Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, October 13, 2015
Provost’s Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Jacob Jenkins, Simone Aloisio, Stephen Clark, Cindy Wyels, Colleen Delaney, Greg Wood, Jeanne Grier, Jim Meriwether, Gayle Hutchinson, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Travis Hunt

Guest(s): Noah Zerbe

Staff: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:32pm

2. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Agenda approved with no objections

3. Approval of the Minutes from September 22, 2015 (attached)
   a. Minutes approved with no objections

4. Continuing Business
   a. Senate Exec recognized N. Zerbe as a guest today, who is currently conducting focus groups on academic affairs restructuring; N. Zerbe added that it has been interesting to hear feedback on some of the different challenges we face, noting his report forthcoming in a few days.

5. New Business
   a. Resolution: Presidential Search (Exec)
      i. S. Aloisio went through and edited it to design it more specifically to CI; e.g. we took the word “public” out in favor of more campus-specific language; referred to a spreadsheet to reflect 12 other campuses that have approved similar resolutions;
      ii. Discussion of whether it strengthens the resolution to have the quoted comments contained in the Rationale section;
      iii. Discussion of the third Resolved section and who becomes the audience for this clause, currently not in agreement with current policy;
      iv. Clarification that the Chancellor appoints the community member on the committee;
      v. ACTIONS: S. Aloisio and J. Meriwether will work together on a final version to come back to Senate Exec; D. Daniels will submit this committee-edited version to them via email.
b. Policy on MPP Search Procedures (Exec)
   i. New policy introduced as one that lays out guidelines on actually conducting the searches, rather than previous policy that outlined the construction of the search committee;
   ii. Discussion that this does not necessarily have an urgent timeline, and that the suggested first priority would be to define to whom this applies;
   iii. Clarification on what the Level III and Level IV designations are;
   iv. Suggestion that this could be a companion piece to the previous policy; noted that right now an open call for faculty members on searches does not happen, so this policy would ensure that this practice would be consistent;
   v. Suggestion that due to a lot of announcements coming via email, that this open call could be included in the Senate newsletter, or also a website, possibly an advertisement in CI View;
   vi. Question about when faculty are off-contract, with suggestion to add language on this to cover our bases;
   vii. Question about the “at least four weeks” section, with answer that legally it has to be a two-week window, but with four weeks you have an opportunity for as rich a pool as possible;
   viii. Observation that the way it’s written there would need to be a forum for each candidate, so if there are four candidates there would be four open forums;
   ix. Suggestion to clarify language that anyone deemed by Provost or Academic Senate Chair, you may chose the language of “as appropriate” or “as deemed appropriate”;
   x. Discussion of how “interaction with faculty” defined;
   xi. Suggestion to change the title to be more specific, i.e. “policy on conducting MPP searches”
   xii. ACTION: Get clarification on the types of responsibilities associated with Level III’s – G. Hutchinson will work with J. Meriwether on this.

c. Policy on Principal Investigator [update of SP08-05 (RSP)]
   i. This policy has to be reviewed by senate, as some changes represented updates but some were major additions – notable change was that lecturers were taken out of the principal investigator role, but that they could be appointed to provisional principal investigator status; most other items are edits to bring it up to our current practices;
   ii. Question about who manages the simple edits that we don’t need to spend time on, answer in this case was Tina Knight and Jason Miller;
   iii. Question about compliance issues, would be nice to know what these compliance issues were; clarification that there is an RSP advisory committee and that this has been reviewed there;
iv. ACTION: that this will be the first policy for Senate review next week as a first reading item;

v. ACTION: G. Wood offered to open up a conversation with T. Knight / J. Miller on compliance issues relating to this.

d. Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research (RSP)
   i. This policy has been to the PPPC, so it may be an item that we can consent to policy;
   ii. Observations that we may not want this to go forward, as it puts the entire responsibility on the PI; further, the RSP office should provide the support / training as opposed to it being solely up to the PI;
   iii. Further observation that it may also need to be incorporated into the CFA as a meet and confer, i.e. just because a faculty member signs up to be a PI they may not be prepared for the workload, so due to it being a workload issue it may be a meet and confer; in other words, we can’t just unilaterally assign duties to faculty members that are outside of the CFA;
   iv. Question if this is being applied retroactively;
   v. ACTION: suggestion to invite key RSP members to next Senate Exec meeting so that they help can answer questions, and let’s also invite Nancy Deans.

