



ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES rev

FEBRUARY 2, 2017

ASD 17-14

Approved 2-16-17

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

A moment of silence was observed.

In Memoriam

- B. Carmon Hardy, Professor Emeritus of History [died 12-21-16, age 81]
- Lloyd Rodgers, Professor Emeritus of Music [died 12-27-16, age 74]
- Mario Martelli, Professor Emeritus of Mathematics [died 12-30-16, age 79]
- Jewel Plummer Cobb, President and Professor Emeritus of Biology [died 1-1-17, age 92]
- Susan Larsen, Associate Professor of Human Services [died 1-7-17, age 49]
- Albert Flores, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy [died 1-14-17, age 70]
- Dennis Berg, Professor Emeritus of Sociology [died 1-19-17, age 77]

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- (Walker) Resolution in Support of CSU Immigrant and Foreign Faculty and Students
M/S/P (Walker/Buck) resolution passes unanimously.

(Walker) Executive Committee met on Tuesday and we also received an email from Vince Buck, so I would like to give him credit as well regarding the Executive Order by the Trump Administration. Senator Walker read the resolution.

- (Buck) My interest in this was heightened by a conversation with a first year faculty member from Spain who was very concerned and I am concerned for her. From the concern, she might look for a position somewhere else, and we spend a lot of effort trying to recruit junior faculty and we can't afford to lose them on the basis they are thrown out because of ill-conceived policy.
- (Walker) made an amendment to add the wording "California Faculty Association"; amendment considered friendly.

Whereas: The American Association of University Professors, many universities and colleges, [the California Faculty Association](#), and thousands of faculty have expressed opposition to this executive order; and

- (Puri) made an amendment to add the word "legitimate", amendment considered friendly

Resolved: That the CSU Fullerton AS forcefully express its opposition to this ill-conceived and even more ill-executed executive order and to any other attempts to curtail the [legitimate](#) activities of foreign nationals on our campus and within our borders; and be it finally

- (Mead) add Attorney General Jeff Sessions, amendment considered friendly if he is approved before this resolution is finalized.
- (Kanel) Relinquished the mic to Dean Fontaine. Dean Fontaine made an amendment to delete words "ill-conceived and even more ill-executed", amendment considered friendly.

Resolved: That the CSU Fullerton AS forcefully express its opposition to this ~~ill-conceived and even more ill-executed~~ executive order and to any other attempts

to curtail the legitimate activities of foreign nationals on our campus and within our borders; and be it finally

- (Walker) The Executive Committee is working on a resolution with regard to advocacy and HI-B Visas and Skilled Worker issues.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

➤	What's Brewing at Pollak Library	February 8, 2017, 5:00-7:30 PM, PLN-130 RSVP @ http://www.library.fullerton.edu/whatsbrewing
➤	Academic Affairs/Academic Senate Retreat, Spring 2017	Friday, March 3, 2017 Marriott Hotel

- (Bonney) Happy Groundhog Day.
- (Meyer) Introduced Dave Mickey, new Senator representing COTA.
- (Bonney) Welcomed and introduced the two new student senators from ASI, Kayleigh Bates and Amanda Martinez.
- (Puri) Introduced the new AVP for Research and Creative Activities, Dr. Chris Liu.
- (Gradilla) Acknowledged in these last two weeks with all the protesting on campus the sense of community of faculty, staff, and students rallying together for issues that have unified us. The spirit amongst the students has been an energy and spirit that I have not been seen on campus in my eleven years of being here. I commend the students and the faculty who have supported their protest.
- (Kanel) The Food Pantry will be opening in March. More detailed information about this in the upcoming edition of the Senate Forum.
- (Patton) Anthropology has entered into a MOA with the Peace Corps; we are now officially a university partner. We have a proposal in Anthropology to welcome Coverdell Fellows in the new Coverdell Fellows Program for returning Peace Corps students to enter the Master's Degree Program in Anthropology. We have sixteen alumni serving right now in the Peace Core in over three hundred and we are the top ten minority volunteer institution. This formalizes our relationship with the Peace Corps and we are proud of that.

Q: (Stambough) Have you done an academic outreach or open call? I know a number of faculty who are former Peace Corps volunteers and there are probably a lot that might not know about it yet.

A: (Patton) We have been subject to a media embargo until it was signed. It was signed by President García a couple of weeks ago. We have an announcement that University News is getting ready to send out; we had to get it vetted by the Peace Corps first. It is probably too late for us to take on students, because our deadline for master's program is coming up for fall 2017; we will gear up for accepting our first students in fall 2018. Unfortunately when I tried to get a list of our own alumni it was very hard for them to come up with a list. We do know the university has tracked that, and we have some data there are quite a few faculty on campus involved with the Peace Corps and we will reach out to them. There is also a secondary effort we have committed to. The Peace Corps has a certificate program for Peace Corps Prep, and we will start working with Lynn Sargent and we have been engaged with meeting with the Peace Corps to have an undergraduate program across campus. We will be talking to different units to try to get that off the ground.

