something that I think it is fair to say the Senate should consider and I think we have considered. We considered it last semester and we are considering it this semester. From there we go through the deliberative process to explore it more in depth,

either at a committee level or as a Senate as a whole. Let's explore that more in depth and maybe it's a good idea, maybe it's not, or maybe we need to tweak it. We saw a tweak last time when we went from zero to six in terms of the amendment that was proposed. Once the Senate makes a decision there are then processes in place to send it back out to the faculty as a whole, for then what would be a referendum to actually make a policy decision. When the Constitutional amendment is placed before the electorate as a whole, faculty as a whole and university as a whole, as a policy proposal that is a referendum that's an actual policy decision that gets settled that way. When we have a Statement of Opinion, the purpose for that is just is this something we need to consider more in depth and is this a direction we may want to consider going? When we have a Statement of Opinion, whether it's this one or ones we have in the future, I don't want us to put too much weight necessarily in to the finite details of what was in that particular statement because it's really kind of a push. If a Statement of Opinion passes, or with this case a strong plurality, that's a push for the Senate and for faculty in the future to add detail to this, to add research into this, to consider it, to deliberate it, to debate it, and then to make a decision which then goes back out to the faculty for final vote. So the Statement of Opinion was just step one on this process, this is step two in the process, and if it goes onto the ballot again that would be step three in the process. But all three steps of the process have a different purpose and all three steps of the process would be necessary for a Constitutional Amendment to go through and not combine what some of those are and what the purpose of some of those are.

- (Fitch) My understanding is what we are going to vote up or down on would be on the proposed amendment that we reduce the number of at-large seats to six. That being said, I think what Steve just laid out, is compelling to me that we should vote for this amendment and put it out to the whole community so that people can vote on it. I've talked to people who are telling me one thing, other people in here are talking to other people who say something else. This is a really important decision, probably way too important to be condensed down into a 15 minute discussion and I think the best solution for everybody and to really clarify where people are on this is to put it out to a faculty vote. The only way we can put it out to a faculty vote is if we approve it today.
- (Wang) This made me think real seriously about my vote. I'm here from ECS, only one member, when I look back over what we have achieved over this year we have no problem with the current structure of the Senate. Whatever we want to do, we focus on the students. We are helping the students, we are trying to make the university a better place. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of my colleagues here, Senate members, as well as the Administration for all your support over this year, that we grow that much. I am very happy and I would like to say the current structure works well with us and especially for our students
- (Oliver) I thought about this a lot since we adjourned prior to summer, and I think we have had a plethora of really good thinking, deliberation, support, and opposed a lot of different points of view. I think back to a comment that Senator Meyer made, and it was very relevant when he commented to the point that the relationship between administration and the Senate is better than we see on our other 22 campuses. I don't see us with terrific negative issues, we work very well as a body. Senator Mead also made a very good point when he showed that we have a number of people that come back and forth between the Senate and other positions, and I think that adds to the luster, insight, and the real credibility of this as an Academic Senate. It reflects what Senator Bonney continues to talk about administration and the faculty, that we really are a body of shared governance and I think we can't lose track of that. I want to comment the Political Scientist Senators Jarvis and Stambough, I am a Political Scientist myself. I think the fact that delegate and trustee is a critical issue and I think this body as a whole, where it has been on a committee I have served on or listening to the deliberations which have been done in this body, we represent our constituencies and we do represent the organization as a whole. I think that is both the role and responsibility that fluctuates occasionally, it goes back and forth, but I think people really accept that and do it very professionally. As far as the apathy and increasing the involvement with the Senate committees, I think that is a different issue that we would have to deal with on a different day. I think it that's all our responsibilities to be marketers of our brand and get people involved, and that is a difficult issue to deal with. The original proposal to eliminate the at-large totally I would have to be in total disagreement with. I think that takes out a viable segment in the shared governance that belongs there. I think the compromise that was made to six at-large doesn't really enhance constituencies that much, but it doesn't foul anything up. It takes a little Bylaw work as Sean has pointed out and Constitutional work, but then we weren't elected to go on vacation, so if that's what it takes, that's what we need to do. The original with zero, I can't comply with that. I have no difficulty with supporting the six, the amendment the way it is. I feel very comfortable with that and think it recognizes a lot of thought and consideration for people, I have really looked at this in a lot of different ways. I can't call for a vote, because Dr. Walker has to speak.

