



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES OCTOBER 29, 2015

ASD 15-149

Approved 11-12-15

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Armstrong, Balderas, Bonney, Buck, Carroll, Casem, Cuaresma, Cruz, DeMars, Dries, Eanes, Filowitz, Fischer, Fitch, Fontaine, Gradilla, Guerin, Hassan, Kanel, Lin, Mead, Meyer, Mouttapa, Myck-Wayne, Oliver, Perez, Powers, Randall, Rhoten, Rodriguez, Sargeant, Stang, Stein, Stohs, Tavakolian, Walicki, Walker, Wang, Wood

Absent: Basil, Chavis, Dabirian, Evanow, Fidalgo, García, Puri, Robles

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. URGENT BUSINESS

2.1 Senator Kanel brought up the outcome of the recent HHD Dean Search. She has received overwhelmingly negative responses from many of the constituencies in her college. Her colleagues wanted her to express their concerns with the process. Senator Kanel asked to have a discussion on the matter.

- The body unanimously agreed to the discussion (10 minutes).

Issues with the search:

- Faculty feel that while they were invited to attend the open forums and provide feedback, their feedback and opinions were not considered.
- Responses have been received not only from faculty in HHD, but faculty in other colleges and this is now a University issue and not just a college issue.
- Faculty have concerns about the use of an outside firm to conduct the search.
- Staff feel that they have no representation in the process.
- Decisions of great consequences are being made by administrators who appear not to accept or respect the recommendations of the faculty and staff, creating a negative campus climate.
- Students enjoy serving on search committees with faculty and staff, however, ASI also feels there is a lack of communication and representation.
- Faith in the search process has been compromised by concerns expressed by faculty that all three of the candidates who made the short list fell short of the qualifications of the Interim Dean.
- How do we support the new Dean who will have to work with a large number of faculty who have expressed negative feelings towards her before she has started the job? What are we going to do to make sure our college will continue to thrive as it has under the current Interim Dean?
- Does the use of an external search firm remove faculty input from the process?
- Why can't we rate candidates and put them in a rank order like we do when we hire faculty?

Provost Cruz acknowledged and expressed appreciation for the feedback. I understand per the Chairs recent report there will be conversations around the policies that guide these processes; questions regarding the use of search firms, questions regarding the representation on the committee, questions regarding how the committee wants it formed, communicates with the campus community to ensure that everyone is up to date on the various steps and stages that goes into the process. I understand the protocol in general associated with the searches will be discussed.

In terms of the comments that were made of the decision making process, I want to assure you all comments were taken into consideration. All of the information that was before me was considered. There were a variety of perspectives with regards to the candidates. The finalists were chosen by some of our most distinguished colleagues. Candidates were brought to campus and interviewed by a cross section of our University allowing me different perspectives on them. I was also able to interact with each of the candidates one-on-one and get a sense of who they are and what they bring. In addition, I had a chance to speak to people that have known each of the candidates for years. All of that information informed my decision. If this University gives Dr. Laurie Rodes an opportunity to

succeed, she will. The first person that expressed support for the success of the new Dean of HHD was our esteemed colleague, Dr. Jessie Jones.

- The body unanimously agreed to an extension of the discussion (10 minutes).
 - It was suggested that a process for people to share their thoughts and concerns should be developed to avoid “reply all” emails.
 - Concern was expressed about the timing of the campus-wide announcement.
 - A request was made for support and help with the transition in leadership in HHD
 - The work of the search committee was lauded and the call for support during the transition was seconded.
 - We are sending out the policy for review and this is the time where it is important to look at the document and look at the process to see what might work better.
- The body unanimously agreed to another extension (10 minutes).
 - The strength, resilience, and collegiality of the students, faculty and staff of College of HHD was recognized and applauded.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 ASD 15-143 Academic Senate Minutes 10-15-15 Draft
M/S/P (Wang/Walker) ASD 15-143 Draft Minutes were approved as amended.

V. CHAIR’S REPORT (Chair Bonney)

4.1 Written Chairs report distributed to campus 10-23-15

This “Chair’s Report” is primarily about issues that have emerged over the last two weeks - a report on what the Executive Committee proposes to do in one case and a request for advice.

