

Academic Senate
August 25, 2015

Present: Azevedo, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Chan, Crayton, Dorsey, Filling, Eastham, Espinoza, Filling, Garcia, Garone, Gerson, Gonzales, Guichard, Huang, Larson, Loza, Manrique, McCulley, Miller-Antonio, Nagel, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Ringstad, Strangfeld, Provost Strong, Silverman, Sims, Stone, Strahm, Strickland, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wellman, Wood, Young and Zhang.

Excused: Advanced Studies, Odeh Oluwarotimi and Kenneth Hoover

Proxies: None.

Guests: The following guests were welcomed: Guests: Oddmund Myhre, Mark Grobner, John Tillman, Nael Aly, Ronald Rodrigues, Maryann Hight, Dennis Shimek, Michael Matoso, Marge Jaasma, Julie Fox, Betsy Eudey, David Lindsay, Brian Duggan, Marcy Chvasta, Lauren Byerly, Shawna Young, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Doug Dawes, Nael Aly, Mark Grobner, Jennifer Helzer, and Donna Andrews.

Consent item: 11/AS/15/SEC Standing Rules of the Academic Senate Consent was received.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
September 8, 2015
2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:
Chris Nagel, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:05 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 5, 2015 (distributed electronically)

Approved.

4. Introductions made by Provost Strong

a. Doug Dawes, VP of Business & Finance

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Dawes as the VP of Business & Finance. Mr. Dawes is coming to us from Valley City State University in North Dakota, where he has served as vice president for business affairs since January 2012. Under his leadership as chief financial officer, the university developed projects totaling more than \$40 million, including construction of the first new building on campus in 40 years.

Before his time in Valley City, he was director and manager of business services at Utah State University. He also has extensive experience in the private sector, including Buena Vista Homes in Arizona, where he served as chief financial officer, and Ford Motor Company in Michigan and New Jersey. Mr. Dawes is a licensed certified public accountant and holds a Master of Science in Accounting and a Bachelor of Science in Accounting from Brigham Young University.

b. Welcomed Ms. Mary Hartsfield as the Director of Advancement Operations. She joined the campus last October and has much experience in management oversight. He is pleased to have her here.

c. Helene Caudill, Dean of University Extended Education

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Helene Caudill to the position of Dean of University Extended Education, effective July 27, 2015. Dr. Caudill has more than 15 years of experience in higher education administration as a dean, program director/chair, and campus director. She also has more than 20 years of teaching experience and utilized a variety of delivery methods, including semester-long, accelerated, weekend, blended, and online formats. Dr. Caudill is committed to student success and has a noteworthy record of working with non-traditional students, administering programs through different delivery formats, and exploring current trends in extended education to best meet the needs of current and future students. Her most recent tenure was as Dean of New College at St. Edward's University in Austin, TX. She holds a Ph.D. in Human Resource Management and an MBA from the University of North Texas.

d. Nael Aly, Dean of College of Business

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Nael Aly to the position of Dean of the College of Business Administration, effective July 1; 2015. Dr. Aly has more than 40 years of experience in higher education, including more than 20 years in academic administration. He has an extensive record of working collaboratively with faculty, staff, students, and community members to support and advance the California State University's academic mission. His most recent tenure was as Academic Dean at The California Maritime Academy (Cal Maritime). Prior to joining Cal Maritime, Dr. Aly was a member of the CSU Stanislaus community, and he served as Dean of the College of Business Administration, Founding Director of the Executive Master of Business Administration Program, and a variety of other significantly impactful roles. He holds a Ph.D. in Industrial Engineering from the University of Oklahoma, an M.S. in Industrial Engineering from the University of Oklahoma, and a M.Sc. in Production Engineering from Alexandria University in Egypt. Began apt on July 1 2015 variety of admin and faculty roles. Pleased to welcome him back. Working collaboratively with faculty, staff and students.

