



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

Senate Executive Committee  
MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, February 2, 2016  
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185  
2:30pm

Attendees: Gayle Hutchinson; Cindy Wyels; Jeanne Grier; Travis Hunt; Simone Aloisio; Genevieve Evans Taylor; Stephen Clark; Greg Wood; Jim Meriwether; Colleen Delaney; John Yudelson  
Guest: Dan Wakelee

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:31pm
  - a. J. Grier asked for any modifications, a quick update on the possible strike was added, along with an update on the Presidential search; further, part of the Chair Report will be an Academic Master Plan (AMP) update'
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - a. Agenda was approved with the updates above.
3. Approval of the Minutes from November 24, 2015 (attached)
  - a. Meeting minutes from 11/24/15 were approved with no objections.
4. Continuing Business
  - a. SP 15-04 Policy on Golden Four General Education Courses (GE)
    - i. Brief opening remarks and a recap of minor changes, including removing the clause about registration;
    - ii. ACTION: SP 15-04 will move forward to the Academic Senate as a second reading item.
5. New Business/Discussion Items
  - a. Replacement for Antonio Jiménez Jiménez
    - i. Recollection that A. Jiménez felt really bad about scheduling error; he is an At-Large member, Exec recalled having a precedent for single semester replacement, members advocating for this; noted that it's more transparent if we have an election;
    - ii. ACTION: J. Grier will talk to Committee on Committees about holding a special election for this replacement
  - b. Policy on Conducting MPP Searches
    - i. J. Meriwether introduced policy, noting that he met with everyone on Cabinet individually; what is displayed is some of the responses from people generally being in support; questions were addressed such as would

we conduct searches in the Summer; for example, originating program usually takes part in position description; other feedback from A. Pavin was that in some ways you don't want the search committee members being public; we had also talked about combining this with previous MPP search document, but language was added to avoid this extra step (notes were added in the background section);

- ii. Question if this will also need to go to the President's Planning and Policy Council (PPPC) – answered Yes; feedback that it's good that you've met with all Division heads, but PPPC also has a first and second reading structure, question if the timing will work out Ok – answer was yes that the timing on this will work out; further question that if there's a really good point raised at PPPC, will it be reflected in Senate – answered Yes, it's an open meeting, and there is some cross-over of committee members between these entities, so that would be covered; comment that there have been a couple similar policies floating around, and these could be passed along so that after first reading we can take a look at these;
  - iii. ACTION: this will move forward as a first reading item at Academic Senate; S. Aloisio offered to locate the similar policies and pass them along.
- c. Faculty Volunteer Recommendation (AVP Enrollment Management)
- i. A call was placed last week to replace H. Dang, received a few nominations; Exec agreed how imperative it is to find someone this Spring; committee agreement with Senate Officers conversing further about the nominations;
- d. Senate Restructure
- i. Major question is if there is anything to add to this before it moves to Academic Senate, or is it ready to go; wanted to know if we can present a two-model option to Senate; plan is to have a draft of the preferred model by the March 2016 Senate meeting; noted that this will have huge implications on elections; observed that we'll also have to amend the constitution, because committee membership is not present in the by-laws, but rather in the constitution; clarification was asked if the President was specifically requested, or just someone from the President's Office; could also be phrased as "President or designee"; further recommended that it would be good to be more specific, such as listing the Vice President; observed that it's on the sub-committees that the enrollment manager's impact will really be felt;
  - ii. Question on what else changed aside from color highlights – answered minor changes for clarity, but also a change on the last bullet point that gives options for seeking faculty appointments; noted that there was not a clear consensus at the last discussion from Exec; recommendation that when you get down to the section that has recommendations regarding the

structure, to then add more language on ex-officio members; for example, you'll want the AVP there to offer the broad strokes; agreement that the guiding principles are good; suggestion that we could proceed with asterisks or some method of highlighting where we really need those ex-officio members; noted that whomever their respective staff representative is will usually come along with the committee group;

- iii. Question if there were other specifics in terms of what staff position would fall under what committee assignment – recollection that this has yet to be discussed; recollection that two brown bags were held that nobody came to; suggestion to use community time before Senate – Exec committee agreed; question if this could be included as Senate business; observation that the issue is that you want the communication out there, but you'll want the feedback too, which will take it longer than five minutes; Committees on Committees is anxious to get this moving along because they don't want to be holding a bunch of elections at the end of the semester;

- iv. ACTION: please send any comments to J. Grier and S. Aloisio.