- (Walker) I would like to speak against the motion that is on the floor. I am completely for eliminating at-large seats, I think its fine and it brings more faculty to the Senate and my vision of that is it gives us more people to put on committees and to report back to the Senate and be involved. I feel like that was an important thing and that was a legitimate purpose for removing the at-large seats. The compromise, on the other hand, I think would exacerbate our problems with name recognition, large colleges being able to dominate those seats, and large constituencies being able to dominate those seats. If you look at the last elections, the folks who are winning are from Administration, Social Sciences, Humanities, Arts, or former Senate Chairs. So I feel like this would exacerbate our current problems with name recognition and other things, so I would be in favor of leaving things the way they are. So I would vote no on this.
- (Dries) I just want to make sure I'm understanding that we are voting on amending to change from fifteen to six currently?
A: (Bonney) That would be correct.

Q: And then pass or fail, what happens after that?

A: In order for this to pass now, it would have to be unanimous. In order for it to go on the ballot immediately, it would have to get twenty-five votes, an absolute majority. Anything less, there is a second procedure that would have to be followed. The clock would start running on that today and would run for two weeks and that requires a petition to solicit a large number of signatures. That is the process.

- (Stohs) Since I'm last, I'm not sure I have to do it, but I was going to call the question.

Q&A:

Q: (Tavakolian) How many signatures are required? I thought it was 10 percent, which is about five people.

A: No, it is 10 percent of the electorate, not of the Senate. So we would first have to calculate the total number of faculty administrators because it includes all the constituencies, and it would be 10 percent of that. I would guess somewhere around 280, but I can't give you that exact number right now, we would have to check because it fluctuates. We will figure out the number and let you know today.

Q: (Kanel) Does that include the staff?

A: It does not include the staff because they are a separate constituency, it does not include part-time faculty because they are a separate constituency, and it does not include Student Affairs for the same reason. It includes all of the Administrative Constituency and the other eight college constituencies.

Q: (DeMars) Is this something that is done online through a link? How are people expected to sign up?

A: The people who wish to propose this has to collect signatures in hard copy. This is a petition that has to be signed.

- (Bruschke) I am going to request a roll call vote at the request of one of my colleagues.
- (Bonney) No, we have taken the vote; the vote is the vote. We had a show of hands, it was not a yes or no vote.

11:50 AM

Topic: Christine Miller, Chair, Academic Senate of the California State University

Chair Bonney introduced to the body Christine Miller, Chair of the Academic Senate for the whole system.

Christine Miller gave an update on the following areas:

- General Information & Background of the Statewide Senate
- Prediction about General Education
- Graduation Initiative 20205
- Insight on Shared Governance
- How to provide input on resolutions that had a first reading

Q/A session followed.

Q: (Stohs) We are concerned about the California State Budget for the CSU and the proposed tuition adjustment. I know the Statewide Senate has spent a lot of time debating that, and I think it would be useful to hear from you as our Chair about where that stands and what you think might happen.