- (Walker) The Pachyderm Challenge will continue! The faculty, staff, and student basketball game will take place on Feb 18th during the CSUF and CSU Davis game.
- (Dabirian) Change your password.
- (Gradilla) Thanks to those who were here over the weekend and for their extraordinary efforts during the heavy rains to rearrange things due to flooded classrooms and offices in McCarthy Hall.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 4.1. ASD 16-151 Academic Senate Minutes 11-10-16 (Draft)
M/S/P (Stohs/Kanel) Minutes were approved unanimously.
- 4.2. ASD 16-164 Academic Senate Minutes 12-8-16 (Draft)
M/S/P (Walker/Stohs) Minutes were approved unanimously.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

5.1 ASD 16-155 Revision to UPS 100.001 - Academic Senate Bylaws

5.2 ASD 17-06 Revision to UPS 410.170 - Doctoral Programs

5.3 NOMINEES TO COMMITTEE

NOMINEES TO STANDING COMMITTEES

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Nominees: Eve Himmelheber (ARTS); **Pending** (COMM); **Pending** (NSM);

Confirmed 11/3: 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)

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Nominees: Pratenu Ghosh (ECS); **Pending** (HHD)

Confirmed 8/25: Brenda Bowser (SOC SCI); Susan Tschabrun (L/A/C/E); Ajay Bhootra (MCBE); Greg Childers (NSM); Tenzin Dorjee (COMM); Jim Taulli (ARTS); Thomas Fujita-Rony (HUM); Kathryn Glasswell (EDUC)

GRADUATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Nominees: Rob Watson (ARTS)

Confirmed 9/29: Chean Ngo (ECS); Enric Mallorqui-Ruscalleda (HUM); Penny Weismuller (HHD); Hamid Tavakolian (MCBE); Paul Stapp (NSM); Barbara Erickson (SOC SCI); John Hoffman (EDUC); Mark Bilby (L/A/C/E); Pete Evanow (COMM)

HONORS PROGRAMS ADVISORY BOARD

Nominees: Scott Parr (ECS)

Confirmed 12/8: John Koegel (ARTS); Jonathan Cornforth (L/A/C/E); Claudia Pineda (HHD); Malia Hoffmann (EDUC); Scott Annin (NSM); Hunter Hargraves (HUM); Matt Jarvis (SOC SCI); Gayle Brunelle (HUM); Thanh Nguyen (MCBE)

INTERNSHIPS & SERVICE LEARNING COMMITTEE (10 faculty)

Nominees: Benikia Kressler (EDUC); Michelle Martin (HHD)

Confirmed 11/3: Janet Eyring (HUM); Mark Herbst (L/A/C/E); John Haan (NSM); Yuna Kim (MCBE); Amber Chitty (COMM); Mark Ramont (ARTS); Eileen Walsh (SOC SCI); Joseph Piacenza (ECS)

NOMINEES TO SEARCH COMMITTEE

DEAN OF STUDENTS

Nominees: Debra Cote (EDUC)

Confirmed 12/8: Christina Carroll-Pavia (L/A/C/E); Armando Martinez-Cruz (NSM); Penchan Phoborisut (COMM)

VI. CHAIR'S REPORT – written report distributed to campus on 1-31-17.

In the midst of considerable disarray at the national level we return to work locally this Thursday with the first meeting of the spring 2017 semester. I hope that all members of the campus community had a refreshing, restorative break because we have a lot of work ahead of us. And here as everywhere there is good news and bad news. We return to the terrific announcement that Ruth Yopp-Edwards is this year's recipient of the highly prestigious Wang Award. But we also confront the loss of seven current and former faculty members whom we will remember at the beginning of our meeting.

A few comments about the agenda for this week.

- The petition to amend the Academic Senate Constitution is at the head of the new business as promised. Any change to our foundational document, or indeed any UPS document (see UPS 100.015 for the desiderata) is serious business and should be intended to redress a problem that cannot be addressed by other means. We will see what the issue is.

There also are several UPS documents before the body passage of which should enhance the experience of students and faculty.

- The proposed new UPS 100.250, Definition of an Academic Unit, returns to the floor after some changes in response to questions raised during the first reading. This UPS responds to concerns raised in the senate last spring about so-called homeless courses.
- The proposed UPS 100.250 is integrated into the revisions to UPS 410.103 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: New Programs, which provide much needed clarification to this policy, and additionally specifies that new program proposals “shall be sponsored by an academic unit as defined in UPS 100.250.”
- UPS 210.020 Review of Tenured Faculty has been revised to emphasize that the review does not involve a recommendation and should be considered an opportunity to determine what support might enhance the faculty member’s career.
- UPS 320.020 University Writing Requirements has been under construction for two years. The document embodies an agreement by the Graduate Education Committee, the Writing Proficiency Committee and the Academic Senate Executive Committee that drafting a document that covered the writing requirements for both undergraduates and graduate students was beyond the pale. The document before the senate therefore addresses only undergraduate writing requirements and constitutes a thorough revision of the pre-existing UPS. The UPS provides much-needed guidance on the distinction between an intensive writing course and the complementary writing courses relied upon by some departments and provides a clear process for the approval for writing courses.
- UPS 100.601 Procedures for Department/Program Name Changes has been strengthened in response to the issues that arose recently in the process for changing the name of the Geography Department, and the memo provided by the UCC chair Mark Fischer clearly lays out the considerations including a schedule for the process and alternatives for disposing of any disputes by the UCC/GradEd Committees.
- Finally the senate will consider UPS 411.100 Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures. Courses which has been revised in significant ways by the UCC to reflect, among other things the impact of an electronic curriculum development process.