e. Oddmund Myhre, Dean of COEKSW

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Dr. Oddmund Myhre to the position of Dean of the College of Education, Kinesiology, and Social Work (COEKSW), effective July 1, 2015. Dr. Myhre has served very ably as the Interim Dean of COEKSW for the past three years, and I thank him for that good work. He also has a distinguished record as a faculty member and department chair. Dean Myhre has an extensive background in educational technology and quantitative research, including notable publications and reports related to assessment and evaluation. He has demonstrated effective leadership and a commitment to the University's mission in a number of ways, particularly through building lasting partnerships with community leaders. Dr. Myhre has a Ph.D. in Educational Technology/Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Washington and an M.A. in Educational Administration and Policy Studies from California State University, Sacramento.

f. Mark Grobner, Interim Dean of College of Science

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Grobner as he assumes the role of Interim Dean of the College of Science. Dr. Grobner joined CSU Stanislaus as a part-time lecturer in 1997 and was

appointed to the position of Assistant Professor in 2002. He was promoted to Professor of Biology in fall 2013. Dr. Grobner has an exemplary record in teaching and service and has made many contributions to the broader community, such as the very successful Science Day that brings hundreds of students and parents to the campus. He has excellent leadership experience and has served as the Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences for seven years, Speaker-elect of the Faculty in AY 2011-2012, and Speaker of the Faculty in AY 2012-2013. As Speaker-elect and Speaker, he greatly assisted the University in meeting the charge from WASC relative to the Special Visits of November 2011 and October 2014. He has served on numerous College and University Committees, such as the Enrollment Management Committee and the RPT Survey Group. He worked on the successful grant proposals that resulted in the Central Valley Math and Science Alliance and Warriors on the Way programs. Dr. Grobner holds a Ph.D. and M.S., both with majors in Animal Science from Oregon State University, and a B.S. with a major in Zoology from Colorado State University.

g. Provost Strong welcomed Ms. Janelle Culjis, Director of the Accelerated Second Bachelor's Degree in the Nursing program. She received her doctorate from San Francisco. She comes with a wide and varied background as a practitioner and educator at UC Davis and Sacramento City College.

h. Jennifer Helzer, Interim Director of International Education

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Helzer as she assumes the role of Interim Director of International Education. Dr. Helzer joined CSU Stanislaus as an Assistant Professor in 2001. She was promoted to Professor of Geography in fall 2012. Dr. Helzer has an impressive record of international teaching (including study abroad) and research, and she has excelled in several academic administrative roles. Currently, Dr. Helzer is the Co-Director of the Geography Program and the Director of the Masters of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies – Geospatial Analysis of Human Environmental Change program. In addition to her work on campus, she currently serves as the Campus Representative to the Chancellor's Office on the Academic Council on International Programs. Dr. Helzer also contributes to the campus through her participation on a variety of committees, including membership on the Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan (CIPSP), and serves as the Service Learning Liaison. She holds a Ph.D. in Geography from the University of Texas, Austin, and an M.A. in Geography from California State University, Chico.

i. Donna Andrews, Faculty Athletic Representative

Michael Matoso introduced Donna Andrews to the Senate. Dr. Andrews oversees compliance and academic integrity as the athletic representative for our campus.

5. Announcements

Donna Andrews shared that Athletics was recognized with 20% of the athletes' GPA at 3.0 or higher and one of their athletes is Nicole Larson the ASI President and senator.

Gerson said that in her role as FDC director they have a series of activities, book clubs, workshops etc., so keep an eye on your inbox. If you want to join a book club stop by and see Emy Barsley.

Espinoza noted that we have enrollment of 9,256 students FTE 7098 students. Accepting applications for spring term closes on 8/31st looks like we will fall within the target.

Julie Fox was recently approached by the Covenant Village in Turlock (the retirement center across the street from Emanuel Hospital). Their director sent a letter and would like to develop a partnership with the university. To this end, they are hosting a faculty appreciation event, Sept. 18th at 3:30pm. Refreshments will be served. They often have people come in to share their academic work. They realized they are missing an opportunity with Stanislaus. Students can also engage in a myriad of ways. In addition, they have a community room open to groups. Speaker Thompson thinks his ukulele group meets there.

Library Dean Rodrigues mentioned that asbestos abatement has been completed and new carpeting has been installed in the Library. In addition, three new group study rooms have been made available to students.