e. Academic Calendar

- i. Questions on how to read the perpetual calendar; recollection that the committee was tasked to come up with some options, one of which is to use a perpetual calendar so that we don't have to keep revisiting this topic every two years; if you scroll down then there's a few options by years, as the dates repeat every seven years; we're limited by HR and E.O. on how long people can go without being paid (45 days);
- ii. Suggestion that we could ask these questions in survey form, i.e. "if we had a fall break, where should it be / how should it be scheduled around Thanksgiving holiday"; observation that a good selling point of this version is that then the one "hanging day" of finals week day won't happen anymore; more clarifying questions asked between staff calendar and academic calendar for faculty;
- iii. Question on who is the survey going out to; agreement that this is the next question, plus to have this version cleaned up before being circulated; suggestion that it would go out to Academic Affairs because it does affect staff; it could also go to Student Affairs as well; agreement on this and a further note that it would include Disability Services;
- iv. Observation that it may be confusing to include all seven versions, we could limit it to one for the survey; noted that the issue is that we can't start earlier than we already do; further observation that you would need to give them all seven versions, because you could sway the results if only one week was featured as a sample; comment that many students are all in favor of a full week off, even it means pushing the dates for the finals around; suggestion to let's also add Student Business Services to that list

with Academic Affairs and Student Affairs; suggestion that it may be more accurate to call it Thanksgiving Break rather than Fall Break, as many may think a Fall break is in the middle of the fall semester (more like October); noted that it still has the effect of having grades due on midnight of Christmas Eve; noted that students who wanted the full week off tended to be commuting to CI from outside of the county; noted that the only non-floating holidays are Veteran's Day and Cesar Chavez Day; suggestion to keep in mind that a lot of our classes only meet one day a week, which may reduce the total class sessions in the semester; comments that we may also need to talk about a balanced number of teaching days between semesters, and this would be an opportunity to do this; comments that there were things to like about having two weeks of instruction after the break instead of one; further observed that the "G" model only has one week, but the rest will have two weeks; comments that the students aren't showing up for Thanksgiving week anyway; suggestions to why not send out this version to solicit feedback on this, rather than making minor tweaks to it all day long;

- v. ACTION: J. Grier will make the suggested changes and to please contact her if anyone wants to review it before it goes out;
- f. Upcoming Policies/Needed Revisions
  - i. Internship Policy
    - 1. A meeting was held over the break with A. Carpenter regarding the need for an internship policy; recollection that Exec sent the policy back a few years ago, due to the main concerns of the faculty risk management for on-site sign-off's, and faculty workload was other concern; K. Hullinger in Risk Management has been asked to come in to assure us that faculty are not at risk and are covered under the university's protections; further notice to be aware that this has gone to SAPP and is coming our way;
  - ii. Curriculum Committee Upcoming Policies
    - 1. Curriculum Committee has sent us several policies, some coming as a package; they are not ready because they're also working with SAPP on the double-counting policy; recalled that Exec decided to not move forward with an individual policy that is not part of a bigger package to include them all; reminded that in addition to the double-counting policy, the package also includes minimum requirements for majors & minors and Policy on Minors;
    - 2. Comments and concerns expressed if SAPP will be modifying the policy, wanting to move away from "anything goes" trend; observed that they have fixed this, but that's why we're waiting for the entire package to come;

3. Question if there is a sense that we will have an updated list of majors or minors that will be in violation of the current policy – answer that we don’t know that yet, and won’t until they submit their package;
  - iii. Chair Evaluation (SP 09-02)
    - i. Opening question recalling that we have these policies on the books, but who is in charge of ensuring that these policies are actually followed – answered that the Dean retains responsibility; commented example that an Exec member was up for chair evaluation, and received an email from the Dean providing info;
    - ii. Observation that our by-laws say evaluation must take place in our second year, but the policy says in the last year; other examples cited where chairs did not receive an evaluation; there’s also a reference to an “Evaluation of Chair Form,” but it couldn’t be found; question that if there is a Senate Policy in place but the implementation occurs locally, how does that work – answer that it’s the Dean’s responsibility to coordinate this; question if we can send this to Faculty Affairs to see if there’s some form in existence or other feedback; experience noted that these evaluations occur within the program, but a conversation with Assistant Provost and Faculty Affairs would be helpful; further suggestion that the respective Dean needs a friendly reminder to initiate this at the program / local level; recommendation that since someone is keeping track of the chairs terms, that this group should also keep track of chair evaluations;
    - iii. Question if anyone can be on the evaluation committee under the CBA – answer that they must be tenure-track faculty and at least three members; noted that there are some programs at CI that aren’t big enough to have adequate committee membership;
    - iv. ACTION: J. Grier will pass this along to Faculty Affairs
- 
6. Chair Report
    - a. It was recently learned that the Chancellor’s Office (CO) did not fully accept the AMP from CI; we had to make some changes to resubmit, the AMP has now been accepted; brief updates are that we spent all that time changing the Mechatronics name, and we can’t do that; we are not pursuing Digital Media Arts, the approval for MS in Biology expires soon, so they will need to resubmit to the AMP when it

is redone; found out that CI can't change the dates, and that the CO changes the date – so we either have to implement it, or take it off;