Last week we had finalists on campus for the position of dean of the college of Health and Human Development. We have a lot of searches going on right now with more finalists for deans’ positions on campus the first week of November and again the first week of December. Anyone who has ever been on a search committee knows what hard work it is and that you have to keep everything absolutely confidential. The procedure for these searches, including the composition and appointment of the search committee, is laid out UPS 210.007 and UPS 210.500. In my experience the faculty who participate do so in good faith and with the best interests of the institution at heart. The process takes a lot of time from deciding on and posting a job description and then reviewing what can be a really large pool of applicants to narrow the field down to ten or so individuals for airport or skype interviews. At the end of all this confidential work the search goes public with the identification of three (rarely four) finalists who are invited to campus for a full day of interviews with faculty and staff and other deans and so on. The finalists start the interviews with breakfast and end with dinner. When these folks are on campus they are our guests. So we should welcome them and treat them with courtesy and respect. It isn’t just that we are checking them out - they in turn are looking at us and will report back to their own campuses and colleagues.

So it was distressing to hear, first, that in some settings these finalists had not been accorded the warm welcome one might hope for - had in fact encountered some not very covert hostility. What was the message they took back to their home campuses one wonders? How do we look to them? It also appears that there were complaints about the procedure and the search committee. That’s hard for committee members to hear at the end of a long process. If there are things about the process that we need to fix then we make revisions to the UPS. And at the end of the day we have to trust our colleagues - that’s part of shared governance and the representative democracy we have on this campus. If you have suggestions on any of this - for example, on a better procedure to constitute a search committee - I hope you will send me an email or give me a call at x7421. And let’s make sure that the CSUF the next sets of finalists encounter is the welcoming place we know it to be.

The other issue is equally complex. The Monday before a grievance hearing to be conducted pursuant to Article 10 of the CBA we open the Orange County Register to a story about the grievant in that matter using a different math textbook than the rest of the department. The reporter had not apparently made any effort to do basic fact-checking with the other faculty in the department. To their credit the reporters for our own Daily Titan were much more responsible. If you missed their story go to <http://www.dailytitan.com/2015/10/math-textbook-drives-divide-in-department/>. The personnel issues that may be involved in this grievance remain

confidential, part of the asymmetry of these sorts of proceedings. The OCR story suggested that faculty have absolute freedom to choose their texts, but as Provost Cruz's email to the campus pointed out there are countervailing policies, in particular special considerations for classes taught in multiple sections. Departments can choose a different set of rules. Here is the AAUP's policy on that problem: AAUP Policy. And is there really that sort of total freedom? What should a department chair do if she discovers that a faculty member is using a text that because of its difficulty level or some other flaw is totally inappropriate for a course? The Executive Committee already has decided that the university needs a UPS on textbook choices both to protect faculty's right to choose but also to reflect best practices as embodied in the AAUP policy. We have referred the matter to the Faculty Affairs Committee and welcome any suggestions you may have about how to frame such a policy.

And finally a word on the Faculty Hearing Panel and the Grievance procedure under Article 10 of the CBA. As I noted in the email I sent out Wednesday, 21 October, this process provides faculty who feel they have been wronged in some way and have not been able to get satisfaction from the Level 1 meeting to have their case heard by a peer committee. You can read more about the process in the Faculty Hearing Manual that I am sending out with this report. Although the Daily Titan called this an administrative hearing that is a misnomer. This is a faculty hearing - four members of the campus community selected at random to hear the matter. The grievant and the administration submit evidence - testimony or documents that are intended to establish or disprove the grievant's claim. He or she has the burden of proving his or her case. The committee has to be convinced by the evidence of the validity of the claim. And I want to underscore the importance of the evidence. Evidence consists of documents and testimony by people who actually were involved in the matter before the committee - not the opinions of people who have not heard the evidence or know it only from the perspective of one of the parties. I've chaired the Faculty Hearing Panel for five years - think the process works - and want to see it respected by the participants. Grievants win or lose their cases on the merits - and again we have to rely on our colleagues to do their job seriously. In my experience they always do so.

Give these issues some thought and let me know what you think so that we can reshape policy where we need to or create new policies as necessary.

