

M. Abed, G. Fernando, D. Lee, Y. Song, V. Villa, B. Yorker

ABSENT

R. Abbott, R. De Chaine, C. Frank, R. Salinas

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Hunt convened the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. 1.1 The Chair's Announcements:

1.1.1 Following is the response from our Parliamentarian, Senator Baaske, to the question raised by Senator Aniol at the last meeting:

According to my research, an abstention is a vote not to vote. Abstentions are NOT counted in voting results. The only exception is when a majority or supra majority of those present or of the body's membership must vote affirmatively, then voting to abstain has the same effect as voting "no." But even in that case, it is recorded as the member not voting.

The following is from Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised:

Do abstention votes count?

The phrase "abstention votes" is an oxymoron, an abstention being a refusal to vote. To abstain means to refrain from voting, and, as a consequence, there can be no such thing as an "abstention vote."

In the usual situation, where either a majority vote or a two-thirds vote is required, abstentions have absolutely no effect on the outcome of the vote since what is required is either a majority or two thirds of the votes cast. On the other hand, if the vote required is a majority or two thirds of the members present, or a majority or two thirds of the entire membership, an abstention will have the same effect as a "no" vote. Even in such a case, however, an abstention is not a vote.
[RONR (10th ed.), p. 387, l. 7-13; p. 388, l. 3-6; p. 390, l. 13-24; see also p.66 of *RONR In Brief*.]

Interestingly, there is a movement in the world of Robert's Rules to have chairs NOT ask for abstentions when votes are taken. No member is forced to vote, unless there is a roll call, and no record is kept of how members vote, so why bother to ask if there is someone who didn't vote to have their vote recorded as having "not voted." If they choose not to vote, they didn't vote. They don't need to tell us about it. It's not about them.

1.1.2 At the last Executive Committee meeting, Senator Baaske reported on the Academic Senate CSU Resolution (AS-2892-09/FA) unanimously approved in May 2009 that states, in part:

“That the Academic Senate CSU request that the Chancellor remind campus Presidents that the authority to make alterations to curricula is vested in the faculty and that campus administrators should refrain from altering course capacities or modes of instruction without following established campus curricular policies and procedures.”

Senator Baaske also reported that the response to this resolution from the Chancellor's Office affirms the faculty control over course capacities and modes of instruction. The Chancellor's response was:

“We acknowledge the principle that authority for curriculum revision is broadly vested in the faculty and we will provide campus leadership with the reminder that is requested in this resolution.”

ANNOUNCEMENTS (*Continued*)

1.2 Senator Moss announced: I would like to invite you all to a reception and signing party for the release of a book, CSU Haiku, by Terry Allison this Saturday, February 26th, 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the Fine Arts Gallery. Terry will be there for the signing.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

2. 2.1 It was m/s/ (Classen) to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 15, 2011 (ASM 10-13).
- 2.2 Senator Aniol requested that the question raised in item 2 of the minutes be corrected by inserting a period after the word “votes.”
- 2.3 The minutes were approved as corrected.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. 3.1 It was m/s/ (Benedict) to approve the agenda.
- 3.2 It was m/s/p (Aniol) to amend the agenda by adding Use of Abstentions in Senate Voting Procedures as a new first-reading item and numbering it item 6.
- 3.3 It was m/s/p (Abdullah) to amend the agenda by adding Resolution on Faculty Compensation for Training and Supervising Students in Independent Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Projects as a new first-reading item and numbering it item 7.
- 3.4 The agenda was approved as amended and all of the second-reading items were renumbered.

RESOLUTION ON SENATE
ENGAGEMENT WITH UNIVERSITY
LEADERSHIP (10-22) *First-Reading*

4. It was m/s/ (Classen) to approve the Resolution on Senate Engagement with University Leadership.

USE OF ABSTENTIONS IN SENATE
VOTING PROCEDURES

5. 5.1 It was m/s/ (Aniol) that the use of abstentions during a Senate vote, when a quorum is present, will be counted as “no” votes. Abstentions may be separately recorded.
- 5.2 A five minute question and answer period took place.
- 5.3 It was m/s/p (Dewey) to extend the time for questions for five minutes.
- 5.4 It was m/s/p (Dewey) to extend the time for questions for an additional five minutes.

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY
COMPENSATION FOR TRAINING
AND SUPERVISING STUDENTS IN
INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND
OTHER SCHOLARLY AND
CREATIVE PROJECTS *First-Reading*

6. 6.1 It was m/s/ (Abdullah) to adopt the Resolution on Faculty Compensation for Training and Supervising Students in Independent Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Projects.
- 6.2 A five minute question and answer period took place.
- 6.3 It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to extend the time for questions for five minutes.
- 6.4 It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to extend the time for questions for another five minutes.

7. 7.1 The Chair reminded the body that the following motion to amend lines 478 to 492 on pages 12 and 13 of document 10-15 was on the floor:

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 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 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.

- 7.2 The amendment was approved.
- 7.3 The recommendation was APPROVED as amended (10-15). Copies of the document are available in the Senate Office.
8. 8.1 It was m/s/p (Baaske) to amend document 10-16 by inserting the following statement above line 73: CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY MEMBERS SHALL BE APPROPRIATE TO THEIR APPOINTMENT. and the words EXCLUSIVELY ASSIGNED TO TEACHING on line 74 after the word "members."
- 8.2 It was m/s/f (Momand) to amend document 10-16 by deleting lines 101 through 104.

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:
RANGE ELEVATION CRITERIA FOR
TEMPORARY FACULTY, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV
(Continued)

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:
PEER OBSERVATIONS OF INSTRU-
CTION, FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER IV (10-17) *Second-Reading*

ADJOURNMENT

- 8.3 It was m/s/f (Flint) to amend line 110 of document 10-16 by inserting the words EXCLUSIVELY ASSIGNED TO TEACH after the word “members.”
- 8.4 It was m/s/p (Warter-Perez) to amend lines 112 and 113 by deleting the word educational and inserting the words IN THEIR ASSIGNMENT after the word “performance.”
- 8.5 Senator Ulanoff suggested as an editorial amendment to line 77 of document 10-16 that the words classroom observations be changed to PEER OBSERVATIONS OF INSTRUCTION.
- 8.6 It was agreed by consensus to accept Senator Ulanoff’s suggestion as an editorial amendment.
- 8.7 The recommendation was APPROVED as amended (10-16). Copies of the document are available in the Senate Office.
9. It was m/s/ (Aniol) to amend document 10-17 by deleting lines 32 and 33.
10. It was m/s/p (Classen) to continue document 10-17 as a second-reading item and to adjourn at 3:16 p.m.