And this is only the first meeting of the semester.

We will have a special meeting of the Academic Senate on 16 February 2017 when the chair of the Academic Senate of the California State University, Christine Miller, will attend. Chair Miller will be here both to talk with us about the ASCSU but also to listen. While there will be regular business on the agenda for that meeting, we want to be sure that the senators have ample opportunity to present their concerns.

Please note that the spring Academic Senate/Academic Affairs retreat will be on 3 March 2017 at the Marriott. This event will be an opportunity to participate in a workshop atmosphere on how to support and enhance the role of the faculty in student success. Details about the workshop will be forthcoming.

Finally this spring will perforce see the initiation of the self-study as we embark on the next WSCUC (formerly known as WASC) accreditation process. A steering committee and necessary subcommittees are being formed to perform this work, and the many faculty who responded to the invitation to serve were much appreciated. There were more volunteers than could be accommodated. The review will culminate in the campus visit in two years, and the campus will be kept informed of progress in the enterprise.

In the face of the turmoil of the last ten days it is difficult to conclude this report on a cheery note. So instead I will echo the call to engagement articulated by a number of thoughtful people on both the right and left sides of the political spectrum. Even radically different views on specific issues should not affect our shared commitment to vibrant democracy and the rule of law. While for some marching in the streets may be the appropriate response for others it will be, as seems necessary, a letter, email or phone call to a congressman reminding the individual of our constitutional precepts. This just doesn’t seem a game for citizens of both political persuasions to sit out if we are ever going to heal our divisions.

VII. INTERIM PROVOST REPORT

- Faculty Affairs & Records office moved to the 2nd floor of the Library in the Faculty Commons area.
- We are beginning the search for a permanent Direct of Faculty Development Center, Mark Filowitz will chair the search committee. The committee will be meeting next week.
- I continue to meet with faculty and department chairs across the university to hear from them what is on their mind and how Academic Affairs can be helpful to what they are working on. I have met with four department chairs from four colleges last semester, and I will meet with another four this semester.
- Pam Oliver and I will meet with several faculty this semester in their department meetings to share with them the priority the university has with Student Success and to hear what is on the faculty’s mind.

- The AA/AS Senate Retreat will focus on the Graduation Initiative.
- Pam Oliver has created a steering committee with members from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to work on the Graduate Initiative to develop both the short-term plan and the long-term plan. The steering committee has created five different task forces, the membership is being finalized and we will share them with you. The purpose of the task forces is to identify road blocks to our students that delay their graduation and their success.
- Our campus has received \$2.5 million out of the \$35 million the system has received to support Graduate Initiative 2025 for this year, through the summer. A number of students have been offered financial assistance for their summer classes. We are adding summer school classes that are needed for these students to graduate and providing any kind of support we can think of to allow these students to graduate in the summer if they were likely to. Many of the students will take longer, but our short-term goal is important because information from the short-term goals will be forwarded to the Legislature so we can ask for a longer term support for the initiative.
- WASC visit is scheduled for fall 2019; we need to start working now. We have almost completed the formation of the different task forces and their memberships. The President will be sending out an announcement next week, announcing the steering committee and the membership of all the sub-committees. They will be working through the spring semester and especially over the summer to create a draft report. We welcome any ideas and willingness to serve on those committees.
- We are beginning a campus-wide effort to think about how we can support our students in their first year at the university. First year is so critical for student's ultimate success, and most of the problems they face occur in the first semester or the first year. If they fail a course they get discouraged, they might have financial issues that stop them from taking a full load of classes, or they might have psychological issues where they need support. So I believe the first year is so critical if we want to meet our student success goals. We have started a conversation with the deans on how to create a first year program for all of our students, not just for the five hundred students that are in the first year experience program. I am pleased to tell you there is consensus on creating this program, and you will be hearing the details of how we go about constructing a balanced and supportive first year experience for all of our students who are entering. It will be a slow process, but I am sure we will get there hopefully by the end of the semester.
- We are beginning work on developing a plan or trying to get an understanding of our online course offerings on campus. The Senate passed a policy for online instruction a few years ago; but how well that policy is being implemented, how many online or hybrid classes or other versions other than face-to-face courses are being offered, we do not know. We want to make sure we support our faculty efforts, those who want to offer online classes and we have a plan for that. We have begun work on assembling a group of faculty, especially associate deans from the colleges, to gather the data this semester and also look at the plans colleges and departments have of expanding or keeping their online courses the way they are for the next year or two so we can have a comprehensive look at the campus-wide online instruction. The most important thing for online instruction is the quality. We must have the highest standards for online instruction implemented on our campus. Instruction, assessment, learning outcomes, online instruction classes should be no less, if not even better than face-to-face classes. There is no attempt to push any individual faculty member or department to adopt online instruction; it's the faculty choice or the department's choice. We want to make sure in Academic Affairs we have all the resources, especially through Faculty Development Center that faculty need in putting some or all of their material online and ultimately helping our students.