A: I like the fact that you acknowledge it was called a tuition adjustment; that's what it was called during the Board Meeting and God bless the students. They stood up and said "don't you dare call it an adjustment, you are increasing it. Don't try to water this down to make it look like something it's not." And they started using different language. I was so proud of them. That's exactly what it is, it's an increase, it's not an adjustment. The Statewide Senate had a really in-depth debate about the position that the Statewide Senate should take on that adjustment. There were quite a few people who made very strong and compelling arguments about the fact that it has been six years since there has been any adjustment to tuition and that if there are going to be adjustment or increases they ought to be small incremental ones, not ones that wallop the students then we go on, let a few more years go by and then we wallop them again. There were some really principled and sound arguments made about the way to engage how much students are paying for their education. Ultimately it was not a unanimous decision by any stretch of the imagination, but ultimately the faculty in the Statewide Senate voted to endorse the student position that there should be no increase in tuition. I wouldn't be surprised if later on the Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee comes back with a resolution that asks the Senate to consider that notion of smaller, more regular, more predictable tuition increases. But we will see what happens with that. At this point, however, what I represent is the Senate's position and the Senate voted to stand with the students.

Q: (Kanel) We talk a lot about it here that Cal State Fullerton has a large amount of students and yet we are at the bottom of the list of getting funding. Does the Academic Statewide Senate have anything to do to advocate for us or is that going to stay a permanent thing? We seem to revisit that on a regular basis here on the Senate floor. Do you have any thoughts or ideas about that?

A: No. That might be something that the Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee might engage in terms of the formulas that are used to deal with campus funding. But I think those are discussions that happen above my pay grade with the Chancellor, with the Board, and particularly with the Presidents.

Q: (Walker) The current budget situation seems sort of like we need "X" amount of money, but we are not going to give you that much money. Do you have any insight? Because I know you get to spend time with folks of higher pay grades, how likely might the Governor be to increase the allocation that we get, or what sort of efforts is the Chancellor's office doing? I know what the ASCSU is doing.

A: The Chancellor's office is ramping up their advocacy efforts. There are going to be some meeting taking place in a couple of weeks in the capital that I will be a part of and other advocacy efforts going on throughout March and April. We are hoping to make a difference in the May revise; I think it will depend on what the LAO says in terms of the state revenues. It's very clear this Governor is building a war chest. That war chest is designed to offset things that might happen from Washington, DC in terms of healthcare and student dreams (those kinds of things), but healthcare I think is a big one. What I'm hearing is the Chancellor's office pointed to about \$2 billion in reserves and wondering whether we might just be able to get a little teeny slice out of the \$2 billion, because \$2 billion might be more than is necessary for that war chest. So I'm from Sacramento, and when I sat there in my living room on Sunday, and hear this is not a drill, everyone in Oroville vacate your homes immediately, I just thought Oroville Dam - there goes any funding that the CSU was going to get. That's just me; it's not anything I'm hearing from the Chancellor's office. But I am hearing yesterday the Executive Committee had a meeting with the Chancellor and were talking about monies and he said he thought that because of all the rain we are getting that wildfires were going to be a big concern, so he put it in this general nature's catastrophe sense of the Governor and others justifying not giving us extra monies because of those issues.

(Bonney) We had a conference last Friday that was talking about closing the student achievement gap and at the end there was a panel discussion, of which Chris was a part. She emphasized that what was really important in making any of this happen was investing in the faculty. It was very stirring, very powerful and I wanted to thank her for making that statement in that place in front of that audience, which included the Chancellor and a lot of the university presidents. So many, many thanks for your advocacy on behalf of faculty.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1. ASD 17-14 Academic Senate Minutes 2-2-17 (Draft)

M/S/P (Stohs/Oliver) Minutes were approved unanimously.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

6.1 NOMINEES TO COMMITTEE

NOMINEES TO STANDING COMMITTEES

DIVERSITY & INCLUSION COMMITTEE

Nominees: Elisa Mandell (ARTS);
Confirmed 10/27: Jennifer Burnaford (NSM); Rebecca Dolhinow (HUM); Michael Perez (SOC SCI);
 Henry Puente (COMM); Charles Smith (MCBE); Julian Jefferies (EDUC);
 Phoolendra Mishra (ECS); James Rodríguez (HHD); Lindsay O'Neill (L/A/C/E)

