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**Senate Retreat Executive Summary**

On August 29, 2018, the Senate conducted a retreat with the theme of shared governance. This meeting started with a PowerPoint presentation of Senate organization, structure, and a review of the actions of the 2017-2018 AY Senate. There was some discussion regarding the application of Roberts Rules of Order to abstention votes for resolutions. This was directed to the Parliamentarian for further clarification at a subsequent Senate meeting, if necessary.

The retreat then moved to six rotating tables. The summary of each table discussion follows.

**Table 1 – Establishing Transparency and Standardizing College Policies & Procedures**

This table, pursued four questions:

1) What are college level policies? How do you find or receive notification about college policies?

*Most Senators were unaware of College Level policies, beyond RTP and college level procedures (such as travel reimbursement). Some Senators distinguished college level policy (generally written) from college past-practices. Most Senators were unaware of a source online or otherwise where college level policies were kept.*

2) What processes are currently in place for policy adoption?

*Most Senators were unclear on how College Level policies were adopted. Most speculated it was in some form of consultation between the Dean and their college’s Chair’s Council. At least one college reported that chairs vote on policy adoption. Most Senators that do no serve in a chair capacity were unaware of the opportunity to participate in college policy formation.*

3) What processes would ensure shared governance with all college faculty & staff?

*The Senators generally supported greater transparency in the development and dissemination of college level policies. They identified a need for written policy for consistency, and that such policies should be easily accessible to all faculty and staff. College level policies also need to be confirmed as consistent with existing University, CSU and labor contract provisions.*

*Senators wanted to know when college level policies were being considered; have an opportunity to be heard in the policy deliberations; and a vote in that process (whether representative by chairs, or direct poll of faculty/staff).*

*Finally, Senators wanted some documentation of the policy with details such as the date of adoption; the adopting body/group; and whether a vote was conducted (and tally).*

4) What is the role of the college Chairs’ Councils?

*Since most college policies appear to be created in collaboration with chairs’ councils, the Senators found they are critical in addressing college level policy transparency. It is important for Chairs’ Councils to inform faculty of the policy development functions, so that faculty can ensure their feedback is included in the process.*

**Table 2 – Chairs’ Councils & Standards for All Colleges**

This table, pursued four questions:

1) Does a Chairs Council exist within your college? What role does the council play? Whom does the committee report to?

*Most Senators were aware of the existence of a chairs’ council for their college but are unclear on their purpose or function. Reporting of chair’s council activities lack transparency on agendas, minutes or resolutions of policy to the faculty/staff. Senators reported they viewed the chair’s councils as reporting to the College Dean.*

2) What policies exist specific to the council?

*Most Senators were unclear on the operation and function of their chairs’ council. Senators want to see more clarity of the Chairs’ Council’s role in shared governance.*

3) What are current practices with regard to decision making practices both formally and informally?

*Senators reported that most Chairs’ Councils meet weekly or bi-weekly. The practices of the Chair’s Council are not clear to department faculty and disconnected from temporary faculty. Chairs differ in their involvement of department faculty in Chairs’ Council discussions and decisions – from transparent to no reporting whatsoever.*

4) Areas of concern?

*Senators would like a clear and concise statement on the purpose of Chairs’ Councils along with an understanding of their effectiveness and role in shared governance.*

**Table 3 – Chairs Elections/Duties/Reassigned Time/Compensation**

This table considered the following questions:  
  
1) What are current chair duties? What are reassigned practices and compensation at your department/college?

*Senators reported increased workloads for Chairs related to enrollment growth outpacing Tenure Track hires. This leads to increased time in hiring, mentoring and evaluating part-time faculty. Part-time turnover is increasing due to a tightening job market, where our PT faculty leave for FT positions at other institutions.   
  
Senators also point increased Chair workloads addressing student concerns such as enrollment, grades, petitions and substitutions. Senators also pointed to increased time on enrollment management – to ensure there are adequate class offerings to address the growth in enrollment.*

*Senators reported that Department Chairs need access to enrollment management data to better project course needs within their departments. Senators reported that Department Chairs need to be able to run enrollment management reports directly from PeopleSoft, including the ability to compare to other departments in the College and University. Senators also reported that Department Chairs need to be trained on reports available to them and how to utilize them to effectively manage their departments.*

*Senators reported that some Deans would like Chairs to “reprimand” faculty but not all Chairs see this as their duty or feel they have the “power” to do this. Senators reported variation in tasks and compensation of Chairs within the University. Senators reported there is University Policy on Chair duties; however, it appears unenforced. Senators were unclear on the duties of Program Coordinators – as some are very similar to Chairs.*

*Senators desired clarity on Chair duties and transparency in compensation.*

2) What are current practices with regard to summer stipends – is this policy better?

*Senators reported that they wanted transparency and standardizing University policies and procedures. Practices across the colleges differ significantly, both in compensation and in work expectations. At least one Senator referenced a formula (for compensation) but did not understand it.*

*Senators desired clarity and transparency on summer stipends for Chairs across the University.*

3) Is there equity in release time for Chairs across your College? Department? University Level?

*Senators reported that they wanted transparency and standardizing University policies and procedures. Release time across the colleges differ significantly, and in many instances do not reflect their actual workload.*

*Senators desired clarity and transparency in the release time offered, and the data-based justifications for deviations made by colleges/departments.*

4) Is there an issue around chair elections, compensation, and duties you think needs to be addressed that we didn’t discuss?