Q: (Gradilla) For the funds for the intersession, summer session support for students, do those students have to have a FAFAS on file?

A: I would have to find out.

- (Walker) Please make sure the students understand if it affects their financial aid.

Q: (Kanel) Is there ongoing training for people who want to teach online through FDC where they can get certified? Is that an ongoing thing throughout the year?

A: Yes. FDC offers several classes on different aspects of online instruction, from basic classes to advance classes. The classes are utilized very well by our faculty.

Q: (Kanel) Are faculty required to take the classes to teach online?

A: The Provost's office does not require them to do so. There may be requirements at the college level or the department level.

Q: (Fitch) There used to be a lot of classes you could recommended that new faculty go to for support and figuring teaching things out that were offered through the FDC, and I don't see a lot of that anymore. Has the university cut back on those kind of resources?

A: There has been no cut back in funding of FDC or the classes that are being offered. I meet with Kristin Stang regularly every week, and I know that a lot activity is going on at the FDC including offering of classes and faculty are very actively participating. If you would like, I can have her supply information for fall semester on what classes have been offered and the attendance.

(Wang) I don't know if you are the right person to appreciate, but I wanted to appreciate the effort on parking. Parking was an issue for several meetings, but is not an issue anymore.

(Walker) Thank you for the extra money for the junior/senior grants.

Q: (Patton) You said that our share of the student success money was \$2.5 million. How was that divided up? We are a very large campus, so it probably wasn't by enrollments.

A: As I mentioned, Pam Oliver had been working with a collaborative group from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs that include all the advisors, graduation specialists, retention specialists, as well as associate deans. They collectively came up with a budget for various items, this is not distributed by college or department, but by activity. At least a third of the money is going for student support and they there are various other buckets, including the number of advisors for the students. I can send you a list. It was vetted by the cabinet, and the Budget office has allocated the money accordingly, which will be spent hopefully by the summer. Some of it might be rolled over to the fall for programs that will continue through to next fall.

VIII. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT – distributed 2-1-17.

The normal reports to the ASCSU occurred, with the exception that Chancellor Timothy White could not attend due to illness. One addition to normal reports was that **by Framroze Virjee – Executive Vice Chancellor General Counsel**. He spoke on Thursday morning and then again in the afternoon.

On Thursday afternoon he presented a lecture on Academic Freedom and then engaged in a Q&A session, spending a total of about two hours with the ASCSU on Thursday afternoon. The PPT file is about Academic Freedom broadly and is posted on the CSUF Academic Senate website – the file does NOT include the following position by the CO (Chancellor's Office).

Briefly:

The **CO's position**, as presented by VC Virjee, is that the **CO cannot negotiate (interpretation: engage in a Socratic dialogue) an Academic Freedom policy with the ASCSU** because the policy is a matter of the conditions of employment. The CFA is the only legitimate body with which the CO can negotiate concerning conditions of employment. The ASCSU had requested (through the CO) to have a three-way negotiation, including the CO, the CFA and the ASCSU. According to the CO, the CFA declined that request. Thus **the ONLY negotiation about academic freedom that can and will occur is between the CO and the CFA**. ASCSU may be consulted and ASCSU may provide input about its position, but the CO will not consider that as negotiation, and will not respond to that input.

The resolutions below are (will be) available on the ASCSU website:

<http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2016-2017/index.shtml>

Highlights of Resolutions Passed:

1. An Academic Freedom Policy was passed unanimously that will be forwarded to the CO; AS-3282-16/FGA.
2. Lactation Resource Policy and Practices in the CSU AS-3277-16/FA; **Passed unanimously.**
3. Tuition Increases in the California State University AS-3282-16; **Passed as amended.**

Calls for no tuition increase.

4. Support for the Letter to President Trump from the Leaders of California's Systems of Higher Education about the Continuance of DACA AS-3279-16/FGA; **Passed unanimously.**
5. Resolution in Opposition to the Appointment of Betsy DeVos as US Secretary of Education AS-3280-16-APEP; **Passed without dissent.**
6. Advice to the CSU Tenure Density Task Force AS-3282-16/AA; **Passed unanimously.**
Encourages CSU Tenure Density Task Force to recommend medium and long-range (higher) targets for tenure density for the CSU system, and to recommend that individual campuses set targets consistent with the system goals.

- (Fitch) It seems the issue of Academic Freedom has been coming up a lot lately. Whatever we can do to promote academic freedom would be appropriate, to have a statement reinforcing academic freedom for faculty, students, and staff.
 - (Bonney) We are have begun collecting materials on this issue. We will figure out how to share with the Senate once we figure out what it will look like.
- (Patton) I got a notice that there is a bill coming up in Congress that would not allow any federal funds to be used for geospatial mapping which includes information like ethnic composition of neighborhoods. When I heard that I thought that really infringes on a lot of people's ability to do research. I understand it is going to be presented. Could we express or channel some of our concerns about academic freedom through our lobbyist?
 - (Bonney) We can do that. The other thing that I have asked Chris Reese to do is to provide us with a list of addresses of people that we could contact in Washington through correspondence and other ways to be try to be more engaged with what's happening there.

