



**ACADEMIC  
SENATE**

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

Senate Executive Committee

MINUTES

Tuesday, November 3, 2015

Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

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

**Guest:** Jason Miller

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:31pm
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Chair called for any amendments, agenda approved with no objections;
3. Approval of the Minutes from October 13, 2015 (attached)
  - a. Minutes approved with no objections;
4. Continuing Business
  - a. SR 15-02 Resolution to End State Support of IGER
    - i. Chair called for comments, no concerns from committee;
  - b. SP 15-01 Policy on Principal Investigator
    - i. Questions regarding if there is a legal reason why a lecturer cannot be a PI; J. Miller answered that sometimes the scope of the grant contract is outside of the CBA contract, but that would be the only limitation; in practice a lecturer has yet to be denied; committee noted not all lecturers have terminal degrees; J. Miller added that the provisional modifier doesn't follow this once approved, so once they're a PI they have all of the rights and privileges as a PI;
    - ii. Questions regarding who supervises the PI and who is accountable for errors; reply was the default is the senior research officer, then would roll up to the Provost's Office; discussion of a potential friendly amendment could be a Provost designee or specific language for the senior research officer;
    - iii. **ACTION: J. Miller** offered to look at that specific language to see if this can be further clarified;
5. New Business
  - a. Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research (Miller, Time Certain: 2:35)

- i. J. Miller introduced policy with comments that although this policy is a good one, now would not be a good time to implement this policy with the ensuing workload, but in order to participate in NSF funding that we will need a policy like this on the books; right now we don't have any pending NSF funding, but anything going forward would be affected by this; NSF says that students have to be trained and that there needs to be a face-to-face component; J. Miller agrees with feedback that the policy is too long at current version;
  - ii. Observation that the policy reads as putting all the burden on the PI, asking if it is advisable to put in language that indicates that the campus intends to share the responsibility with the RSP supervisor; J. Miller replied that this would reflect the practice, but at the end of the day it's the PI's responsibility to ensure that the students are fulfilling the training; suggestions to modify the last sentence to include "with support of the senior research officer";
  - iii. Committee called for exhibits, passed around by J. Miller, these are the RCR Training Certification Form and the RCR Procedure Form; suggestion that with these exhibits, it is the responsibility of the RSP officer to provide the template, further suggestion that language be added that PI will actually do it; J. Miller commented that these are procedure documents that we are recommending, but NSF is not mandating one procedure over another; question if the training has to be approved training from someone in particular – J. Miller answered no; clarification if this applies to students receiving funding – J. Miller answered yes, clarifying that if a student gets a scholarship then they don't have to get our training, i.e. if they're not getting concrete support from a grant, then they don't have to do it; suggestion for the training form was that "trainee" is a new term being introduced that may need clarification;
  - iv. Alternative language was then offered to mention RSP support to the PI, including a "sponsor appropriate" addition to this; after discussing the intended meaning behind "mentoring" versus "training," a suggestion was made to take out "mentoring" language and replace with "training";
  - v. Chair asked for thoughts on having this ready for Academic Senate next week, considering the recent changes discussed;
  - vi. Discussion on timeframes and urgency; suggestion to put in language that allows for flexibility in future scenarios, J. Miller agreed;
  - vii. **ACTION: J. Miller** will have these changes submitted by tomorrow so that it may be placed on next week's Senate agenda.
- b. Academic Master Plan 16-17 (APC)
- i. Discussion of this matter being time sensitive; observation that the projected MA of Public Administration is displayed, yet we don't have a BA in Public Administration; feedback was that this particular discipline

is in Political Science, where it is common that one doesn't necessarily need an undergraduate degree in this, as it is primarily a graduate program;