4.2 Written Supplemental Chairs report distributed to campus 10-28-15

This is a supplement to the Chair's Report I sent out on Friday, 23 October 2015. In that report I invited comments on the issue of the selection of instructional materials for courses and on the policies we have in place regarding searches for administrators. I have received six responses, and am including those already shared publicly or for which the authors have agreed they may be circulated more widely.

Following additional discussion at its 27 October 2015 meeting the Executive Committee has referred both matters to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The transmittal memoranda to the chair of the committee, Kathryn Dickson are attached as a separate document. You will note that with respect to the textbook issue the Executive Committee has requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee determine whether there is a need for a UPS on the selection of textbooks and other instructional materials that could serve as a set of guiding principles for departments and programs to help them develop their own distinctive policies on these issues. Executive Committee suggested some questions that the committee might wish to consider in its deliberations. With respect to the issue of the search policies Executive Committee recommended among other things revisions to UPS 210.007 that reflect the majority view in the Statement of Opinions on the role of the college in identifying faculty for dean search committees. Executive Committee requested swift action on this policy. As both matters now are with the Faculty Affairs Committee any additional comments or suggestions you may have should be directed to the chair.

Finally a reminder that we will be responding to the clear majority view from the Statements of Opinion that we phase out the at-large seats in the Academic Senate so representation will be done by constituency. The project will be referred to the Constitution Committee in the near future.

VI. PROVOST REPORT

Faculty Hiring

Of the 75 searches that were approved this year for faculty tenure track, approximately 67 are in different stages of the process.

Student Success Team

Our Student Success Team and the good work they are doing for our students is not only reflected in our increased graduation rates and narrowing of achievement gaps, but is also being recognized nationally. The

Education Advisory Board has selected our Student Success Team structure and the data driven work they are doing and custom campaign for at risk students as well as Teaching Exemplars Network (TEN) nationwide. The APLU in November will be designating our Student Success Team work as well an innovation to watch. Very proud of the good work that is being done by our colleges, faculty, staff, and administrators that are working on behalf of our students.

VII. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT

Senator Walker reported:

- There is a meeting next week.
- The system wide committee for smoke-free campuses met this morning; that is moving forward.
- 20 of 23 campuses have passed resolutions for more open searches for presidents.

VIII. ASI REPORT

Senator Cuaresma reported:

The Board of Directors is currently discussing a textbook resolution that will reflect the students' voice. It is currently under discussion and ASI is open for feedback.

IX. CFA REPORT (Senator Hassan)

The strike authorization vote ended yesterday; the results will come out next week. Only CFA members were allowed to vote giving authorization to the Board of Directors (which consist of 25 people statewide) to call for a strike if necessary. Regarding negotiations for salary increases, the Chancellor's office has offered 2 percent increase for this year; however the CFA has requested a 5 percent General Salary Increase (GSI) for everybody and a Salary Service Increase (SSI) for those to whom it applies. The parties are very far apart so the next stage is "Fact Finding." The fact-finding team is made up of three members. CFA appoints one person, the Chancellor's office appoints the second person, and the third person is a neutral third party appointed by the Public Employees Relations Board (PERB). The team will submit a report. Based on past experiences, it's usually a report 2 to 1. The CFA representative agrees with CFA's position, the Chancellor's representative agrees with the Chancellor's position and the third person in the middle, the independent person, is crucial and they will submit their report. When they submit their report, there is a 10-day blackout period where both sides study and see if based on the fact-finding report, they can come to an agreement. After that, the Chancellor's office can impose their last best offer and the CFA can call for faculty to take various types of work actions.

