Senate Executive Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, September 5, 2017

Provost’s Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

Attendees - Stephen Stratton, Kaia Tollefson, John Yudelson, Greg Wood (on behalf of John

Griffin), Geoff Chase, Scott Perez, Antonio Jiménez Jiménez, Genevieve Evans-Taylor, Jennifer

Perry, Cindy Wyels, Jeannette Edwards (Staff), Chelsea Lincoln (student representative)

Meeting Called to Order - 2:32pm

Approval of the Agenda - S. Stratton moved that item # 8 on the agenda be changed to item #4.

The revised agenda was approved with no objections. [1-senate-exec-agenda-09-05-2017.pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5C1-senate-exec-agenda-09-05-2017.pdf)

Approval of the Minutes from May 22, 2017 - Approved with no objections [senate-exec-meeting-minutes-05-22-17-final.pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5Csenate-exec-meeting-minutes-05-22-17-final.pdf)

Continuing Business - S. Stratton referenced document provided to the Academic Senate Chair,

Virgil Adams, by the previous Academic Senate Chair, Cindy Wyels. [Hand-off to Virgil.pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5CHand-off%20to%20Virgil.pdf) Highlighted

portion that mentioned the policy on internships. Background - EO has not been fulfilled for 4

years now. Policy was brought to the committee, but was not passed. Determining factor was

faculty didn’t have the necessary authority e.g. risk management. When put to faculty, it was not

approved. Last year, the committee, created a brief policy, which passed in Senate. As faculty, these

are the parts pertaining to the EO that faculty has purview to manage. The President will be

discussing this with the Provost. Question raised if this will need to be discussed by Senate? Response was that it would only be necessary if the President does not accept the policy. In addition, in

principle, the other half of the policy can be built, go through President’s Policy and Planning

Council (PPPC).

S. Stratton stated there are things to keep track of regarding the Senate by-laws.

Other Business *\*change made to agenda: item moved up*

Honorary Degrees – Presentation from Genevieve Evans Taylor, Chief of Staff [Honorary Degree Process 9 1 17 (2).pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5CHonorary%20Degree%20Process%209%201%2017%20%282%29.pdf)

G. Evans-Taylor informed members of opportunity for faculty to nominate

someone for an honorary degree. Academic Chair, V. Adams, will collect nominees from

faculty by September 17 and bring them to the committee when it meets on September 18.

New Business

1. Curriculum Committee – Reference email received from Jared Barton, Chair of Curriculum Committee: [FW\_ Curriculum Submissions for AY 17-18 Email from Jared Barton.pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5CFW_%20Curriculum%20Submissions%20for%20AY%2017-18%20Email%20from%20Jared%20Barton.pdf)
	1. Highlighted policy would decrease opportunity for program change to every 5 years, and would accept program changes the year after program evaluation process.
	2. Discussion – Agreed that five years is too long a wait time. J. Perry stated this could be especially problematic for new programs and asked if the length of time be dependent on when the program was created. J Perry suggested the Committee Chair come to Senate Executive meeting to explain further. J. Barton is on sabbatical. Blake Gillespie served as Curriculum Committee co-chair last year. S. Stratton agreed to speak with Gillespie to obtain more information, being mindful of the October deadline. C. Wyels pointed out that one CC for entire university is coming up in the conversation. G. Wood asked if there were other committees with a similar policy and indicated that the Senate By-Laws describes the job of the CC, but committees dictate their own procedures. A. Jiménez Jiménez suggested maybe a restructuring of the committee because of university wide RTP there are many files it is becoming difficult to perform thorough evaluations of them all through just one committee. K. Tollefson reminded members of a CC discussion in the fall and stated that one university committee shouldn’t be examining course by course changes that programs should as experts in their various fields for making those decisions.
2. Faculty Affairs Committee - No information. Item carried over to next meeting
3. PPC – Kent Porter, interim AVP for Faculty Affairs is making sure we meet all contractual requirements of the CBA. One of the obligations not yet met is the structure of PPCs. He is meeting with various deans of programs that are unable to meet the requirements – some due to not enough tenured members in their programs.
	1. Discussion - A. Jiménez Jiménez informed members Chairs are not receiving all the necessary information. He suggested and will communicate to the Dean of Arts & Sciences to suggest that K. Porter distribute a memo providing guidance for process. He asked if Faculty Affairs Committee would then need work on the policy. S. Stratton responded it would go through URTPC. A. Jiménez Jiménez stated that the RTP policy needs to be changed. S. Stratton stated that Kent would need to direct university RTP committee to meet as soon as possible to address. C Wyels stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee implements RTP policy. S. Stratton clarified that the Faculty Affairs Committee looks at policy, not individual program standards. A. Jiménez Jiménez summarized that the Faculty Affairs Committee should look at the RTP policy, and the URTPC should look at PPSs, which need to be changed to be in be in compliance. K. Tollefson noted that resolutions put forth by S. Kelly, encouraging programs to address digital scholarship and mentoring undergraduate research in their PPS.
4. 17/18 Priorities - Senate Chair not present
	1. GE, RTP (PPS revision, PPC structure) and By-laws
	2. C. Wyels mentioned her conversation with V. Adams about direction of Senate for AY2017-18 in which she believed his intent is to ask Senate Exec what issues we would like to lead on rather than waiting to respond to issues from other sources. G. Wood asked what issues may coming up. C. Wyels gave the example of tenure-track density and asked if there are things we want to proactively investigate. The CO often asks for commentary. We assign to committees and relay their thoughts to the Provost before responding to these CO requests.
5. Proposed Resolution on Student Research and RTP [Resolution on Student Research and RTP (2).pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5CResolution%20on%20Student%20Research%20and%20RTP%20%282%29.pdf)
6. Proposed Resolution on Digital Scholarship and RTP [Resolution on Digital Scholarship and RTP (2).pdf](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5CResolution%20on%20Digital%20Scholarship%20and%20RTP%20%282%29.pdf)
	1. S. Kelly not able to attend. Provided voice recording [Voice\_170905.3gp](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjeannette.edwards%5CDropbox%20%28CSUCI%29%5CAcademic%20Senate%20AY%202017-18%5C1-senate%20exec%2009-05-2017%20Materials%5CVoice_170905.3gp)