Strahm asked whether the FTES data provided by Espinoza includes graduate students. Yes, per the Provost.

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)

Sims noted that FAC hasn't met yet so there isn't a report and Peterson noted the same for FBAC. Ringstad noted that GC will be participating in the campus conversation about graduate education and connection with community.

Filling noted that SWAS will be meeting next week and he will continue to try to speak the truth as Chair.

Stone said that UEPC will be meeting on Thursday and agenda was published. They will be reviewing the two pass system and other carryover items.

Filling noted that senators will receive a draft report from the system committee on creation of a sustainable financial model. This has implications for how we allocate resources in the CSU.

7. Consent Item

a. 11/AS/15/SEC Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

This is the document that we will use to run the meetings. Sims moved and Nagel seconded. No objection.

8. Information Items

a. CIPSP-Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan Recommendations

Provost Strong gave an overview of the document, beginning with the conclusion of the document.

Strategic planning should be an effective continuous improvement process that assists faculty, staff and administrators to make more effective decisions. Strategic planning goes beyond normal planning in added attention to changes in the environment, a broad University and regional perspective, integration among stakeholders and processes and a long term orientation. Strategic planning is challenging and difficult to execute effectively but when properly operationalized it creates more consensus and effective focus resulting in higher levels of performance.

Strong reviewed the process leading to the formation of the CIPSP, and the charge from the president's memo of 6/24/14, which describes his reaction to the Strategic Planning Working group empowered in 2007 to implement the SP. The committee was to identify the top 5 priorities for the campus, why they are important, and how they will be measured.

The Charge to the Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan (CIPSP)

1. The operationalization of the Strategic Plan (2007) and the Implementation document (May 2008) should be improved in the following ways.
 - a. Identify the campus's top five priorities for the next two years, including for each:
 - i. Why the priority is important.
 - ii. How progress toward the priority will be measured, including targets where appropriate.
 - b. Develop "action plans" for the five priorities selected. CIPSP will prepare action plans for the priorities selected so that planning is integrative and implementation measures are specified. CIPSP will create broad action plans and ask divisions, colleges, departments and other units to provide more specific actions plans congruent with the Implementation document (May 2008) instructions cited above or new instructions recommended by CIPSP. It may be that specific action plans and results already exist in these organizational units, and the CIPSP-led process will provide an integration of action plans at the University level.
 - c. Reach out to on-campus and off-campus stakeholder groups for expertise and input to execute the charge.

Item 2 describes the structure and operation of the committee.

2. The structure and operation of the CIPSP will be as follows:

The CIPSP will execute the charge above and will be a permanent University committee. This committee will be led by the Provost and be comprised of campus leaders as follows. Continuity with committee members would be advantageous, and staggered terms may be recommended now or in the future. The Provost is the permanent chair.

- a. Provost - Chair of the Committee to Implement and Prioritize the Strategic Plan (CIPSP)
- b. Two vice presidents (in addition to the Provost) – recommended by the President's Cabinet

- c. Two deans – recommended by the Provost’s Advisory Council
- d. Five faculty members – recommended by the Committee on Committees (Academic Senate)
- e. Two students – recommended by ASI
- f. Two staff members – recommended by the Staff Council

They met almost every Friday morning September through May, 2014. They learned that the Strategic Plan is not an easy activity to do well. Pg. 4 describes the consultation process the committee went through. This was an extensive process. They held open forums in December to gain more information from the campus. There was an extensive survey done in December and shared with the campus community in February and March.

The CIPSP then identified 6 priorities from the original SP. They took the priorities directly from feedback from the survey. Objectives and action items were added by the CIPSP. They voted on every goal which was arduous process. WASC has charged the university with significantly revising or developing a new strategic plan in advance of our next accreditation review to begin 2018. This challenges the university to develop an integrated SP process involving all sectors of the university.

Rec. #2 states the following:

Recommendation Two: The Provost is responsible for the overall supervision and measurement and reporting process of the six goals above in part due to his/her role as Chair of CIPSP and SPWG (“under the leadership of”).