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Nominees: Marty Bonsangue (NSM); **Pending** (COMM)
Confirmed 2/2: Betty Chavis (MCBE); Zakyi Ibrahim (HUM); Sadeeka Al-Majid for Yuying Tsong (HHD);
 John Patton (SOC SCI); Joel Lanning (ECS); Adolfo Prieto (L/A/C/E); Vita Jones (EDUC);
 Eve Himmelheber (ARTS);

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE

Nominees: John (Kenneth) Faller (ECS)
Confirmed 9/29: Michael McAlexander (COMM); Bill Hoese (NSM); 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)

NOMINEES TO SEARCH COMMITTEE

ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC OPERATIONS

Nominees: Kim Norman (EDUC); Volker Janssen (HSS); Sam Behseta (NSM); Adelina Gnanlet (MCBE)

VII. CHAIR'S REPORT – Distributed to campus on 2-10-17

This week's chair's report will be brief because the items on the agenda for the meeting on the 16th are the same as they were for the meeting on 2 February. But first another celebration for the campus with the announcement that Geoffrey Lovelace in the Physics Department has received a CAREER Award, the National Science Foundation's most prestigious award for faculty members early in their careers. Coming at the first anniversary of the announcement of the detection of the gravitational waves the timing seems perfect. We continue to celebrate the absolutely outstanding work that all our faculty perform.

Two remarks about the agenda for the 16th. Thanks to Katherine Powers we discovered that we had been using the wrong draft of UPS 410.103 so the documents for next week's meeting will look somewhat different from the version you perused for the meeting on the 2nd. Also, because we devoted nearly 40 minutes to the debate on the amendment to the constitution, we have scheduled time certain to complete deliberation and voting on the petition from 11:35-11:50. The balance of the meeting will be made available to Christine Miller, the chair of the ASCSU who will share with us thoughts on a number of topics including the GE Task Force that is being established, the 2025 Graduation Initiative and shared governance. This promises to be an interesting and engaging discussion. To maximize our time with Chair Miller we also will distribute all the usual reports - ASI, ASCSU, CFA, and Provost – prior to the meeting.

For those among us who think warmly of the student activism of an earlier age, the engagement of our own students at this difficult moment is most encouraging. It speaks highly of our students that groups with opposing views can share the same space in an appropriate manner. The willingness to listen to diverse voices on contested issues is crucial to the life of our institution.

VIII. INTERIM PROVOST REPORT – Distributed on 2-14-17

Graduation Initiative 2025

First, I would like to follow-up on Senator Gradilla's question from the February 2, 2017 meeting. Senator Gradilla asked whether recipients of the Graduation Initiative 2025 "Completion Grants" for intersession and summer courses need to have a FAFSA on file and whether the grant would affect their financial aid.

Recipients of the intersession and summer “Completion Grants” do not need to have a FAFSA on file. However, the grant must be coordinated with the student’s federal and state financial package through the Office of Financial Aid. For intersession, there is little chance that this grant would affect a student’s award since intersession costs are not counted in our standard cost of attendance, nor is aid awarded specifically for intersession. For summer, there should not be a big impact because most of the aid typically awarded in summer is limited to the aid the student did not use during the academic semester.

Also, as an update on our Graduation Initiative 2025 efforts, I am pleased to announce that a Qualtrics link has been set up to help gather input on challenges you have noticed that delay a timely graduation, as well as suggestions for solutions to these challenges. To accomplish Graduation Initiative 2025’s ambitious goals, we need everyone’s input and creative ideas to help our students achieve their dreams of a college education and a meaningful life and career. Please use this Qualtrics link to provide us your feedback: [Faculty and Staff Feedback on Student Success](#). We are in the process of establishing five task forces to review and work on the input provided. I will continue to keep you updated on the progress.

Searches in Academic Affairs

In terms of searches within Academic Affairs, I am pleased to report that the Director of Faculty Affairs and Records search committee had its kick-off meeting last week and the position announcement will be posted soon. On-campus interviews are tentatively scheduled for the last week of April. Soon, we will also begin the search for a permanent Associate Vice President for Academic Operations. The search committee is in the process of being established. I will continue to keep you updated on the progress.