*NTTIF Senators were unclear whether they have voting rights in Chair elections. Some Senators reported Chairs “weaponizing” their role/power by failing to hold regular meetings or have a regular presence in the department. Senators reported that some Chairs have been in their positions for several years.*

*Senators also expressed concern regarding junior faculty (Assistant and Associate) ranks being tasked with Department Chair/Program Coordinator duties, and how such duties may stifle professional advancement. Senators suggested that additional assigned time for research be granted to those that fail to gain advancement, especially in departments where there has been no viable (or willing) alternative person to serve as department chair or program coordinator.*

5) What are the procedures around chair elections in your Dept? College?

*Senators are unclear whether NTTIF faculty can vote in Chair elections. Senators report that colleges are not clear on eligible NTTIF in any given semester. Some Senators expressed reluctantly taking chair position as “there is no one else to do it,” or “bringing an outside person would be worse.” At least one Senator intimated that Chairs weaponize class schedules with NTTIF to influence Chair elections.*

*Senators desired uniform standards for Chair elections and clarity on whether NTTIF have been included in the process. Senators desired processes to limit Chair ability to influence Chair elections thru hiring NTTIF.*

**Table 4 – Establishing Standardize NTTIF Hiring, Evaluation, and Professional Development Across Colleges**

This table considered the following questions:

1) What are the hiring practices at your college level regarding the hiring of NTTIF?

*Senators reported varied knowledge regarding NTTIF hiring practices, according to participants’ experiences in hiring on campus. Senators with knowledge reported that while many hires happen in emergency situations (need for quick hires) the use of hiring pools and trusted recommendations aid in finding quality instructors. Most Senators wanted to know more about college level NTTIF hiring practices and how to institutionalize collaboration with TT-faculty. A few Senators shared excellent NTTIF practices from their departments that offer starting points for professionalizing policies and practices across CSUDH.   At this time, these are largely a matter of the person(s) leading not principles or policies.*

2) What are the evaluation procedures of NTTIF?

*Senators with experience in evaluating NTTIF reported that evaluation procedures included teaching observations, review of PTEs and end of semester meetings with NTTIF. Senators reported the need to make evaluation procedures known to the larger faculty body. One Senator thought it would be valuable to understand the content and teaching methods used by NTTIF in lower division classes, to compliment the upper division classes taught by TT faculty.*

3) What resources are provided to NTTIF members at your college with regard to PD distribution of faculty development or conferences?

*Senators indicated that professional development or conference resources were practically nonexistent for NTTIF.*

4) Are NTTIF included in department meetings? Elections for chair/senate?

*Some Senators stated NTTIF are invited to department meetings and rarely attend. Voting responses varied.*

**Table 5 -- Establishing Transparency in Academic Affairs Budget Process: Creation of Academic Affairs Budget Committee & College Budget Committees**

This table considered the following questions:

1) Who is included in the current budget decision-making practices and what are the policies in AA?

*Senators generally had no knowledge of any college process for budget decision-making. One Senator reported knowledge of a college process (HHSN).*

2) What should an AA Budget Committee and College Budget Committee look like for shared governance?

*Senators reported the following potential members:*

*Vice Provost or Financial Lead (if hired)  
3 Faculty Members elected by Senate (representing different colleges)*

*One staff member from AA*

*Include some Department Chairs*

*2-3 faculty members per college elected by Senate*

*2-3 faculty members per college elected by college*

*ASI or student member*

*Senators questioned how to include voice of lecturers? (eligible as elected faculty?)  
Several Senators urged that Deans should not be part of a College Budget Committee.*

3) Are their college budget committees?

*Most do not think so. Generally left to the Dean and ARM.*

4) What is included in the current budget decision-making practices and what are the policies in the colleges?

*Senators reported a desire for increased transparency, particularly down to the department level. Senators reported that opengov.com does not offer drill down data to departments or colleges. Senators desire projected spending for the year and actual spending going back two years. Senators want this information provided to Chairs and that Chairs being included on the college budget committee. Senators want to know the decision makers for college level and department level budgets. Senators reported they sought a breakdown of college spending, such as monthly statements.*

*It was noted that there is greater budget knowledge for programs with lots of fees – e.g. CAH (Art, Music).*

**Table 6 - Create Equitable Support for Faculty Scholarly/Creative Activity Within/Across Colleges**

This table considered the following questions:

1. What are the current practices at your department level regarding support for Scholarly/Creative Activity?

*Details of department level support varied across the campus. Senators do not want any reduction in support as a result of efforts to equalize support across/within colleges.*

2. What resources are provided to faculty member with regard to Faculty Scholarly Activities?

*Senators reported mechanisms for reassigned time varied among the Colleges. Reassigned time is generally based on a policy or determined by Department Chairs and College Deans.*

3. Areas of concern?

*Senators expressed the need to increase baseline RSCA funding across the University. Senators expresses a need for creative space (like lab space) for people doing creative work. Senators considered including lecturers in RSCA process. Senators desired greater support for cross-college and cross-departmental scholarly/creative projects.*

*Senators report that some colleges have no financial support for scholarly/creative activities. Senators viewed RSCA grants as geared toward new TT faculty, while all Tenured and TT faculty need ongoing support. Senators indicated that existing policies supporting scholarly/creative activity across the University lack clarity and transparency.*

4. Best practices to share?

*Senators reported:  
  
Enrollment-based budge model that allows chairs to allocate WTUs to faculty for scholarly/creative activities (A&H)*

*RSCA matched at college-level (A&H)*

*Buying out faculty WTUs*

*Travel Policy that guarantees TT & Tenured Faculty support for conference presentation*

*Release Time for faculty that publish at certain rate/level*