Recommendation Four: The charge for a subsequent strategic planning committee (whether that be a continuation of CIPSP or a strategic planning committee focused on revising or creating another strategic plan or both should require that the strategic planning process establish clear horizontal and vertical linkages between institution wide goals and those of academic school and administrative departments. (see Executive Summary of the 2015 Hanover Research report on Strategic Planning Vertical Integration, attached).

Recommendation Five: The strategic planning process called for in the WASC memo dated March 6, 2015, will begin fall semester 2015 and be completed by the fall semester 2018, at the latest. This process should begin with the careful development of a plan to create the revised/new plan. Included in the “plan the strategic planning process” is a literature review for methods of conducting strategic planning at the university level and an incorporation of the best principles and methods in creating a plan to revise/replace the 2007 plan. Some of the processes used by CIPSP in 2014-15 are not practical for the development of a comprehensive strategic plan and strategic planning process.

Recommendation Six: All members of CIPSP and any other University strategic planning committee will attend a University strategic planning workshop that covers best practices in the literature.

Speaker Thompson noted that this topic will return to senate as a discussion item. There were 26 goals in our SP and the current process focuses on a more manageable number and allows people to recognize ways to buy into it. The senate may wish to make recommendations responding to goals that start on pg. 5 and pg. 8 and may make other recommendations as well. The Speaker asked whether the Senate’s input would be directed to the CIPSP.

Provost Strong stated that the CIPSP has reached out to multiple groups and will reach out to the community in the next few weeks. They will review feedback and will consider making changes if there were dramatic changes that needed to be made, but are reluctant to do so. The Senate can make recommendations to CIPSP, and CIPSP will consider them. After that the recommendations go to the SP Working Group and the President at the same time. The SPWG will have 14 days to consider and respond.

Speaker Thompson interjected to ask the membership of the SPWG.

The provost replied, listing the Speaker, Speaker Elect, and Faculty At large, Director of Institutional Research, VP of Enrollment Management and Provost.

Speaker Thompson repeated that this will return as a discussion item at the next Senate meeting. The emphasis is on pgs. 5-9; be prepared to discuss those next time and discuss with your departments. This is one of the big items for this year for the Senate.

Huang asked if there's any expectation for departments or programs to implement these goals. The provost replied that yes, there is an expectation that programs will implement the current 2007 Strategic Plan.

Speaker Thompson noted that one of the points of possible integration is inclusion of UBAC into the process in ways that align with these goals. This may make programs more interested in the process of prioritizing and implementing.

b. RPT Survey Report: Next Steps (15/AS/14/FAC Endorsement of RPT Survey Report)

Speaker Thompson noted that the Senate endorsed all the recommendations in that report and we actually sent this to the president. It is important to note that the President also endorsed this on 3/2/15. He Pointed out Rec. #3

Recommendation 3: Continue efforts to ensure that all tenured and tenure-track faculty, as discipline experts, have a good understanding of the complexity of developing elaborations and the role elaborations play in the RPT process. Share elaborations within and across Colleges and call upon all departments to regularly discuss and examine their elaborations with attention to both the unique aspects of their discipline and to the means by which other departments communicate their priorities and expectations. Utilize the Faculty Development Center to engage faculty in critical dialogue regarding strategies for thinking about and preparing elaborations.

It's very important that we have focused elaborations. FAC sent a memo to the co-chairs of URPTC and to Maryann Hight chair of FDC in the spring. They requested that the URPTC and FDC lead those discussions to implement the 3rd recommendation. He imagines that when URPTC and FDC meet we will hear more information.

Gerson noted that at new faculty orientation they had a brief activity on RPT.

c. Clicker Training

Demonstration provided.

9. Discussion Items

a. Importance of Faculty Governance (attachments)

Speaker Thompson addressed primarily the new members of the Senate. The faculty constitution lists specifically the governance responsibilities delegated to the General Faculty and to the Academic Senate, of which the first is recommendation and review of policy.

The document entitled “Importance of Faculty Governance” is an informal statement SEC put together a few years ago. Thompson noted the roles played by CFA, Senate, and administration in formation of policy, and referred to his discussion of this in the General Faculty Meeting. In particular, CFA is permitted to comment on matters of policy, and Senate is permitted to confer with CFA. Thompson called upon members of the Senate to understand their roles and how their roles interact with others in the system of governance. Finally, Thompson asked if there were suggestions or responses to this discussion.