IX. ASI REPORT

(Martinez) The CSSA discussed this week a resolution that was passed about a year ago in support of open course evaluation. There is a debate on whether it was supposed to be implemented, but other things came up on our agenda so it wasn't necessarily pushed on each AS's campus. Each AS or ASI, if they wish to, can go forth and implement this but it is not legally binding. I was wondering if there was any discussion in the past about open course evaluations because it would be a partnership with Student Affairs, Academic Senate, faculty, and everyone here. Is there a debate on it on our campus or what are faculty opinions?

- (Bonney) Not recently, but we can refer this to the Executive Committee to figure out how to address this.

Q: (Kanel) Would you mind saying what open course is?

A: For example, currently students before they pick courses, they go on ratemyprofessor.com and what students and other ASIs have had concerns about is sometimes those are biased and don't give correct information, and students really do chose courses based on those comments. The comments could be outdated, incorrect, and they can be missing out on what they are paying for. Each student's learning experience is different than the other, but students really do rely on this website and it is an issue. This resolution wants to take that away and have a separate one where it is in collaboration with students and faculty. Have Student Affairs to create a separate one using the feedback form that we already use, but have it be anonymous and open. But obviously each campus would have its own system to be rated on.

(Bates) We have two vacancies on the Board of Directors, so if you know anyone in your classes for the College of NSM & the College of EDUC, they just have to have a major or minor for either college. For the College of Education because its specific to grad students and credential students, it is open to students who are part of the clubs that are affiliated with education ICC, so they have a wider range of students who can apply to the College of Education. The applications are open now online; they close next Wednesday.

Elections for next year's Associated Students are open, the day the candidate packets close is February 17th.

We are looking at changing the elections process. Coming to one of our committees today is to bring forth an Election Judicial Council, which is very common amongst other AS and other ASI's. We don't have one and it is heavily put on the Election Commissioner to make those judgment calls. Our Election's Commissioner feels it would be better to have a group of people who are in there to make that decision so it's not solely on the Election's Commissioner. We are looking to vote for that, if it passes I will let you know.

Our Union Board is now going to be elected. There are seven open positions for this next fiscal year and people who want to run for our Facilities Union Board have to run in an open election.

We closed applications and chose people for the California Higher Education Student Summit (C.H.E.S.S.). They were notified this morning and will go lobby on March 13th.

X. CFA REPORT

Tomorrow leadership from all 23 CFA Boards are coming together because we have a lot to discuss. We don't have a formal bargaining team meeting, however, some of us from the bargaining team have been strategizing to put together the package. I haven't seen an agenda for what most of us are talking about, but I can't imagine the academic freedom wouldn't be on there but if it's not I will bring it up.

- (Walker) I strongly feel when you look at the AAPU documents and the traditional way we discuss academic freedom in the Academic Senates, even when there is collective bargaining, I want to know who we yell at really loudly, so we can make sure all the folks who need to be at the table are at the table? If you can find out if we need to yell at the CFA, the CSU, or anybody?

XI. NEW BUSINESS

11.1 ASD 17-02 Petition to Amend the Academic Senate Constitution

M/S/ (Fischer/Fidalgo)