Thank you for your continued hard work and all you do for our students.

IX. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT – Distributed on 2-14-17

On Thursday there was a social and dinner. Approximately 160–200 people attended, including ASCSU Senators, the President, Provost and AVP of Student Affairs from each of the 23 campuses, ASI student leaders from each campus, representatives of CSSA, administrators from the Chancellor’s Office and members of the CSU Board of Trustees.

The main part of the Conference was all day on Friday, with two keynote speakers:

1. **Dr. Diane Ravitch**. (Program note) She is a champion of public schools across the country. Drawing on over 40 years of research and experience, Ravitch is the nation’s leading advocate for public education. Her years of experience working in the government shaped her approach to education, and gave her a unique and powerful perspective which she brings into all aspects of her work.

She spoke about the two goals of the Grad Initiative 2025: (1) increasing the graduation rate overall and (2) closing the achievement gap; and noted, most importantly, that there is a tension, even “conflict” between the two. If the CSU places its attention primarily on #1, it is likely that the achievement gap will not go away, and could easily widen. In contrast, a successful focus on the achievement gap will increase the graduation rate.

2. **Dr. Tia Brown McNair**. (Program Note) She is Vice President in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Student Success at Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in Washington, DC. She oversees both funded projects and AAC&U’s continuing programs on equity, inclusive excellence, high-impact educational practices, and student success, including AAC&U’s Network for Academic Renewal series of yearly working conferences.

She spoke about the achievement gap. A good bit of the discussion was about clarifying the (many) terms related to equity, equality, and so on; that equality is not the same as equity. She reminded us that the achievement gap is not necessarily the ability gap. And one of **the key points** was that while ensuring that students are college ready is relevant for K–12 and admissions, the CSU should ensure and focus on making **college ready for students**.

Dr. Ravitch spoke in the morning, with breakout sessions following.

Dr. McNair spoke after lunch, with breakout sessions following.

The breakout sessions were a random mixture of Administrators, faculty, students and CSU Trustees. The goal for each group (about 24 total) of people in these sessions was to arrive at one or two main recommendations about the Graduation Initiatives and forward them to the Chair of the Conference, Dr. Praveen Soni, an ASCSU Senator and faculty member in the Department of Marketing at Long Beach State. The recommendations and notes from the sessions will be summarized for future reference and action.

X. ASI REPORT – Distributed on 2-14-17

ASI Board of Director's has two positions open; one for the College of EDU and one for the College of NSM. Please encourage students to apply at <http://asi.fullerton.edu/government/leadershipPositions.asp>

ASI Elections

ASI elections applications are open for ASI President and Vice President, Board of Directors, and Titan Student Centers Governing Board. Please encourage students to apply at:

<http://asi.fullerton.edu/government/elections.asp>

XI. CFA REPORT – Distributed on 2-14-17

CFA Statewide leadership met in Long Beach February 3-4, 2017 for the Spring Kickoff meeting – *Protecting the People's University*. Among the sessions were discussions around the altered national landscape and the impending threat to public education, unions, academic freedom, and the CSU's vulnerable students, faculty and staff.

At the kickoff, a results recap was provided regarding the political action hours CFA committed to and performed during the 2016 General Election for CFA endorsed candidates and ballot measures. CFA had committed to a total of 2,594 hours – that goal was trounced by 76% as CFA collectively performed 4,559 hours. Statewide, 329+ individual faculty members took political action during the campaign – that number goes well beyond the statewide and chapter leadership and into our rank-and-file membership. Of the 71 legislative races CFA took positions on, 65 won (overall an 89% win rate). Of the 7 ballot measures CFA took positions on, 5 passed including our top priority Proposition 55. Finally, with the help of CFA members on the ground, both Assembly and Senate Democrats obtained supermajorities in their houses.