- ii. Recollection that in the past there was an asterisk that said "\*\*\*contingent upon external funding" – examples used were in Computer Engineering and MS in Nursing; discussion of previous AMP format that contained more notes and footnotes; further discussion that all of this comes back to academic planning, it's a resource issue, but we're building our undergraduate programs; recommendation that we need to revisit this and that we need to bring this to stateside;
  - iii. ACTION – this will be a Senate agenda item for next week.
- c. Policy on Conducting MPP Searches (Exec)
- i. Recollection that the list of MPP IIIs and IVs had been circulated;
  - ii. Question that if the minimum requirement is two weeks, why do we need four; reply was that the spirit is to allow for a richer, deeper pool of applicants; maybe two weeks for some urgent positions that need to be filled quicker, but four weeks would allow for a rich pool; recommendation to find the broadest way possible that MPP III's would be afforded maximum flexibility based on what the needs would be;
  - iii. Example was cited when a faculty member was asked to be on a search in the past, but the other search committee members already had someone that they wanted – the search turned into a farce as a result because the pool wasn't deep, was not a good experience; this policy is an effort to change this;
  - iv. Discussion of law and ethics in searches, also about accountability – at the end of the day it's the administrator in charge that would weigh in, so not sure why "Academic Senate" language is in there; discussion of alternate language suggestions, to replace "Academic Senate" with "Academic Senate Chair," as a portion of the accountability would go back to the chair in some respects;
  - v. Suggestion on the idea of having the same recruitment window for staff as for faculty; feedback was that this could adversely affect out of state candidates; suggestion to why not use the same timeframe, we just hire an interim in the meantime to fill the gap – risk here might be that there may not always be an interim person; clarification that this discussion about existing positions, but that this policy would affect new positions; recollection that in this example used that we still had the time to fill the position; noted that all of our discussion examples are coming from Academic Affairs and not from other divisions;
  - vi. Consideration that this will have to go to PPPC because of the scope of the policy, as Senate itself cannot impose on its current jurisdiction due to the scope outside of faculty and academic affairs; observation that we may

receive questions from Cabinet on how this affects their responsibilities; recommendation for more conversations with Cabinet; reminder that we can still pass a policy that the President doesn't end up signing;

- vii. **ACTION: J. Meriwether** will discuss with cabinet members and bring revisions of this to hear more at our next Senate Exec meeting.
- d. Policy on Minors (Curriculum)
  - i. Introduction to policy highlighted that portions of a policy cannot be superseded, so the Curriculum Committee came back with this policy; recalled that we thought that it omitted some language (see Q&A), which was addressed;
  - ii. Previous discussion recalled that historically it was common to require a minor along with a major, a simple Google search will find hundreds of examples; appears that Curriculum Committee doesn't think that we should be able to require a minor; reply was that this specific question was posed to them, but that senators retain the right to voice opinions based on other research and to voice recommendations; committee cited other examples from other undergraduate universities requiring a minor; recollection of a previous example here at CI where we need more distinction between Art and Art Management;
  - iii. Question in accountability section and if program chairs should be added to this; reply that maybe both program chairs and program advisors are added; further observation that there are minors that won't have a correlated program chair; also, shouldn't double-counting be addressed; reply was that Curriculum Committee is currently working on a double-counting policy; suggestion then made that unless this is a policy package coming forward, that we may be missing some characteristics, i.e. that this policy might be able to include language regarding a certain number of non-double counted units if necessary;
  - iv. Senate Exec agreed to hold this until it can be a companion package with the double-counting policy;
- e. Minimum Characteristics of Majors and Minors (Curriculum)
  - i. On hold due to previous discussion above, please see Sec. 5(d)(iv.)
- f. Perpetual Calendar (Exec)
  - i. Recollection of the task force at the beginning of last year, tasked with major planning efforts; in addition to the calendar put together by H. Dang, this calendar also takes into account spring leap years as well; what you see here recommends through 2030; contains language on the guiding principles, adapted from CSU Humboldt; this has not been written out in the policy template language yet, right now putting it forth to Senate Exec for feedback;
  - ii. Discussion if this needs to be a Senate policy or can it be a process document; answer was that the calendar piece itself needs to be a policy,

but the rest can be a process, Senate does need to pass an academic calendar as its policy; suggestion that because this seems to be a university-wide policy, further comments that it will be a big shift in how we do things because it does propose a Fall break; noted that our first day when we can start is given to us by the state, then we're also limited by how many days we can go without pay; observation that we're basically taking winter break days and putting them into fall break, so faculty may be grading up until Dec. 23<sup>rd</sup>;

