

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes

MEETING #7

Thursday, November 29, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Towner Auditorium (PSY 150)

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA-MSA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES-MSA
 - 3.1 Academic Senate meeting of November 15, 2018
4. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
 - 4.1 Executive Committee: Announcements- announcements of recent deaths of two esteemed faculty members, Misty Jaffe and Kent Merryfield. There was a moment of silence in their honor. Both were very active in faculty governance and will be missed. EC has invited 2 professors to speak at the Academic Senate spring lecture series. “The Tyranny of Metrics” author and Benjamin Bowser, author of “The Abandoned Mission of the CSU”
Annual conference of *Best Practices* held at CSU Fresno applications being accepted.
 - 4.2 Nominating Committee- NS states that COE needs a member on the NC for next semester. Vacancy due to sabbatical, need member for spring 19 only. Shadi Sabegh was selected.
5. SPECIAL ORDERS
 - 5.1 Report from CSULB President Jane Conoley: TIME CERTAIN 2:15 pm- JC reported on Jeet Joshee and JC in London for CSU Alumni event, 50 Alumni from CSULB met with JC and JJ at conference, also met with current students in London. Asked about the procedure for removing “Emeritus” status from a faculty member. National Collegiate Honors Council rated CSULB Honors program run by Dr. Deborah Thien as excellent. “Fit well” app created by a former CSULB student and presented idea to JC at conference. Nancy Matthews asks if JC supports the “Tenets of Shared Governance” document from the CO.
 - 5.2 Report from CFA President Doug Domingo-Forasté- reports on 3.5% for faculty to appear in tomorrow’s paychecks (12/1/18). Evaluations to be sent out soon, DDF reminds faculty that they need to send a response on evaluations within 10 days; states that responses should be sent if positive or negative evaluations received.
 - 5.3 Report from ASCSU Senator Kelly Janousek: TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm- KJ reports on recent ASCSU reports. Reviewers are needed for CC courses to ensure they meet our standards. “Course hero”, a free website that pays students to upload course notes, exams, and other materials from specific professors so allows students to skip lectures and preview exams. They have even tried to put a kiosk

on campus. Faculty in encouraged to look at “Course Hero” website to see if their materials are posted. Also states that CSU students are graduating with less debt than the norm. CC update provided by Praveen Soni regarding online college. ASCSU passed resolutions on course review requirements. Course hero has had legal counsel who have requested a disclaimer on their website. Public records request regarding making grades, instructors, rosters public, was “cleansed” to remove instructor names. Alternate appointments also discussed which are hiring faculty to perhaps only do: teaching and research, or teaching and service, not all three.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.2 Proposed revision of Policy on Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity PS 11-08 (AS-1058-18/FPPC/EC)—SECOND READING: TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm- a document was produced from the results of the straw poll. Lines 50-58. Move to replace lines 44-47 with lines 50-58 moved and seconded. FH proposed term “release time” to be replaced with “reassigned time” in line 54. Dean Pavri states she has concerns with the difference between small grants and RSCA. AC states that colleges can come up with ways to switch between the two awards. AC also states chairs need to know about these awards due to scheduling issues. AC states you should be only able to apply for one pool due to difficulty for committee in making the decision. PS states it is a resource issue. Curt Bennett raises concerns about results of straw poll as a guideline when straw poll results were so close. Josh is concerned with 2nd paragraph, too restrictive. CSH speaks against all changes and wants to go back to old wording. CSH wants to go back to original FPPC document. Vote on lines 44 and 45, keep as is or replace Voting (approve lines 50-58) A=21 **(keep lines 44-45) B=27**. Next voting on lines 45-47, moved by AC. Voting (keep lines 45-47) A=15 **(remove lines 45-47) B=26** now discussing lines 60-66 (NS wrote) which is based on the straw polls lines 69-70(AC wrote), deleting lines 60-66 motion to change and seconded. Discussion NM states adding language about “colleges having power to develop their own deadlines” XX spoke against that, Josh speaks against, AC speaks against Josh’s point then all deadlines remain the same. JC speaks of creating one application for all the awards so would need one deadline. DS states that Simon Kim states the application deadline, DS says colleges should keep separate deadline for autonomy. NH speaks in favor of lines 69-70. CSH speaks against, GG addresses workload issue. GG states that those who receive RSCA’s should be forced to sit on RSCA committee. Vote on strike lines 45-47: A=strike language B= not strike language. **A=30 B=12**. Voting on lines 69-70 with amendment; AC moves to table discussion on lines 69-70, moved and seconded: A=table B= continue discussion. Vote: **A=39 B= 6**. Line 74 motion by CB, CSH speaks in favor of this amendment. Move line 74 to in between 72 and 73, Vote: **A=36 B=3** voting to add language of line 74 to in between 72 and 73.

Working on section 3.2 AC added language lines 168-171 to explain awards. Yes (add language), NO (do not add language)= Nellie Wieland suggests a straw poll, DS says language of “may” instead. Discussion is tabled until next meeting.

- 6.3 Proposed revision of Policy on Avoidance of Conflict of Interest PS 99-15 and Policy on Nepotism PS 05-10 (AS-968-17/FPPC)—SECOND READING
- 6.4 Proposed revision of Policy on Faculty Awards PS 12-06 (AS-1067-18/FPPC)—SECOND READING
- 6.5 Proposed revision of Charge of University Mini-Grant and Summer Stipend Committee (UMGSSC) (AS-1068-18/FPPC)—SECOND READING

7. NEW BUSINESS-

- 7.1 Discussion of documents on tenets of shared governance: TIME CERTAIN 2:40 pm- PS reports that these documents are from CO and last year’s ASCSU’s EC. This came about due to EO 1100 and 1110 being put forward without any consultation for the most part. Many concerns were raised due to this. In May CO spoke to ASCSU and then put forward Shared Governance document, asked if EC had any concerns or issues, introduced in May at Plenary meeting. In September the discussion continued on this document, feedback solicited from campuses. NS asks for feedback on the document which was put on the AS website. GG states that documents regarding shared governance from the CO mean nothing in his opinion. He states they do “whatever they want” to do regarding various issues. He states that CO often ignores objections put forward. NM states that CSUDH rejected their document one month ago, NS answered that CSUDH began their discussions earlier than they should of. HB asks if this document will have a role in future scenarios or just another document in a stack of document that are meaningless. PS says it depends on if the CO and ASCSU work together through collaboration, or not. PS states there is an “emergency clause” where things can happen in an “emergency”. What constitutes an emergency? KJ states that there has been a lot of change in the CO with regards to AVP’s. KJ suggests letting ASCSU “fight” out with the CO. NM suggests a memo stating areas of concern. NM states that referring to some of the other CSU documents and pointing out areas of agreement rather than areas of disagreement. NM suggest a memo stating what we support. Josh suggests that faculty primacy is a concern and what does that entail? Josh motion for a straw poll for a recommendation to ASCSU to recommend. Voted: **(Yes) A= 47 (No) B= 2**. Fumio asks if this had been in place would that have affected EO 1100 or 1110. DS asks if timing is an issue, 110 days vs. 75 days for example. PS states that Executive Vice Chancellor states that this is a “starting point” and if more discussion is to ensue, first this statement must be approved. KJ suggests an “addendum” to be added to the end of the document. GG asks what the enforcement policy is; if something is not given the correct time period. PS says to protest. BJ states that the Board of Trustees are the fiduciary party, so BOT

gives recommendation to CO. Some felt the document is vague and that is problematic; primacy is not clear in this document.

8. ADJOURNMENT-3:56 pm