

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes

MEETING #7

Thursday, November 29, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Towner Auditorium (PSY 150)

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA-MSA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES-MSA
 - 3.1 Academic Senate meeting of November 15, 2018
4. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
 - 4.1 Executive Committee: Announcements- announcements of recent deaths of two esteemed faculty members, Misty Jaffe and Kent Merryfield. There was a moment of silence in their honor. Both were very active in faculty governance and will be missed.

Working on section 3.2 AC added language lines 168-171 to explain awards. Yes (add language), NO (do not add language)= Nellie Wieland suggests a straw poll, DS says language of "may" instead. Discussion is tabled until next meeting.

- 6.3 Proposed revision of Policy on Avoidance of Conflict of Interest PS 99-15 and Policy on Nepotism PS 05-10 (AS-968-17/FPPC)—SECOND READING
- 6.4 Proposed revision of Policy on Faculty Awards PS 12-06 (AS-1067-18/FPPC)—SECOND READING
- 6.5 Proposed revision of Charge of University Mini-Grant and Summer Stipend Committee (UMGSSC) (AS-1068-18/FPPC)—SECOND READING

7. NEW BUSINESS-

- 7.1 Discussion of documents on tenets of shared governance: TIME CERTAIN 2:40 pm- PS reports that these documents are from CO and last year's ASCSU's EC. This came about due to EO 1100 and 1110 being put forward without any consultation for the most part. Many concerns were raised due to this. In May CO spoke to ASCSU and then put forward Shared Governance document, asked if EC had any concerns or issues, introduced in May at Plenary meeting. In September the discussion continued on this document, feedback solicited from campuses. NS asks for feedback on the document which was put on the AS website. GG states that documents regarding shared governance from the CO mean nothing in his opinion. He states they do "whatever they want" to do regarding various issues. He states that CO often ignores objections put forward. NM states that CSUDH rejected their document one month ago, NS answered that CSUDH began their discussions earlier than they should of. HB asks if this document will have a role in future scenarios or just another document in a stack of document that are meaningless. PS says it depends on if the CO and ASCSU work together through collaboration, or not. PS states there is an "emergency clause" where things can happen in an "emergency". What constitutes an emergency? KJ states that there has been a lot of change in the CO with regards to AVP's. KJ suggests letting ASCSU "fight" out with the CO. NM suggests a memo stating areas of concern. NM states that referring to some of the other CSU documents and pointing out areas of agreement rather than areas of disagreement. NM suggest a memo stating what we support. Josh suggests that faculty primacy is a concern and what does that entail? Josh motion for a straw poll for a recommendation to ASCSU to recommend. Voted: **(Yes) A= 47 (No) B= 2**. Fumio asks if this had been in place would that have affected EO 1100 or 1110. DS asks if timing is an issue, 110 days vs. 75 days for example. PS states that Executive Vice Chancellor states that this is a "starting point" and if more discussion is to ensue, first this statement must be approved. KJ suggests an "addendum" to be added to the end of the document. GG asks what the enforcement policy is; if something is not given the correct time period. PS says to protest. BJ states that the Board of Trustees are the fiduciary party, so BOT

gives recommendation to CO. Some felt the document is vague and that is problematic; primacy is not clear in this document.

8. ADJOURNMENT-3:56 pm