Emergency Academic Senate Meeting  
April 4, 2012  
Minutes  

LSU  
2:30 to 3:30 p.m.  

Voting Members Present: Blackaller, Carvalho, Cauthen, Chai, Dales, Fawver, Ferris, Furtado, Gasco, Gould, Heinze-Balcazar, Hill, Holguin, Jacobs, Jones, Kalayjian, Kaplan, Keville, Kowalski, Kravchak, Krochalk, Kulikov, Malamud, Miller, Monty, Moore, Peyton, Pourmohammadi, Prado, Robinson, Rodriguez, Vanterpool, Verba, and Wing.  

Voting Members Absent: Coulibaly, Davis, Fitzsimmons, Ganezer, Garcia, Graham, Lopez Morin, Murrey, Niederman, Norman, Salhi, and Whetmore.  

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Bergmann, Bersi, Bragg, Gordon, Joshi, Maki, Martin, Parham, Pawar, Robles, Torrecilha, Tubbs  

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Absent: Borrego, Daniels, Franklin, Rodriguez, Saks  

Guests: Ben Zhou, Cindy Grutzik  

Executive Committee 2011-2012: Jim Hill, Chair; Ericka Verba, Vice Chair; Diane Miller, Parliamentarian; EPC Chair, Janine Gasco; FPC Chair, Tom Norman; Statewide Senators, Pat Kalayjian and Kate Fawver.  

Recorder: M. Brooks  

Call to Order  
2:30 p.m.  

Approval of Agenda  
MSP  

Approval of Minutes  
MSP  

Hill opened the meeting and said that we will be meeting from 2:30 to 3:30 p.m. because we only have the room for that period. Hill said that we would be only discussing what is on the agenda.  

“Re-constitution of PED (for AA) versus a special Task Force versus re-constitution of all PECs” Discussion limited to fifteen minutes. Vote.  

Jerry D. Moore, comments April 4, 2012, at Academic Senate Emergency Meeting:  

I urge President Garcia and the Provost Torrecilha to retract their proposal to develop a Task Force and instead follow the policy outlined in PM 00-03 and long-standing policies for Program
Review. I understand the Provost’s reasons for having a specific time frame and a process focused on Academic Affairs; these are legitimate objectives that can be achieved under PM 00-03 and existing processes for ongoing and significant review of academic programs as well as all the other divisions of the University.

I oppose the Task Force for a very simple reason: we have seen over the years that on-going issues are not well-served by ad hoc procedures. I hope Provost Torrecilha will not be offended at what I am about to say: I hope he is at CSUDH for decades or longer, I hope he attends my retirement party. But it is simply the case that we have had five provosts in five years, which must be a record somewhere. In the 20 years I have been at CSUDH, we have had the institutional continuity of a Bolivian government. Over that time, we have seen new initiatives, new strategic plans, task forces, brought in consultants, diversified our academic portfolio, divided colleges and recombined them, etc, and what recurrently happens is these do not result in effective and enduring assessment of programs and the University’s goals and directions.

If such ad hoc initiatives were effective, we would not be having an emergency meeting of the Academic Senate today.

If we had meaningful and on-going program reviews, we would not have to rely on external accrediting agencies to tell us what faculty positions need to be filled.

If we had followed established procedures and seriously looked at programs—in good times and in bad—we would not be facing this situation...again and again and again.

Ad hoc initiatives do not solve enduring problems for a simple reason: they inevitably require so much energy to justify the procedure that this takes precedence over substance, and there is no institutional commitment to implementation. This is exactly what we saw in fall 2009. So much energy is invested in procedural debates that substantive issues are not addressed and that—combined with a high rate of administrative turnover—means the can is kicked down the street and the problems are never faced.

And there is another consideration: What confidence can we have in an administration that does not follow its own Presidential Memos? We saw this in the memo from then Provost Vogel’s October 23, 2009 memo that indicates that he didn’t know that PM 00-03 even existed or was relevant. We have seen what happens when established policies are not followed and ad hoc measures are put in their place—turmoil and conflict followed by....nothing.

To conclude:
Provost Torrecilha can do the following: 1) set a time frame for Academic Affairs PEC; 2) call for elections from within Academic Affairs to be held within two weeks, and 3) establish a deadline for results by December 7, 2012. Simultaneously, he and all other members of the Administration should follow the guidelines of PM 00-03, and commit to an ongoing and
enduring process of Program Review, one that not only deals with this immediate challenge but which will become a basic procedure on this University for years to come.