Nagel suggested adding language regarding non-faculty, or non-departmental representatives and roles in the Senate and in governance, since our Senate includes students, staff, and athletics representatives.

b. One Sheet Requirements and Privacy Issues

Speaker Thompson explained that there has been ongoing of the development of the One Sheets, interaction between the Communications Department within the Division of University Advancement and academic departments, and privacy issues. The Provost distributed a sample of One Sheets.

Thompson reported his understanding that privacy issues have largely been resolved, and that Shirley Pok will be meeting with chairs’ groups in the colleges to discuss the development of One Sheets.

Peterson asked whether departments can still make changes to their One Sheets. Department of Economics, Ag Studies, and Social Sciences was not given permission to change theirs. It seems that those designing them decided to add what they thought they should without much consultation.

Provost Strong noted that Tim Lynch and Shirley Pok are working with department chairs, and that they are amendable to meeting the needs of departments. According to the Provost, anything can be changed. The Provost also stated he thinks that Shirley Pok will be attending the Chair’s and Dean’s luncheon meeting and is not sure she’ll be going to individual departments.

Wood asked what the privacy issues were. Peterson replied the department was given the impression that their choice was to “take it or leave it.” If Peterson Inc. is noted in the brochure as having hired graduates, it could give the impression that they would likely hire new graduates. Further, companies may not have given their permission to be mentioned.

Sims related additional concerns about likenesses and quotations of students and faculty from programs having been used without express permission. There may be things that are legal and allowable but that a department or individual doesn't want in their One Sheet.

Thompson concluded that there appears now to be more balance in the decision-making process.

c. Faculty Status

Speaker Thompson shared a document representing SEC's attempt to figure out how we are going to deal with the topic of faculty status on campus. The document was brought before the Senate to initiate conversation and to focus on the issues. This is a big, complicated issue, will take a while, and we need people to participate. Thompson admonished Senators to take this to their academic departments/programs to discuss, in particular the items that are at the top of page 2, the 4 recommendations from the AAUP Statement. He clarified that this is what the AAUP recommends, and we need to ask how we are doing things at Stanislaus. He expressed hope that if departments discuss this at a meeting, non-tenure-track faculty be included in those discussions. One of the challenges is that we hear from all those interested and involved. He also sent a lengthy memo to all VP's and ASI President encouraging them to be involved in this process from the beginning. John Tillman has provided a lot of data to us and we will include it in this document. Any revision to the Faculty Constitution will take 2/3rd vote of the faculty and approval by the president.

Garone asked, for the sake of facilitating departmental discussions, if part-time non-tenure-track faculty were to be allowed to have votes on RPT process at either department or university level. Should they have a voice in evaluating full time faculty?

Nagel said that the CBA prohibits non-tenure track faculty to participate in deliberations regarding tenure or promotion. Speaker Thompson said that we'll share the current Voting Rights with the Senate next time we discuss this.

Gerson stated that she knows that many non-tenure-tracks are doing a lot in their departments. She, Nagel, and Cooper are trying to get a lecturers' group together in FDC and if nothing else so they can share ideas. She ran into obstacle when she tried as FCETL director to invite new part time faculty to attend the New Faculty Orientation and couldn't make that happen. Because part-time faculty don't necessarily have a contract signed prior to the semester, they can't be identified and invited to come to campus to feel like they're really welcome and part of our group. Once they are in a class and on the payroll we can access their names and invite them here. These are some of the struggles.

Speaker Thompson said that we are focused on membership and voting, but it appears that this issue involves broader issues of equity and participation. Another issue might be compensation for such work. The only expectation for many non-tenure-track faculty is teaching, so compensation may become involved in the future too, and at that point, administration will need to weigh in.

Filling noted that while it is true that for many non-tenure-track faculty the only duty stated in their contracts is instruction, many are hired for reasons related to research work, their degrees and so on. The aim is to treat faculty as faculty. Filling also explained that this issue arose in part as a result of a grievance at Fresno related to non-tenure-track faculty voting for department chairs. He begged pardon, but expressed his opinion that it appears similar to movements to get women and people of color the vote.