- (Fischer) There was a statement of opinion on eliminating the at-large seats, and the statement of opinion showed largely the electorate wanted to do that. Eliminating the at-large seats encourages more people to get involved in shared governance. As the University has grown, fewer faculty know a significant number of people outside of their own department, thus at-large seats are won primarily on the basis of name recognition.
- (Fidalgo) Senator Fischer has explained the reasons clearly, and I agree with him.
- (Walker) I am neither for nor against this, but I have some structural issues that I think would make implementation of this very difficult as it is currently proposed. I think we need to be very intentional and clear in terms of purpose and process for changing our Constitution, particularly when we deal with the electorate. We have tried over the last four years or so to straighten out the Bylaws so that the constituencies are clear, because if you look around the table and you look in the Senate office, those who were here and had all the institutional knowledge are not here as much or not here at all, so we have to rely on our documents to tell us what we need to do. I want to be clear that we need to do things that make sense. Also as a body, we adopted UPS 100.015 and it talked about the things we should be thinking about when we revise University Policy Statements. We really want to ask the question, does this solve the name recognition problem in large departments, probably not, in small, maybe who knows, and in large colleges who knows. Does this help us do anything? I don't know. We have been doing this for a long time, and we have been doing it the same way. The way we currently do it, we have administrators sitting around the table, we have faculty sitting around the table, and the one flaw we can say we have is that sometimes it would be great to get a lot of new people involved or have more faculty to serve on committees, any sort of these things would be really great and I think this does kind of do that. The other thing I will remind everyone is if you were here last year, we spent a long time going back and forth just to fix the constituencies so that everyone understood the consequences of what we were doing clearly, and I think that is one of the things we need to think about as we do this. This proposal doesn't specify the who, what, when, where, how, why, or any of that, all it does is modify the first portion of the Constitution in Article II and that is not the only place at-large senators are mentioned in the Constitution and it does some things that I'm not sure how we fix. For instance, how do we deal with the at-large senators who are currently in seats that were legitimately elected by their peers, by the Academic Senate Electorate, we have no idea. While I would like to say I really want to support this I think as a body we need to think about do we really want to do this, and if we do, I feel this should go to a committee so we can straighten out all of the Constitutional issues and Bylaws issues and come back with something that is completely ready to go. If we don't want to pursue it, then we all vote no or whatever, then we are good to go.
- (Fitch) I realize there would be a lot of housekeeping and cleaning up on this. I think my biggest sense of this is trying to figure out how to maintain the current historical memory and experience of some Senators like myself who have been around here for a long time. Yet as somebody who has been around a long time, desperately wanting to get newer people involved and the difficulty of trying to bring in the younger faculty so they can get that kind of experience. I've been running at-large lately, but when I first came in I would have never gotten elected as an at-large seat and the constituency seats are not very many, which is where I think some of the difficulty is. Does it solve the name recognition, not entirely, but we are trying to get younger faculty involved on college committees so they meet people in other departments. etc., I think that is where the goal is. I don't know whether or not this is the best way to get there, but I do think it is certainly a step along the way. Should we decide to do this, there are ways of making sure a document is consistent across different parts of it.
- (Kanel) I wanted to address a couple of the issue brought up by Senator Walker about the historical memories and policies. I believe Administration and Student Affairs are still constituencies as we have written, they are considered part of the faculty and they will have elected officials. The other challenge was about fixing the rest of the document; I think it's a little premature to go through and fix the rest of the document, why put that work in if it doesn't pass? So perhaps that wouldn't be so hard to fix, you go through the document and wherever it says at-large, you eliminate that. What was the purpose of having at-large seats in the first place? How did that come to be? And why is it necessary, or helpful, or needed to have at-large seats when we do have constituencies and people representing you in the Senate that relates to the amount of people in that college? So it is much more of a republic democracy way of doing things, so it does feel much more representative in that regard. This was mentioned on the statement of opinion and it did seem that the majority of faculty were for this, the

majority don't want to keep it like it is, so I have to consider the constituency in determining my vote because I've been elected to vote for my constituency, not vote my own opinion.

(Bonney) as a historical point of information, the Senate was originally all at-large seats and the constituencies were added in 1976.

- (Sargeant) I will admit to some confusion as to what the problem is that we are trying to solve. I've heard some people refer to the issue of name recognition, and there may be some issue there. I'm not sure eliminating at-large seats is necessarily the solution. You could also argue that term limits would accomplish the same thing, so you ensure that periodically, by the structure of it, there will be new faces and new voices on the senate that might be something to consider. The other issue in terms of what is the purpose of an at-large seat? I think it is exactly what Senator Kanel just said, if you are in a constituency, you are supposed to represent from that constituency. If you are at-large, you are supposed to be above a constituency. If you are a senator from HSS, who is an at-large member, you are not there to represent HSS you are supposed to be there to consider the campus as a whole. It may be that our understanding of what the at-large seats are for may have eroded over time and we need to think about that. But I think we need to be very careful that we don't create a senate that is so constituency driven that we might end up at odds with each other.

- (Self) Proposed an amendment to change the number of seats listed on original petition.

M/S/P (Self/Fitch) The amendment passed.

"...35 full-time faculty members, of which 6 shall be at-large and 29 shall represent specific constituencies..."

- (Walker) Point of order, we have been given a proposal that has a specific number of seats listed, so if we are going to amend said proposal, I would like the body to be able to understand how that affects electorate and the number of seats on each constituency. Is this amendment in order or not?
- (Bonney) The amendment could be proposed at this time. As a point of order, we do care about notice and the body has not had notice prior to this moment if this change. Typically we would have expected to have at least a week's notice of a change because this would significantly change what is being debated here.
- (Bruschke) As a point of order, we consider amendments here all the time, and they frequently change the nature of the original motion.
- (Bonney) Not this much.
- (Bruschke) What item on Robert's Rules govern when a change becomes too large to be considered an amendment?
- (Bonney) This would actually be a motion to substitute, not a motion to amend. It has now become a very different motion. It is no longer a motion to simply eliminate the at-large seats, it a motion to change the number of at-large seats down to a specific number and requires a different understanding of the constituencies.
- (Walker) If we want to do this, if it is seconded, we can speak for or against it. However, I am worried if we don't have a clear understanding of what happens to the seats, I don't know how we vote on it.
- (Fitch) I second the motion.
- (Self) I thought this could be a happy compromise about different people, different opinions and something that both sides can work with or work together. I'm a new senator, but as a faculty I'm the Department Chair and I have been here for 16 years and I'm a first year senator. I think by having more constituency seats for the specific college we may be able to encourage more new younger faculty to get involved with this shared governance.
- (Fitch) I like this much better than the original motion that was brought forward for a variety of reasons. I think it does move in the direction of providing more opportunities for new people in all constituencies, not just the college level constituencies, but in administration and other constituencies as well where new people come in. I also think that it would provide a better balance in the Senate, you would have a good strong core of people who are running at-large and those at-large seats would still be available to solve the kind of problem that Senator Sargeant was raising. I think it would make a much more fruitful body of the Senate.