- b. Question regarding the implementation window, do these programs know when this window closes – answer that if it's still on the AMP, then that starts the clock; Provost's Office will work diligently to get these communications out;
- c. Question if this is then a consent item at Senate or is it part of the Chair Report; comment that we approved it in Senate, CO made changes to the document and sent it back to us, and so now we can't change it;
- d. D. Wakelee enters as guest of Exec, was asked procedural question, right now we need to figure out how to present this new AMP as accepted by the CO; D. Wakelee provided background on how we got here, in that there were format and content issues that the CO refused to accept, not huge, but there were some things relating to suggested programs that have since timed out; the sense is that they were not substantive changes, but items that had to be addressed before the Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting;
- e. Question if it can be changed at all – answer was No; suggestion to provide this info in the chair report, Associate Provost gives a report on it, then it could be a consent item in the following Senate; further comment that we won't necessarily need to get a long form back from the programs who want to resubmit; we had two that said were done, and these were kinesiology and nutrition; other feedback was that if you go five years beyond the date that's on the AMP, then you're done; agreement that it would be useful to have Chris Mallon come back, it was enlightening on what is expected from us in terms of an AMP; noted that if it's a consent item, you actually can't talk about it under Robert's Rules; observation that all the Trustees want is a brief description of what we want and when, so they don't want to see the long form; so this is the shorter short-form; the clock starts when you put it on the list;
- f. Question to clarify if this is Mechatronics then you need to call it Mechatronics and not Computer Engineering; recollection that what originally went down was "Computer Engineering (Mechatronics)"; observation that if the CO is saying that this is not just a name change and this is a separate program, and if so, then there may be disagreement that the Senate has agreed to this change; answer that there may be a misunderstanding about naming – naming at the CO has a different connotation than it does here; recollection that there was money set aside at the state budget to start a Mechatronics program, and so it was the intent of Senate to approve such a program;
- g. Resolution that the first order will be making sure that the approval process is more clear, and recollection that no one was trying to be dishonest in the process that led to the Senate's approval; comment that a half-hour info session before the Senate meeting effectively communicates enough transparency; comment that we shouldn't see programs being pushed at CI just because there's financial backing,



it should be because they are consistent with the CI mission (not saying that this was the case with Mechatronics);

- h. The question is what does this group need to decide moving forward; thoughts were that the next consent item is to ask what version of the AMP should we be displaying on the website; observation that folks may be more enthused about seeing another long form with the name change, then they may be more apt to attend a brown bag, rather than just a simple name change; further conversations are underway at Curriculum Committee right now on how to fix this process, then we'll be better equipped to fill out the steps between the beginning and end;
  - i. Question if a brown bag is a formal or informal step in the operation – answer that it is currently an informal step; recollection that in the past it was much more common that long-forms were going to the chairs, and also that the Curriculum Committee used to send an email to the chairs, i.e. “this is the new program, please provide feedback”
- 7. Other Business
  - a. An update on the potential strike: we are at impasse, we are waiting for the Fact Finding Report, coming out sometime later this month; after report there's a 10-day blackout period; after the blackout period if the two parties don't agree, then the CSU can make an offer or withhold work hours (strike); how the strike is implemented no one knows yet, could be rolling, etc.; will it affect students if it comes to that, yes, and could be short notice as well; if the strike is long-term, at what point do we say “we don't have a semester anymore”; or a grade strike, where grades are withheld; agreement that no one wants the strike; comment that if it goes down that long road, then students may be asking for refunds; agreement that there would be many serious ramifications that are unknown at this point;
  - b. Update on Presidential search timelines: the big committee meets on Thursday, and from that meeting we determine the in-person interviews in the coming weeks; noted that last week Sonoma announced their new President; that committee makes their announcement to the BoT; Feb 22<sup>nd</sup> are face-to-face interviews, announcement should be on March 9<sup>th</sup> for CI and Chico; further noted that the BoT could also go “off-list,” they don't need to necessarily heed the recommendations from campus; J. Grier noted that she is going to Senate Chairs meeting next week, will be able to report on their general feelings about the process.
- 8. Meeting Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 4:39pm