

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSTIY, LOS ANGELES
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
February 15, 2011

J. Benedict, D. Lee, V. Villa, N. Warter-Perez

B. Guzman, C. Haras, J. Perez- Carballo, M. Tufenkjian

Chair Hunt convened the meeting at 1:34 p.m.

1. Senator Abdullah announced: On March 3, CFA will be sponsoring a talk by Dr. Teri Yamada, Professor of Asian Studies at Cal State Long Beach, on "Restructuring the California State University: A Call to Action." The event is co-sponsored by the departments of Asian and Asian American Studies, Chicano Studies, History, Latin American Studies, Liberal Studies, Pan-African Studies, Psychology, Sociology, and Theatre Arts and Dance. It will be at 3:15 to 5:00 p.m. in the University Club, so I will pass around a flyer.
2. Senator Aniol asked: I have a question about the procedure we use in the Senate. I don't understand the matter of when we call for votes. How do abstentions count when we tally up the vote? Do they count as "nos"?
3. It was m/s/p (Classen) to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 8, 2011 (ASM 10-12).
4. It was m/s/p (Huld) to approve the agenda.
5. It was m/s/ (Flint) to approve the recommendation (10-20).
6. It was m/s/ (Momand) to approve the recommendation (10-21).
7. 7.1 It was m/s/ (Song) to amend line 122 on page 3 of document 10-15 by inserting the words MAJOR PERFORMANCE before the word "areas," deleting the parenthetical phrase, and inserting the words OF SPECIFIED CATEGORIES.
 - 7.2 Senator Cleman suggested as a friendly amendment inserting the word SPECIFIED before the word "areas" and changing the parenthetical phrase to (CATEGORIES A, B, C).
 - 7.3 Senator Cleman's suggestion was not accepted as a friendly amendment.
 - 7.4 The Song amendment failed.
 - 7.5 It was m/s/ (Cleman) to amend line 122 on page 3 of document 10-15 by inserting the word SPECIFIED before the word "areas" and deleting the parenthetical phrase.

ASM 10-13
Approved February 22, 2011

ABSENT

EXCUSED ABSENCE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: VOTING RIGHTS OF FACULTY, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (10-20)
First-Reading

PROPOSED POLICY DELETIONS: DEPARTMENTAL RIGHTS OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS WITH RETREAT RIGHTS, ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE IN ALL UNIVERSITY ELECTIONS – FACULTY ON LEAVE, AND VOTING RIGHTS OF FACULTY SERVING IN RETIREMENT AND PRERETIREMENT PLANS, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTERS II AND III (10-21) *First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: POLICIES AND CRITERIA GOVERNING RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (10-15) *Second-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:
POLICIES AND CRITERIA GOVERNING
RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMO-
TION, FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER VI (*Continued*)

- 7.6 Senator Huld suggested as a friendly amendment to the Cleman amendment adding the words IN THE CATEGORIES A, B, C after the word “areas.”
- 7.7 It was agreed by consensus to accept Senator Huld’s amendment as friendly.
- 7.8 Senator Klein suggested as a friendly amendment to the Cleman amendment deleting the word the before “categories.”
- 7.9 It was agreed by consensus to accept Senator Klein’s amendment as friendly.
- 7.10 Debate continued and it was agreed by consensus to amend the Cleman amendment by making “categories” singular and inserting the word OR between B and C.
- 7.11 Senator Klein suggested as a friendly amendment changing the wording to SPECIFIED AREAS OF CONCERN.
- 7.12 Senator Klein’s suggestion was not accepted as a friendly amendment.
- 7.13 It was m/s/p (Klein) to substitute a motion to amend line 122 on page 3 of document 10-15 by changing the language as follows: SPECIFIED areas OF CONCERN (to be specified)....
- 7.14 The substitute motion passed.
- 7.15 It was m/s/f (Baker-Cristales) to amend lines 134-136 on page 4 of document 10-15 by deleting the words to receive a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion at least satisfactory performance must be demonstrated in all three categories.
- 7.16 It was m/s/ (Abdullah) to amend lines 185 to 187 on page 5 of document 10-15 as follows: ...record of sustained outstanding performance in categories A and B, “educational performance” and “professional achievement,” IN AT LEAST TWO CATEGORIES and at least satisfactory performance in category C, “contributions to the University” THE THIRD.
- 7.17 Senator Moss suggested as friendly amendment to the Abdullah amendment deleting the word satisfactory and inserting the word COMMENDABLE.
- 7.18 The suggestion made by Senator Moss was not accepted as a friendly amendment.
- 7.19 The Abdullah amendment failed.
- 7.20 It was m/s/ (Abdullah) to amend lines 208 to 210 on page 5 of document 10-15 as follows: ...be recommended for that action only if found to be outstanding in category A, “educational performance” and category B, “professional achievement” AT LEAST TWO CATEGORIES and at least commendable in category C, “contributions to the University” IN THE THIRD.
- 7.21 Senator Cleman suggested as a friendly amendment deleting the first at least.
- 7.22 It was agreed by consensus to accept the suggestion made by Senator Cleman as a friendly amendment.
- 7.23 The Abdullah amendment failed.
- 7.24 It was m/s (Whitcomb) to amend line 124 on page 3 of document 10-15 by deleting the words before the next performance review.