- (Jarvis) Point of clarification. Are we debating an amendment or are we debating if it is friendly?
- (Bonney) We have a motion to amend, which has been 1st & 2nd.
- (Bruschke) I like this amendment quite a bit. It seems we are trying to fix two problems. We have asked the electorate their preferences and they expressed it to us and our current document is out of step with the question we asked them to answer for us. So whatever we can do and if there is not good reason to do that, ok, but there is not, we should pursue it. And the other issue I think is as it stands now, at-large constituency could get 15 out of the 45 seats and there are also 3 statewide seats. So one constituency could hold 18 seat in the Senate. Now that hasn't happened, but let's think of an electoral college might have built into its structure the possibility that you could repeatedly have a candidate win fewer popular votes and still take the election. When is the time to fix that? The answer is not after the election, not after it has already happened and the disaster has unfolded. Maybe for hundreds of years that has not been a problem. As a Constitutional question, we should address it and make it fair. The reason I like this amendment is there is a reason for at-large seats, this preserves six of them plus the three statewide. The only question is what is the best balance of at-large to constituent seats? Right now with the at-large balance, it can take 40 percent of the Senate, this make that 20 percent. I think that is a fair compromise and it also fixes many of the problems of having to go through and rule out everywhere in the Constitution where it says at-large. You don't have to get rid of them, there is just fewer of them. It expresses the will of the electorate, cleans up a potential structural problem, and maintains a fair balance and does not eliminate at-large seats.
- (Meyer) I'm looking at the response from the Statements of Opinion and it shows that 48 percent of the faculty agreed and I'm not seeing 48 percent as a majority. I wonder about the issue of six and whether nine or twelve or any other number that's dividable by three might be something that one might want to consider. I'm also concerned about what problems we are trying to fix with not only the current amendment, but the original amendment? I'm returning from the Statewide Senate after being gone from that body for about 12 years, Diana Guerin was kind enough to hold my place and when I go to the Statewide Senate meetings and I've been there last year representing Chair Bonney, what I hear and what I see is what we have seems to be working better than senates and the relationships between the senates and the administration of the other 22 campuses. So I'm not exactly sure why we are trying to fix something that isn't broken. As far as getting younger members in the Senate, last year I served as a member of the constituency from College of the Arts because we could not find anybody else to run for that seat. When I got elected to the Statewide Senate, my position needed to be filled, I looked for a junior faculty member who was interested, I introduced him earlier today. That's the process that has been working very well for quite some time. Yes Senator Bruschke has made the comment that it is possible for us to have a very high percentage from one department because of the at-large seats. It might be possible, but I think it's very unlikely that would ever happen.
- (Stohs) I would like to call the question on the amendment on the floor.
There was a hand vote and the motion passed. (17-yes, 14-no, 6 abstentions)
Back to the main motion.
- (Casem) My question is related to the statement in the original motion that talks about the redistribution. Would that be consistent with policies that exist in the Constitution as it exists right now?
 - (Bonney) Not clear how the redistribution would take place; we don't have that before us.
 - (Casem) Could that be addressed by those who made the motion?
 - (Walker) What do you want to know?
 - (Casem) If we are making these changes and the statement is saying we are going to be redistributing the new breakdown of these seats per constituency, my question is, is it the intention of the people who proposing this to stay with the policies as they exist now in the Constitution? Or is there some different redistribution plan?