Sims related that he has been asked why we are looking at this. This will cause a lot of discussions. Hiring practice has changed so significantly in the last 20-30 years, that the ways governance structures were constructed are out of date. Governance structures have not evolved to meet that change. 75% of faculty nationwide are contingent. 72% of instruction is provided by non-tenure track faculty. We have reached a tipping point and SWAS is urging each campus to take this on. This is not an attack on the rights of tenure-track faculty, but to be fair to non-tenure-track faculty. Keep this in mind as you frame this conversation in your departments.

Speaker Thompson pointed out the blank space on point #4. SEC is going to great pains to try to get this right so we can share the headcount, percentage and FTES that are actually taught by the different groups.

Strahm expressed concern with AAUP recommendation #1, point 4, regarding graduate students. This makes her nervous and it seems to her to be a much more transitory group on a campus.

Sims noted that these recommendations are just recommendations, and coming from AAUP. They are written for many kinds of institutions, and this particular recommendation probably relates more to universities with large cohorts of such students and postdocs. This could be a point to discuss in departments. ask what this means and what the implications are for our campus.

Speaker Thompson noted that their TAs are invited to English meetings, so if they show up, he'll express what they have to say.

Filling anticipated objection, stating that lest one think SWAS considers this represents "handing everything to lecturers," this in no way has slowed SWAS efforts to push on tenure-track faculty density and increasing ranks. We have been successful in getting the Governor to pencil in \$11 million to hire more tenure-track faculty next year. Don't misinterpret what the SWAS resolution on inclusion of non-tenure-track faculty in governance means.

Garcia thinks that on our campus we missed an opportunity to have this discussion a long time ago due to our inability to define counselors as faculty. He is glad we are having this conversation, but it is a bit late.

Gerson pointed out that at Sonoma State all faculty are regarded as faculty and at 50% time base are eligible to vote. We can modify our language to make us comfortable, including regarding TA's. There are ways to deal with various kinds of concerns, and we should have these conversations for sure.

Byerly noted another comfort regarding “transitory” persons having the right to vote. Those who feel themselves to be transitory or less devoted, or that this isn’t an institution they are interested in, will probably not participate in those votes. In this way, it’s kind of like American politics. It’s probably not too much to worry about.

Wood noted recommendation 1, Pg. 2 about researchers. What’s the rationale about researchers? Speaker Thompson said we need to keep in mind this is a national organization. Wood wanted to know if we include researchers in our discussion. Sims replied that that itself is a topic of conversation.

Huang queried whether non-tenure-track faculty at Stanislaus have a desire to participate.

Eudey said that when folks are contributing to the university in their roles and they don’t have a say, it creates divisions among people that shouldn’t be there. Those who might want to participate may not have vocalized it. She’s pushed for years to include more lecturers in committees and voting. Whether there are 12 or 200 it’s important to include them. Many full- and part-time lecturers have become accustomed to not being involved. We need to tell them they can get involved and we’ll be a better university.

Nagel stated he doesn’t think it matters how many will volunteer or are interested or participating. Those kinds of surveys are not helpful. Asking people how they feel about it isn’t the same as asking whether it’s the right thing to do to extend eligibility for participation.

Gerson averred that the same variation in level of interest in governance goes for tenure-track faculty: some just do the minimum in order to check off a box on RPT requirements. Some faculty may not be looking for more involvement, but some may and we may see that whole range.

Thompson noted that the document titled “Status of Faculty 2” is the one to consult and provide feedback for next time. He asked for written feedback and to gather information for next time. Finally, Thompson charged senators to consult with colleagues and contribute to the discussion.

10. Open Forum

Sarraille asked for comments about the recent announcement by the president for the salary adjustment proposal. What are your thoughts and points?

Strahm said she knows that we have an excellent quantitative researcher on CFA executive committee and lots of data was gathered about this issue. How much of that information that was analyzed did the administration use as part of their decisions?