- iii. Committee agreed to not take this to Academic Senate next week, but instead will continue discussions at next Senate Exec.
- g. Director of Center for Multicultural Engagement (CME)
  - i. Review of CME revising their charter in April, part of their process is to forward their nominee to the Academic Senate, which we are to then give a yea or nay to, but let's first ask what our role is on what we're deciding; first suggestion was to put them on the ballot when we do our committee voting, but that doesn't blend with their timeline and desire to have someone start in January; recommendation to have some consistency between each of the centers on how this process works; clarification that this is the first attempt at a policy for other centers to mimic and/or adopt;
  - ii. Observation is that this may not be Senate's role, but rather the Assistant Provost's role; the CME is asking for approval on who this is, and if the Senate doesn't approve, then they have to start over; further questions on whether this a meaningful action that Senate should undertake; appears that they modified this last April and that this is what they're operating under;
  - iii. Call for comments if this can be placed on the Senate agenda as a first reading item; observed that this was submitted to the Committee on Centers and Institutes, but do we know if they reviewed it and/or if attempts were made to submit it to Senate; clause was located to communicate with Academic Senate within their by-laws;
  - iv. **ACTION: J. Grier** will contact them to follow up with this.
- h. Request to Report (10+): Technology Strategic Plan (Berman)
  - i. M. Berman asked to give this report, put in this request months ago, specifically asked for Nov. 10<sup>th</sup> (back in September); committee asked if he could still give us the highlights within five minutes and if we can be sent the presentation ahead of time;
- i. Request to Report: Steven Filling ASCSU
  - i. Committee will welcome S. Filling, he's mainly here to solicit feedback from people on any issues, so should be able to keep to a short timeframe;
- j. CI Capital Campaign—communicating to faculty
  - i. Campaign is currently in the silent phase, organizers are wanting to know the best way of communicating this to faculty; consideration to have N.

Ipach attend next Senate Exec meeting; question on how long are we in a silent phase and is it for the entire campaign; answer was most likely the entire campaign; a video of the campaign was created for donors and could be shown; examples cited of positive experiences with information sharing meeting with Advancement, office is a bit insulated, so having more opportunities for this information sharing is a good thing; observation that it's the recognition of these moments that get the donors to offer their support; agreement that this is a good opportunity to express our vision, often it can be faculty that are the potential donors; comments that CI has business faculty and communication faculty with the expertise to help, maybe they could've been involved earlier in the process; reply to comments were to be careful about any such assumptions, as there has been faculty involvement from these programs;

- ii. **ACTION – J. Grier / Senate Exec** will invite her to come to the next Senate Exec meeting;

#### 6. Chair Report

- a. J. Grier recalled foundation project proposals submitted, we have 21 proposals; last year we had a sub-set of Senate Exec and co-chairs of the Fiscal Policy Committee; agreement that it worked well last year, although observation that two-thirds of the money going to someone whose name was not on the proposal was problematic;
- b. J. Grier recalled the need to nominate two people from Senate Exec, J. Yudelson and J. Jenkins offered to help;

#### 7. Other Business

- a. **Reminder** that we want to look at the Senate Structure Task Force next week;
- b. Recollection of K. Tollefson's questions about disturbed students, but what about an electronic document that could be on someone's desktops; possible idea to discuss at next meeting;
- c. Meeting adjourned at 4:35pm.