At the last senate meeting, the question was raised regarding whether or not CFA would be addressing academic freedom in the upcoming bargaining meetings. After examining the majority of input received from the bargaining survey, CFA will be bargaining very aggressively for academic freedom as this was a major concern of those responding.

XII. NEW BUSINESS**12.1 ASD 16-117 New UPS 100.250 - Definition of Academic Unit**

M/S/P (Fischer/Stohs) ASD 16-117 New UPS 100.250 was approved without dissent.

- (Fischer) Line 14: Academic unit should be lower case.
- (Fidalgo) It mentions units that exist outside of a college. Which ones are they and who oversees them?
 - A: The Honors Program and the First Year Experience. Academic Programs but ones that are staffed by multiple departments or multiple colleges like the Honors Program, which doesn't actually reside in a college, but is still an academic unit.
- (Mead) I would say one of the things we put in here to address some of those concerns is to make sure there are faculty involved in such entities and or some sort of senate advisory committee or oversight committee, or something that is involving the faculty voice.
- (Stohs) I believe that is stated on Line 15 in Section A.

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

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

- (Kanel) I have a little issue with wording a couple of times. You call it a periodical review, but throughout the document you write periodic evaluations. Are we using review and evaluation synonymously, because in my mind they mean different things? So I wonder if we can have consistency and use either review or evaluation throughout the document.
 - (Bonney) I'm going to ask Senator Patton what the committee thought since they drafted it.
 - (Patton) We gave this to the Executive Committee in September, so I'm trying to remember everything. I do remember we were very careful of realigning the language with the CBA. So I think those changes were made they were appropriate to the CBA. Maybe Kristin can speak to that as well.
 - (Stang) In Article 15 under Evaluation General Provisions, 15.1 states the term "evaluation" as used in this Article shall refer to either a Periodic Evaluation or a Performance Review.

- (Walker) In the Collective Bargaining Agreement, it says periodical evaluation although it uses the words periodic review occasionally. This is a periodic review, so it has no performance review implications. I agree with Senator Kanel

I would move that we make sure it says periodic evaluation the whole way through.
Amendment consider *friendly*.

- (Jarvis) In Section G, Lines 122-124, I read that as being vague. When it says all these people shall meet with them at every stage, that reads to me that it's quite possible at every stage of the review I have to meet everybody. The way the *and* is done. I think specifying at the relevant stage or something like that could clarify that.

If people consider that friendly, I would say "at the relevant stage".

- (Walker) I don't think it's friendly because it still has the Peer Review Committee, the Department Chair, and the appropriate administrator shall meet at the relevant stage. So it's still saying all of them have to meet.
- (Jarvis) How about respective stages?
- (Walker) Can I make a suggestion to your amendment? I would suggest replacing that with a new sentence that says:

"At the conclusion of each level review, the appropriate person (e.g., Department Peer Review Committee Chair, Department Chair, or the appropriate administrator) shall meet with the faculty member."

Amendment consider *friendly*.

This would also make it an appropriate sentence and the sentence at the end of the paragraph appropriate. Department may specify individual meetings or single combined meeting.

- (Fischer) I think there is a word missing on Line 30, insert the word "data" after quantitative.
Amendment consider *friendly*.
 - M/S/P (Walker/Fitch) Amendment to insert the wording "If required by the department" at the beginning of Item 3, Line 32.
 - (Dries) Suggested, "if requested" instead of "if required" considered *friendly*.
- Back to Main motion*

~~12.3 ASD 17-03 Revision to UPS 320.020 – University Writing Requirements~~

- 12.4 ASD 17-04 Revision to UPS 410.103 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: New Programs
- 12.5 ASD 16-154 Revision to UPS 100.601- Procedures for Department/Program Name Changes
- 12.6 ASD 17-05 Revision to UPS 411.100 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses
- 12.7 ASD 17-16 Revision to UPS 270.102 - Graduate Committees and Advisers
- 12.8 ASD 17-17 New UPS 4XX.XXX - Proposed Graduate Learning Goals

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

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