



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**
C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

**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;



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L I S L A N D S

- 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