e. Policy on Minors (Curriculum)
   i. Recollection that last year we asked Curriculum Committee to come up with a policy on minors for us, now we have it; minimum 15 units max 24 units; they are currently working on a double-counting policy, due to issues where minors are double-counting;
   ii. Question about the rationale behind the last clause, citing a program that required a minor to help boost professional readiness, but with this clause would then be prohibited from doing so;
   iii. Discussion that students should not be forced into minors, although could be encouraged to do so; desire expressed for a more concrete definition in terms of what constitutes a minor;
   iv. Observation that this policy also doesn’t comment on the ability of whether or not you can minor in your same major program; reference to Policy on Minors: to declare a minor students must declare a major (SP 04-29);
   v. Observation that current SP 01-02 lists upper division limits units to 9, and this policy reduces the limit to 6; further observation that it seems like they’re wanting to supersede one section of a policy, but not sure if this is the best approach;
   vi. Discussion of catalog rights issues and student options to re-declare majors;
   vii. Comment that definition in this policy for minors could be better differentiated from certificates;
viii. **ACTION:** J. Grier will speak with Curriculum Committee about making some revisions before it comes to full Senate and invite chairs to next exec

f. Senate Restructure Draft (Exec)
   
i. Senate Task Force II met and is presenting restructure draft to Senate Exec in going forward with Model B, which was the representative senate model;
   
ii. Discussion of ex-officio status, the voting senators not conforming to school affiliation, and if there are adequate numbers of at-large members due to various positions on campus that don’t deal with academics;
   
iii. Question about the implications of this model on our current mix of lecturer and tenure track faculty, i.e. if they all have the same voice could contribute to an imbalance; answer commented about voice and being involved, using the example of the most recent survey we had, which only had a total of nine lecturers vote, so the ratio of participation wouldn’t necessarily hold up;
   
iv. Noted that by the majority of faculty the representatives would be elected;
   
v. Discussion of faculty contracts weighed against their volunteer duties as elected members;
   
vi. Discussion of non-voting Senators; e.g. at CI the Provost is not a senator, even though she is invited; note as senators have a platform to speak as non-voting members; opinion that it’s important for cabinet to be at senate, and by making them senators it encourages them to attend, there would be an expectation of attendance;
   
vii. N. Zerbe recalled senate structure at Humboldt of 2/3 faculty, 1/3 students and staff, vice presidents vote; previously had a senate of the whole, then a representative senate, and now a university senate; HSU had a WASC report that was critical of shared government, so we modeled ours after San Diego State;
   
viii. Discussion that being a senator is more than going to a meeting, it means being on one of the four standing committees;
   
ix. Discussion about the Academic Affairs column, looking like a lot of heavy lifting and not sure about possible lengthy time commitments; envisioned that down the line each school could have its own Academic Affairs committee;
   
   x. **ACTION:** Ask Taskforce II for revisions, alternatives, and context to bring back to exec. Then hold brown bag meetings to further discuss this before coming back to Senate

   g. Update Academic Calendar & AMP (Exec)
   
i. Discussion re: BA in global studies, it needs to get into the catalog by this Thursday in order for it to be offered in the Fall, question about if this is ready to go; suggestion to check with D. Wakelee on this to be sure, also to ask the program to make sure that they’re aware of the deadline;
ii. **ACTION:** J. Grier will invite the AMP group to next Senate Exec meeting to get the most out of this discussion.

h. Psych MA discussion
   i. This item is going to Curriculum Committee;
   ii. Observation that if there is a substantive change then it would come back to us, but if not then we won’t see it again;
   iii. However, we should formalize a policy on this process and what constitutes substantive change

i. Request to Present: 30 minutes: water conservation and deferred maintenance
   i. Recollection that both of these presentations were made at cabinet and were moving;
   ii. Discussion of the suggested length of their presentation;
   iii. **ACTION:** Exec agreed to offer presenters 15 minutes at community time or 10 minutes at senate;

6. Chair Report
   a. CSU Policy on Background Checks for University Volunteers
      i. Tabled due to time constraints
   b. Request for Steven Filling to talk at Senate on 11.10.15
      i. Jeanne will email exec about this

7. Other Business
   a. None – meeting adjourned at 4:35pm