- (Fitch) Given there is some confusion and this is really important, can we table this until the next meeting?
 - (Bonney) You can't table it until the next meeting. And just to be clear, on February 16th the Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate will be present and I don't know how long that conversation will go on. So I want to make sure if we extend it, we extend it until the March 2nd meeting.
- (Bruschke) My understanding of the way we allocate them now is proportioned to the amount of people in the constituency which changes every year and there is a spreadsheet and formula that the math people worked out and this would simply change what we are dividing by. Instead of dividing by 20, we would divide by 29, but the process would remain unchanged. I do believe there are people who are at this table that have access to that formula and have already made the calculations. It is not a secret and would not change the result of this motion.
- (Patton) I got on the list to address the proposal that is not on the table now. Given the time, I would like to call the vote.
- (Bonney) We still have several names on the list and it would be really be inappropriate to do that.
- (Mead) I'm sort of in the same position as Senator Patton, but I will make some comments. I would like to point out that over the years the Senate has taken up a large number of different issues, including whether or not there should be housing developments in Brea, or today we expressed a resolution concerning ignorance in Washington, DC. Other times I have been asked what does the Academic Senate going to do in terms of proactive approach to other issues that may be at the state level, local level, national level, or international level. And I think as an elected body, I can understand why people are looking at the Academic Senate. At the same time, to a certain extent Academic Senates have been very narrowly focused upon issues of curriculum, RTP, and that sort of thing. Over the years as we have expanded our Academic Senate we have expanded who can participate. As we expanded the issues we discuss we also expanded the participation and who is included in the Academic Senate including adding of staff positions a couple of years ago. So I'm wondering what we are trying to accomplish here as we debate this proposal. I'm not sure going from 42 percent at-large to 17 percent at-large necessarily address those issue especially since I look around I think Senator Stang was elected initially at-large, I know Senator Stein who use to be here was elected at-large, I believe former Senator Kari Knutson-Miller was elected at-large. We do have new bodies coming into the Senate through the at-large position. I also know it is difficult to find people in the College of Business, as one person who has arguably allegedly monopolized one of the College of Business seats. I know that it is hard to find other people, I have tried to find other people and thought about moving at-large myself, I also know that others made efforts last year to find somebody to run in the college and they were unsuccessful. I'm not sure going to the at-large is going to do that. At the same time, what we are doing now as we move more and more to constituents, we have people migrating back and forth in the Senate between constituencies and administrative positions and all of a sudden what we are saying is you have changed your position you no longer qualify to serve on the Academic Senate. As I look around, there is a good number of people that have been on the Academic Senate and probably have cut their teeth on the Academic Senate. Senator Matz, former Senator Walk, and I have met other people who have been through collegial governance Dean Fontaine, Dean of HSS, Kari Knutson-Miller in UEE, Mark Filowitz is an Associate Dean. There is a large number of us who have moved back and forth, and my point is these people do not become bad or evil or the dark side or anything as they move and they don't come back. Keep that continuity on the Senate. I think that is important and that is more important the trying to recruit people that may not be interested.
- (Fidalgo) I would really like to move away from the representation of people who go to administration becoming evil, that is not serving anybody and that is not the point at all. But it is true that as a Senate member, you represent the faculty with a different vision than you would do if you were in an administrative position, even if you are the same person. The issue that the vision of a faculty member is not the vision of the person in an administration position. The motion we have now helps to address that issue.
- (Walker) I would like to say that we are now not discussing what we asked our electorate about. The changes to the seats would be:
 - L/A/C/E would go from 1 to 2
 - Social Sciences would go from 3 to 4
 - NSM would go from 2 to 3
 - MCBE would go from 3 to 4
 - Humanities stays the same
 - HHD would go from 2 to 4

- EDUC would go from 1 to 2
- ECS stays at 1
- COMM would go from 1 to 2
- ARTS would stay at 2
- Student Affairs would stay at 1
- Administration would go from 1 to 2

So that is how the effect it would have, but that is not what we asked our electorate about. Both in terms of the phased in approach that was mentioned in the Statement of Opinion, we let the current seats expire and a change in the number. The original Statement of Opinion asked to eliminate them all as their terms went away.

- (Perez) The broader issues I'm hearing in the dialogue is issues of proportionality and issues of administration versus faculty. But in the conversation what I also heard is a larger challenge of getting people interested in serving on a very important function of the university. So my question is how does the motion address that issue of dealing with the apathy? Given the broader context, that to me is a broad issue. Does it affect that, and if so how?
 - (Walker) I can't respond to that because I don't know how it does. I think maybe Senator Bruschke or the folks who made the motion can speak to it, or Senator Fischer, or Senator Fitch.
 - (Fitch) I know there are some constituencies where it is difficult to find people to run. Senator Fischer is a good example, we've had contested elections in Humanities, we've had contested elections in the Social Sciences. It does make it difficult. We wanted to encourage more diversity on the Senate for example, and Tom stood up to try to come in. I think people feel more comfortable running as the constituency because we have conversations with each other. Whether it be on floors, which tend to be college centric in a way, or whether it is on college committees that people are on, it is easier to talk to people to persuade them this is a good thing. I think it does help to see it as something that is more doable when you've got a critical mass coming from a constituency. I think part of the problem right now is often some of these constituencies are so small that you get one person here or there, and it does make it hard. I remember some of the stuff that came up when I was first on the Senate, was really tough. I didn't know whether I should speak out or not, I didn't even know who to talk too. I think those are some of the concerns that some of us have about why we think this could be a good thing.
- (Kanel) Move to adjourn. It's pass ten till and we aren't going to finish this today.
 - (Bonney) we don't have anyone else on the speakers list, we can vote.
- (Jarvis) I have a fairly long piece to say. I wouldn't mind making a motion to adjourn and picking this up at a later date.
 - (Bonney) To be clear, we will talk in Executive Committee once we hear back from Chris Miller about how much time she needs for her conversation. If it appears that the entire Senate session may go to that, then we will continue this on March 2nd or next Senate meeting after the February 16th meeting. It is not going off into the distant future, we will take it up no later than March 2nd.

11.2 ASD 16-117 New UPS 100.250 - Definition of Academic Unit

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

11.4 ASD 17-03 Revision to UPS 320.020 - University Writing Requirements

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

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

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

XII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Kanel/Jarvis) Meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM.