

M. Abdullah, M. Abed, G. Fernando, C. Haras, R. Land, N. McQueen, M. Pomirchy, T. Salmassi, Y. Song ABSENT

C. Blaszczyński, L. Judson EXCUSED ABSENCE

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

1. 1.1 The Chair's Announcements: ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 I am pleased to announce that Melina Abdullah and Nancy McQueen have been elected by the faculty to serve as Senators-at-large for three-year terms ending Spring, 2014.

1.1.2 I am also pleased to report that Stephanie Nelson has been elected by the Senate to serve on the Intercollegiate Athletics Board for a four-year term ending Summer, 2015.

1.1.3 On May 17, 2011, President Rosser approved the Senate's proposed modification of the policy on Deadline for Ordering Required Textbooks, Faculty Handbook, Chapter VI, effective Fall Quarter 2011.

1.1.4 Following is the response from Vice President Chavez to the question raised by Senator Moss:

Question:

What steps has the University taken in the last year to further reduce the overall carbon footprint from 2010 levels, and how is this measured?

Response:

In an effort to save money, reduce energy consumption and lower Cal State L.A.'s carbon footprint, several projects initiated and completed during 2010. These include:

- Installation of a building monitoring system which allows building engineers to evaluate the electrical usage of each building in real time. This gives the campus the ability on an ongoing basis to measure and monitor energy consumption against historical data. It also allows us to anticipate our electrical needs in the future, enabling better management of consumption and our carbon footprint.
- The lighted sign at the Welcome Center was converted from neon to LED lights. LED lights consume up to 75% less electricity than neon bulbs.
- The campus is currently piloting the reusable tote program through Office Max (our office supply vendor) which allows reuse of delivery totes. This eliminates the manufacturing and disposal of 6,500 pounds or 3 1/4 tons of cardboard.
- The campus installed two new electric vehicle charging stations in lot 10 for commuters and campus guests. This will encourage more usage of electrical vehicles and reduce emissions.
- The hydrogen fueling station is nearing completion. The station will deploy the latest technologies with the capacity of 60 kg/day, sufficient to fuel 15 vehicles or a bus and 5 more vehicles. The station will be grid-tied and powered by 100% renewables. At the time of completion,

ANNOUNCEMENTS (*Continued*)

Cal State L.A.'s station will be the most advanced publicly-accessible electrolysis-based station operated by a University.

- All new buildings on campus, including the recently completed Wallis Annenberg Integrated Sciences Complex, Public Safety Building and the soon to be completed Corporation Yard Building, were designed to outperform the Title 24 Standards for the California Energy Code by at least 15 percent. These efforts help to reduce the BTU/square foot consumption. As such, all of these buildings meet the standard to be LEED certified buildings. However, given the cost associated with certification of these buildings the campus has chosen not to pay for that designation.
- Grounds and landscaping continues to pursue xeriscaping, a visually attractive landscape that uses plants selected for their water efficiency. An established, properly maintained xeriscape needs about one-third the water of a traditional turf-based landscape.
- The campus continues to explore potential partners for the use of solar panels on buildings as well as parking lots and structures.

As a final note, staff continues to explore viable energy efficiency projects with the long range goal being the further reduction of our carbon footprint, to the extent that it is financially feasible.

- 1.1.5 Following is the response from Provost Vaidya to the questions raised by Senator Pomirchy at the Academic Senate meeting on March 8th:

Question:

How does the Honors College impact other Colleges?

Response:

Honors College serves to attract, support, and retain high achieving and motivated students who take majors in one of the six colleges (A&L, B&E, CCOE, ECST, HHS, NSS). It benefits from an advisory committee made up of faculty drawn from the colleges and library and key administrators drawn from the University's administrative units. Honors College students will matriculate with a degree program offered through one of the six colleges. Honors College will thereby have a positive impact on the entire University.

Question:

I understand that the Honors College has its own curriculum and offers classes. How are they adding classes while the University is cutting classes for other students?

Response:

Students in Honors College take courses offered by the Honors College as well as courses offered by other departments and colleges. Like courses from all other colleges, Honors courses have been developed by University faculty and have been approved through the normal curriculum process. In order to meet its enrollment allocation, Honors College courses generate FTES that counts towards the campus enrollment target.

- 1.1.6 Following is the response from Provost Vaidya to the questions raised by Senator Abed at the Academic Senate meeting on April 5, 2011:

Question:

If semester conversion is to take place, course deletions will routinely be taken care of as part of rethinking the curriculum in every department. Faculty members are well aware that the numbers of courses in programs will have to decrease. What need is there to duplicate faculty work?

Response:

While the President has requested authorization from the Chancellor to convert to semester calendar, a decision has not been made. Regardless of when we convert to a semester calendar, there is a need to delete courses that have not been offered in 2 years or more.

Question:

During the past two years, departments have been forced to cancel courses they would otherwise have taught and hope to teach again as soon as possible. Therefore, in a significant number of cases, the fact that courses have not been taught has little to do with choices departments have made.

Response:

Departments have been given the opportunity to request that courses not offered in 2+ years not be deleted from the curriculum/catalog along with a rationale for the same. As a matter of information, over 80% of the courses that have not been offered in 2+ years have not been offered in more than 4 years.

Question:

Many faculty did not understand that there was a reason to state on a course proposal that a course would be offered less frequently than once per year (with the resulting 4-year window for offering it). It is true that these courses could be modified; however, given the likelihood of semester conversion, modifying current courses would not be a good use of faculty or administrative time.

Response:

We will work through the college deans, associate deans and department chairs to make faculty aware of the importance of projecting, as accurately as possible, the frequency with which a course will be offered.

- 1.1.7 Following is the response from Provost Vaidya to the question raised by Senator Dumitrescu at the Academic Senate meeting on April 12th:

Question:

Is there anything that would prevent a department or college to allocate unused travel funds to FERPS?

Response:

A revised set of procedures for faculty travel funds will be forthcoming effective fiscal year 2011-12.

- 1.1.8 Following is the response from Provost Vaidya to the questions raised by Senator Aniol at the Academic Senate meeting on April 19th regarding sabbatical leaves:

Question:

What is the purpose for the recommended category since only those in the highly recommended category were approved?

Response:

University policy, as articulated in Chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook,

ANNOUNCEMENTS (*Continued*)

charges the University Sabbatical Leave Committee with reviewing proposals as well as department/division/school and College recommendations and rankings. The Committee is then charged as follows: "The Committee shall indicate which proposals are highly recommended, 'recommended' and not recommended. The Committee shall rank order the proposals within the 'recommended' category. The committee's recommendation on each sabbatical application shall be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs." Thus, the policy approved by the Academic Senate charges the committee with distinguishing between highly recommended and recommended proposals. More important, this distinction is critical every year, as the University does not have sufficient funds to award every sabbatical application and the distinctions made by the committee are weighed heavily in the Provost's decision as to which proposals to fund.

Question:

Why is the number of sabbaticals approved for the 2011-2012 year significantly lower than the numbers in these previous years?

Response:

The number of sabbaticals for 2011-2012 is significantly lower than in recent years because the University's budget is anticipated to be lower in 2011-2012 than in previous years. Given the CSU's budget as currently outlined in the legislature's budget proposal, the CSU system is facing a \$500 million cut. Pursuant to Article 27 of the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (which states that "prior to making a recommendation to the President regarding the sabbatical leave application, the appropriate administrator shall consider the recommendations [of the department and the faculty committee], other campus program needs, and campus budget implications." As the appropriate administrator, I could not recommend to the President that more than this number of sabbaticals be funded in the fiscal climate that we face going into 2011-2012. While we are facing severe budget restrictions, I nonetheless felt that it was important to fund *some* sabbaticals; thus, I recommended to the President that we fund only those proposals rated "highly recommended" by the University-level faculty review committee and the President accepted this recommendation.

- 1.1.9 Following is the response from Provost Vaidya to the questions raised by Senator Carrington at the Academic Senate meeting April 19th:

Question:

I want to know why there is not a transparency as to who was awarded a sabbatical and who was not. Clearly the list of who is eligible is public record but when they are awarded the results were not public. Why is there not transparency? Is this not a public record?

Response:

Sabbatical awards are a matter of public record. Indeed, each year when the awards are announced to the recipients, the Provost's office transmits the final list of awardees to the Public Affairs office. This list has been transmitted to Public Affairs and is attached to this response.

1.2 Vice Chair's Announcements:

The following faculty members have accepted appointment by the Nominations Committee to serve on the committees indicated for

three-year terms ending Summer Quarter, 2014:

- Yafen Lo (Child and Family Studies) - Risk Management and Safety Committee
- Freddy Lee (Marketing) - Space Management Subcommittee
- James Ford (Music) and Rika Houston (Marketing) – The Student Educational Equity Advisory Committee to the Vice President for Student Affairs
- Michelle Wallace (Special Education and Counseling) - Fiscal Policy Committee
- Diane Haager (Special Education and Counseling) - University Auxiliary Services, Inc. Board of Directors

ANNOUNCEMENTS (*Continued*)

2. Senator Dumitrescu announced her intent to raise the following question of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

The current policy on the evaluation of department chairs states that “if a review includes statements and/or opinions about the performance of a department/division chair or school director from individuals other than the author(s) of the report, the source(s) of such statements and opinions shall be identified by name.” In the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (and possibly in other departments as well) the written comments about the chairs’ performance have practically ceased to exist: on the one hand, untenured faculty (and even tenured ones) who may have something to criticize fear repercussions, and, on the other hand, part-time faculty are concerned about losing their jobs. Can we find a way of assuring these people that the confidentiality of their comments will be preserved? In the unlikely case of a lawsuit (if this is the reasons the policy has changed), it would be sufficient for the dean to know their identity and disclose it if necessary. But asking junior and part-time faculty to put in writing critical opinions about the chair who holds their future in his or her hands, to a point, is not a good idea.

The current policy on appeals for obtaining “no record drop” states that the official documentation in support of the appeal should be submitted to the Office of Enrollment Services, which is the sole entity to decide on the matter. There have been numerous cases in which students who get a poor grade with which they do not agree submit dubious documentation that leads to their simply disappearing from the roster, as if they never took the class. I brought to the attention of the Executive Committee several such cases (that I am not going to discuss here), but, to the best of my knowledge, nothing has been done officially to change the policy. So my question is: can we institute an additional level of review, by the instructor of the course, when an appeal for a no record drop is presented? Such an additional level of review, even if more work for the faculty, would prevent further abuses of the system on the part of dishonest students from happening.

3. 3.1 It was m/s/ (Classen) to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 17, 2011 (ASM 10-23).

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.2 No changes were requested and the Chair ruled the minutes were approved.

4. It was m/s/p (Benedict) to approve the agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

5. 5.1 Jose Perez-Carballo, Cheryl Cruz and Cheng Li were nominated for the College of Business and Economics position on the Nominations Committee.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE:
NOMINATIONS FOR THREE
POSITIONS – THE COLLEGE OF
BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS,
THE COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES AND THE
LIBRARY AND STUDENT
AFFAIRS

5.2 Victor Manalo, Beth Hoffman and Colleen Friend were nominated for the College of Health and Human Services position on the Nominations Committee.

5.3 Holly Yu, Scott Breivold and Kenneth Ryan were nominated for the Library and Student Affairs position on the Nominations Committee.

REPORT OF THE STATEWIDE SENATE
MEETING: MAY 5-6, 2011

INFORMAL REMARKS – ASHISH
VAIDYA, PROVOST AND VICE PRES-
IDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

FACULTY GRADUATION INITIATIVE
GROUP PRESENTATION

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:
THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC
FREEDOM AND PROFESSIONAL
ETHICS, FACULTY HANDBOOK,
CHAPTER II (10-36) *First-Reading*

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION:
RANGE ELEVATION CRITERIA FOR
TEMPORARY FACULTY, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (10-28)
Second-Reading
Forwarded to the President

PROPOSED POLICY: PEER OBSERVA-
TION OF INSTRUCTION, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI (10-29)
Second-Reading
Forwarded to the President

ADJOURNMENT

6. Statewide Senator Baaske announced that a written report of the Statewide Senate meeting would be distributed to the Senate via e-mail.
7. Provost Vaidya spoke to the Senate. A question and answer period followed.
8. Professors Talavera-Bustillos, Menzies and Classen presented a report to the Senate. A brief question and answer period followed.
9. It was m/s/ (Huld) to approve the recommendation (10-36).
10. The recommendation was APPROVED (10-28). Copies of the document are available in the Senate Office.
11. 11.1 It was m/s/ (Classen) to amend line 39 of document 10-29 by inserting the following language: FOR TENURED FULL PROFESSORS, AN OBSERVATION SHALL BE CONDUCTED DURING EACH FIVE YEAR POST-TENURE REVIEW PERIOD.
11.2 Debate ensued.
11.3 The Classen motion was withdrawn.
11.4 It was m/s/p (Baaske) to amend document 10-29 by deleting the language on lines 37 to 39 and inserting the following statement: FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS, AN OBSERVATION SHALL BE CONDUCTED AT LEAST ONCE DURING EACH POST-TENURE REVIEW PERIOD.
11.5 The recommendation was APPROVED as amended (10-29). Copies of the document are available in the Senate Office.
12. It was m/s/p (Huld) to adjourn at 3:10 p.m.