Sarraille said that as CFA president, he and others in the executive committee were invited to see the preliminary version of the president’s proposal. In particular, Strangfeld had done work ahead of time analyzing faculty salary data. They developed recommendations on addressing

compression and inversion problems. Administration was not interested at all, in Sarraille's estimation, in anything except perhaps minor revisions to their own plan.

Nagel expressed disappointment but not surprise that the administration's proposal excludes lecturers.

Petratos offered his gratitude to the president and provost for the administration's salary proposal.

Garone noted the limitation of only comparing persons in the same department in the same rank. This ignores anyone who is the only one in a department at that rank. It also ignores the compression between ranks. Both of these are injustices.

Eudey said that in comparison to sister campuses, faculty in equivalent departments are underpaid at our institution, and similarly situated persons at the other campuses were not looked at for a comparison.

Strangfeld pointed out that the data analysis done by CFA showed that Garone's points were overwhelmingly the kinds of problems in faculty salaries. This result was consistent across colleges, not just one college or one department; the pattern was there throughout.

Silverman raised a question about faculty membership. Believes lecturers outnumber tenure-track faculty in his department. In CS, many lecturers are graduates of the program. Some are full time lecturers. Some are professionals who may teach a course or two for some extra money. He does not think they should be participating in governance in the department.

Sims reminded the senate, in their roles as senators, when presenting this issue to departments to please resist the urge to impose a personal opinion at the front. All opinions matter but as senators one is urged to get all opinions. He further asked senators to be impartial in framing the issue and leading this conversation at the department level.

Wood brought up the policy directive on criminal background checks and credit checks, transmitted via email from VP Shimek. Are faculty promotions included among those promotions requiring background checks? Are criminal reports being done for new jobs and also for those applying for promotions? Are we subjected to these background checks?

Shimek said that the policy does not require back ground checks for faculty promotions. Current faculty is grandfathered in their positions. Only if they move from their current position to a new position primarily working with minors would the policy require a check. New faculty are subjected to criminal checks and possibly credit reports if they are working with substantial financial matters in area of making financial decisions. This is not sorted out yet, but it will be a small number of faculty who would be affected by the policy.

Strahm asked what the point is of running the background checks. Shimek replied that the policy change has been considered for some time, to do background checks in ways that are done throughout academia. A particular issue is when university employees work with minors. Many academic institutions like UC have been doing background checks for a long time.

Speaker Thompson brought up the tenure-track Counseling faculty issue. Two years ago the senate passed a resolution encouraging administration to hire more tenure-track Counseling faculty, which the Senate saw as a return to the status quo of having a core group of tenure-track counselors. After the Senate resolution, the FAC, FBAC the Chairs of CAHSS all reiterated the same core position. There was lots of discussion and not much has happened. He is sorry that VP Espinoza had to leave early and is missing this discussion. SEC is putting together a memorandum to update everyone on this situation, but mainly to reiterate that the faculty's position has not changed.

Bettencourt thanked SEC and the Senate for that support and ongoing support given the Counseling faculty are a small number. He explained that a search is in process for Director of Disabled Student Services, and when someone is hired, he will be going back to Psychological Counseling full time. The DSS position is posted on HR Website. He anticipates that by January he should be back in Psychological Counseling full time.

Strahm whether the DSS position will be tenure-track. Bettencourt replied that, actually the Director of Disabled Student Services is an MPP position.

Thompson asked if the number of people doing counseling is actually fewer now. Bettencourt replied that there was a half-time hire, and believes it is the same number.

Silverman returned to discussion of background checks. The stated purpose for the background checks is to protect university assets. He read from the policy document that backgrounds checks may include social security records; workers comp claims, and sex offender registries. Reading from VP Shimek's email. How will these records determine if I'm a dangerous person to minors? Shimek replied that the primary reason for the policy is protection of minors. Thompson suggested SEC could add this item as discussion with Shimek and bring it back to Senate as a discussion item.

Strahm said that in addition to background checks, the work place behavior item also needs to be discussed. Of course we need to be civil to each other but policies like this can also be dangerous, shutting people down in discourse. This is on the SEC agenda and this item will also return to the Senate in the future.

Speaker Thompson implored the Senate to review and discuss with colleagues the Faculty Status 2 document to be sent via email.

11. Adjournment

4pm