S. Kelly’s two proposed resolutions lay out the logic for specifying credit for mentorship of undergraduate research and for digital scholarship in Program Personnel Standards (PPS). For the resolution on undergraduate research, Kelly requested that programs review their PPS and provide more consideration, and clarity regarding where student research fits (i.e. teaching? research? service? Or all three? Kelly suggested that providing that clarity will give incentive to junior faculty to get to become involved in this high impact practice.

Regarding digital scholarship, Kelly noted that faculty in some disciplines, are specifically trained in digital humanities and are expecting to come into CI and continue pursuing those options. Unless a program has specified how digital scholarship is to be treated, questions will arise. Suggest having PPS review then inform the Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee. If resolutions are passed, will need to ensure that copies are transmitted to the President, Provost, Deans, and all program Chairs.

Discussion on resolutions: C Wyels mentioned that Academic Senate has a committee charged with reviewing resolutions such as this. The committee should use their expertise to examine the resolutions and make recommendations to Senate Exec. This is a procedural concern of bypassing committees that have specific charges. K. Tollefson concurred. G. Wood asked for clarification if it would be Faculty Affairs Committee or university wide. C. Wyels clarified that Faculty Affairs Committee makes policy recommendations regarding standards for appointment to tenure, etc. A. Jiménez Jiménez noted that it would be helpful to have general language about these two topics to be included in General Program Standards, instead of each program having to come up with their own. Suggested creating a template that programs can decide whether or not to use. S. Stratton stated he would send both RTP questions (PPC structure and S. Kelly resolutions) to the Faculty Affairs Committee for their recommendations. He asked if RTP document aligns with CBA. A. Jiménez Jiménez confirmed it does not and added that each person is currently choosing their own PPC, a practice that is our of alignment with CBA

Executive Order 1100 & Executive Order 1110

 GE will be meeting today to discuss 1100 and 1110; specifically, how they impact new GE policy approved last year. G. Chase shared that n the surface, it looks like 1110 is more draconian; workload impact of 1100 is significant as well. Requires faculty to go in, examine curriculum, make sure GE is aligned as needed. Articulation Officer Janet Rizzoli has expressed that this will be hard to complete by Fall 2018. Must be done by Spring to be applied for Fall 2018 catalog and enrollment. CFA has sent a letter to the CO asking to meet and confer on both EO’s, stressing that it will seriously impact workloads and create staffing issues. J. Yudelson stated the first Academic Senate meetings to be held Sept 13-15. There have been many negative comments received about CO unilaterally deciding curricular matters when curriculum is the purview of faculty. S. Stratton suggested reaching out to GE colleagues for commentary. A. Jiménez Jiménez voiced concern about simply reading the EO’s which doesn’t give enough background. Suggested requesting a formal statement from GE to inform Senate discussion on Tuesday. G. Wood asked if someone has this impact understanding. G. Chase answered that 1100 does, but not for 1110. J. Rizzoli and Blake Buller in Articulation are already going through curriculum to identify where issues come up (hidden pre-requisites, what can we count as upper division; when can we offer upper division courses). Not sure how far into that process they are. Neither is making policy or even any recommendations. This is just to get sense of the landscape. Both are ex-officio members of CC and possibly GE too. S. Stratton will email request to faculty for input prior to Senate and will reach out to J. Rizzoli and B. Buller. J. Yudelson will make an announcement at Senate.

Chair Report – Virgil Adams not present; no report at this time

Senate Agenda Review – *for Exec consideration*

1. President Beck to address faculty - Approved without objection
2. Myriah Gonzales, M.A., CSUCI Crisis Advocate - Approved without objection
3. Senate Newsletter request to highlight Fall Student Research Showcase 2017 - Approved

without objection

1. Announcement for nominations from faculty for Honorary Degree – Approved without objection

Other Discussion: A. Jiménez Jiménez mentioned difficulties with IRA funding. Asked if it is necessary for all IRA proposals to go through President’s office for approval. There seems to be a breakdown somewhere in the process, maybe in finance or at the President’s office. G. Evans-Taylor suggested looking at the Executive Order regarding IRA proposals. Proposed the question – Does the President have to look at all and sign or can she delegate that authority? A. Jiménez Jiménez stated that there needs to be a more simplified but flexible process. S. Stratton wondered if difficulties this time were due to turnover in Academic Affairs. Inferred that there was a slowdown in Materials, Supplies, Future, Technology funds. G. Chase responded that once aware of a problem, it was addressed. He met with VP for Finance and Administration which was helpful and they worked through it. Had a discussion with the President. He does not foresee any problems in the future, but if there are any he wants to know about it. A. Jiménez Jiménez stressed that the investigation needs to go all the way to the President’s office. G. Evans-Taylor will continue to investigate.