X. NEW BUSINESS

10.1 Open Discussion on Revision to UPS 210.000 Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures

- Chair Bonney framed the discussion. We have sent UPS 210.000 to FAC and they will be consulting with FDCB as they go forward, but we wanted to open up the floor for a 10 or 15 minute discussion today to get some preliminary ideas about things that people would like to see changed. What are ways we can improve UPS 210.000? This is an opening conversation intended to give the FAC some guidance.
- Senator Gradilla expressed the concern that under our current RTP process, service is under-valued compared to teaching and research and scholarly activities. If we want to engage more faculty in leadership and service across the University we should consider more explicit language that reflects a greater value placed on service.
- Senator Kanel shared that based on her experiences on the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) the concept of "faculty responsibilities" is an area that need clarification. It is a source of issue when we do our deliberations, and it's not very specific about what means and how it is taken into consideration in the RTP process? We always felt it is more of an administrative disciplinary action issue rather than an RTP issue. The other thing is scholarship and peer review versus engaged scholarship. The more specific you can be in that language, the easier it makes it for FPC. That is why we wanted FPC to review these standards because if it is not stated clearly, how are we to interpret it.
- Senator Perez acknowledged Senator Gradilla's comments and elaborated on them by suggesting that "teaching, research, and service" are not necessarily distinct categories, but often overlap, making their separation in the context of RTP a false dichotomy.
- Senator Fitch asked if there is any way to change the RTP calendar to allow more flexibility when reviewing DPC files, especially when reviewing files for 2-year appointments.
- Senator Stang would like to make sure the committees that are reviewing UPS 210.000 see a copy of the engaged scholarship proposal that was approved by the College of Education. It's a very unique document that has a focus on high impact practices. It would be a good thing to

consider for inclusion in revisions because of our focus on high impact practices and some of the tenants of our potential master plan as well as our strategic goals.

- o Senator Walker asked that the abbreviated reviews be considered to make them as easy as they are now, but to include more information to allow probationary faculty appropriate feedback when necessary. He will forward his suggestions to Dr. Dickson.
- o Senator Gradilla asked if we could dedicate a Spring FDC University-wide meeting where we could discuss the topic of UPS 210.000 with just the chairs.

10.2 Revision to UPS 100.000 Academic Senate Bylaws

M/S/P (Walker/Casem) Motion to approve changes to the Bylaws to create a standing Research Policy Committee and also a revision to the Faculty Research Committee.

Senator Walker framed the reason for the revision of the Bylaws. A standing Research Policy Committee is needed to respond to rapidly changing external pressures from outside agencies regarding compliance issues. He also explained the Faculty Research Committee will narrow its focus to the implementation and review of the intramural research and scholarly activity grants. They will not be involved in the development of policy. There will be consultation between the Faculty Research Committee and the Research Policy Committee.

There was discussion following explanation by Senator Walker of the recent revisions.

(Mead) noticed the current language of the revised Bylaws listed one student member while most standing committees have two student members.

M/S/P (Mead/Rhoten) Motion to add a second student to this committee

Motion was approved unanimously.

Back to main motion.

M/S/P (Mead/Walker) Motion to remove appointed by Associated Students Inc., we address it previously in the document, so at this point it is redundant.

The body agreed it was a friendly amendment.

Vote (by Voice) Motion to approve revision to UPS 100.000 Academic Senate Bylaws as amended passed unanimously.

10.3 ASD 15-107 UPS 3XX.XXX Declaration and Change of Majors and Minors [source: UCC]

M/S/P (Fischer/Walker) Moved to approve ASD 15-107 UPS UPS 3XX.XXX

Senator Fischer gave the background on this UPS.

M/S/P (Fischer/Walker) Motion to amend the document to include an appeal process for students. The heading on line 65 "Appeal" the wording would read as follows:

Should a student disagree with a decision of the chair or program coordinator on any of the above, he or she may appeal to the relevant Associate Dean, who will make the final determination.

Back to main motion.

There was discussion on the document

(Walker) A friendly amendment to remove lines 29-30, this would leave the responsibility for what students must take for courses and defining that in the current version of UPS 410.103. This would prevent two policies conflicting with each other.

The body agreed it was a friendly amendment.

Back to the main motion.

(Powers) A friendly amendment was made to add the word 'undergraduate' very early in the document. Suggest it appears in the title or between the words "every" and "students".

The body agreed it was a friendly amendment.

Back to the main motion.

(Sargeant) A friendly amendment to direct that appeals go to the Petitions Committee.

The body agreed it was a friendly amendment.

Back to the main motion.

(Fischer) A friendly amendment to have the appeals go to the University Petitions Committee.

(Walker) Motion to add to the criteria for all of the categories "the student's personal career and educational goals".

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Guerin/Mead) Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.