- 7.25 Senator Cleman suggested as a friendly amendment deleting the language on lines 122 through 124 beginning with the word and.
- 7.26 The suggestion made by Senator Cleman was not accepted as a friendly amendment.
- 7.27 It was m/s/ (McQueen) to substitute a motion to insert a period after the word “stage” on line 122 and to insert the following sentence: THE AREAS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT MUST BE SPECIFIED AND THE DEFICIENCIES MUST BE CORRECTED BEFORE TENURE OR PROMOTION TO THE NEXT RANK.
- 7.28 Senator Fernando suggested as a friendly amendment that the words before tenure or promotion to the next rank be deleted and replaced with BY THE NEXT DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW.
- 7.29 Senator Fernando’s suggestion was not accepted as a friendly amendment.
- 7.30 The McQueen motion to substitute failed.
- 7.31 It was m/s/p (Flint) to substitute a motion to delete the language on lines 122 through 124 beginning with the word and.
- 7.32 The substitute motion passed.
- 7.33 It was m/s/p (Henderson) to amend the second cell in the first column of the Performance Review Periods beginning on line 217 on page 6 of document 10-15 by inserting the words PERFORMANCE REVIEW after the word “probationary.”
- 7.34 It was m/s/ (Baker-Cristales) to amend lines 478 to 492 on pages 12 and 13 of document 10-15 as follows:

The criteria for evaluating faculty with joint appointments shall be consistent with those used for comparable evaluations of faculty members appointed to a single department/DIVISION/SCHOOL.

Faculty with joint appointments in two or more departments/divisions/schools OR EQUIVALENT UNITS Shall be evaluated EITHER by the Peer Review Committee and chair if not a member of the committee, in each department/division school and each college in which he or she is appointed OR BY A JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY FROM EACH DEPARTMENT/DIVISION/ SCHOOL. IF A JOINT COMMITTEE IS UTILIZED, THIS COMMITTEE WILL CONSIST OF MEMBERS OF ALL ACADEMIC UNITS WITHIN WHICH THE CANDIDATE HOLDS A JOINT APPOINTMENT. EACH ACADEMIC UNIT SHALL ELECT THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE UNIT AND EACH UNIT SHALL BE REPRESENTED IN AS CLOSE TO EQUAL PROPORTION AS POSSIBLE TO THE PROPORTION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TIME ASSIGNED TO THAT UNIT. IF NOT A MEMBER OF THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE, THE CHAIR OR DIRECTOR OF EACH ACADEMIC UNIT SHALL WRITE AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION. A FACULTY MEMBER APPOINTED IN TWO DIFFERENT COLLEGES WILL BE EVALUATED BY THE COLLEGE-LEVEL PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE IN AND EACH COLLEGE IN WHICH HE OR SHE IS APPOINTED.

COLLEGE DEAN(S), IN CONSULTATION WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER HOLDING A JOINT APPOINTMENT AND THE DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIR(S) OR SCHOOL DIRECTOR(S), SHALL DETERMINE WHETHER THE FACULTY MEMBER WILL BE EVALUATED IN EACH DEPARTMENT OR BY A JOINT COMMITTEE; THIS DETERMINATION SHOULD BE MADE AT LEAST 30 DAYS PRIOR TO THE FILE CLOSURE DATE FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER’S FIRST EVALUATION. IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS, CHANGES

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:
POLICIES AND CRITERIA GOVERN-
ING RETENTION, TENURE AND
PROMTION, FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER IV (*Continued*)

TO THE DEPARTMENT-LEVEL REVIEW PROCESS CAN BE
EFFECTED EITHER AT THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE FACULTY
MEMBER WITH THE DEAN'S APPROVAL OR AT THE DISCRETION
OF THE DEAN AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE FACULTY
MEMBER. SUCH CHANGES WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE FOR ANY
REVIEW CYCLES BEGINNING 30 DAYS AFTER THE CHANGE IS
INSTITUTED.

In every case, the department and college-level recommendations shall be
forwarded to the respective dean(s) of the colleges(s) in which an appointment is
held; each dean shall conduct an evaluation and forward a recommendation to the
Provost. For individuals holding a joint appointment, the President shall make a
single decision regarding retention, tenure or promotion.

ADJOURNMENT

8. It was m/s/p (Ulanoff) to continue document 10-15 as a second-reading item and to adjourn at 2:56 p.m.