Kravchak said that he has concerns about having an acting president or a permanent president within the next year that can change everything. Kravchak said to Torrecilha that he hoped Torrecilha would convey to the other VP’s we want to see what other division PECs have to offer up. Gasco said that EPC would like to urge the administration to implement PM 00-03 and they prefer the entire process includes budget transparency including what is and is not being cut. We want to see it all. We also want the program review process in place for academic affairs and for all divisions. Malamud said that he agreed with Moore and believes that zero based budgeting is a better plan. Monty said that he agreed with Moore and the comments by Malamud and Kravchak. Monty said that we should not approve a taskforce or adhoc and there is and has been too much overturn at the top. Fawver said that it is difficult to make decisions today when we do not know who will be at the top. Fawver said that she was for the PEC. Vanterpool argued in favor of the PEC and all division PECs. He said that we had already agreed to this and we should stay with the plan.

Torrecilha said that he appreciates all the information and hard work the faculty and senate have done. His concern is with academic affairs and he is not sure we can re-constitute all the PECs. We need to plan carefully and he believes the taskforce is the way to go. The focus would be a 3 to 5 year plan with a beginning and middle and an end. We would put in place a plan that we can go back to. Torrecilha said that he is not looking at this as a way to discontinue programs. PRP and PEC look at one unit and sometimes does not make the connections it needs to make.

Moore made a motion to re-constitute all PEC’s within the parameters of PM 00-03. Verba said that this would be in lieu of the taskforce and Moore said yes. Feuer wanted to know how PECs were originally constituted and how they might be reconstituted. Moore said that they began with PM 00-03. Verba read the PM aloud. Feuer said that it did not answer her question. Hill said we can add or modify the PEC committee membership. Fawver said that as she remembers it PECs were painful and expensive. They would come before UBC regarding re-allocation of funds. Since there has been no new money the PEC’s were stopped. No one tried to hide anything. The question is can this body re-constitute the PECs? Torrecilha said that we cannot ask that all PEC’s be re-constituted. We can only re-constitute academic affairs PEC. Malamud said that the 3 to 5 year plan in this economic environment doesn’t seem realistic. We ought to look at where we are making cuts. UBC should look into this. Moore said that the academic senate is responsible to call on leaders to follow their policies. If the provost wants academic affairs PEC that is fine. Gould said that the academic senate has the right to recommend anything to the university. There was a vote to end the discussion and all were in favor with 1 opposed. There was a vote to follow PM 00-03 in lieu of creating a taskforce. 30 were in favor; 1 was opposed and 2 abstentions. MSP.

Membership of such a committee and Time line for formation of such a committee and when results could be expected.

There was a discussion about the membership of the PEC. Gould said that the academic affairs PEC could be reconstituted as they were with no more than 7 members. Parham said that the PEC included 1 representative from each division and it included a staff member. Feuer said that
she did not want to put colleagues on PECs who will decide who gets to live and who gets to die. The problem with that is then the faculty has no voice. How can we participate without being complicit in firing of colleagues? Verba suggested that we adopt Torrecilha suggestion to add to the PEC a representative from each division. Moore said that he supports shared governance and he is certain that we cannot amend a PM on the floor of the senate. We can figure out a way to get representation. We could have an ex-officio member of UBC instead of the chair. Moore said that the PM states that there are 7 members from academic affairs. Grutzik said that it is hard to represent the college of professional studies with 1 person. We need more than 1 faculty member because our needs are different. Kravchak as a music department chair was not in favor of COP having more than 1 representative. He said that the college of arts and humanities has many faceted needs as well and we are getting only 1 representative. All colleges have broad diversity. Kravchak asked if faculty really want to sit on a death panel. Kravchak said that he prefers to have the faculty represented than not. Vanterpool said that we know we want to follow PM 00-03 and it is possible that we can add to the composition of the committee. Fawver asked what the university PEC has been doing since the PECs dissolved. She asked Maki. Maki said that he does not recall. Maki said that he is concerned about the PEC only having faculty representation. Maki said that the PEC should have faculty as well as administrative representation. Maki also said that a college like COP would need more than 1 faculty member to represent them. Maki’s second recommendation would be to make the PEC a larger committee.

Verba suggested that the senate allow the executive committee to work on this and bring back a suggestion to senate next week that we can vote on.

Gould moved to have the discussion end. The motion was seconded and there was a vote: all were in favor with 1 opposed.

Gould moved to refer this discussion to the executive committee and for that body to come up with a recommendation for the composition of the PEC and to bring it back to the academic senate meeting next week for review and vote.

Meeting Adjourned.