



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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, February 23, 2016
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: Jeanne Grier, Michelle Dean, Jim Meriwether, Sean Kelly, Simone Aloisio, Travis Hunt, Greg Wood, Stephen Clark, Genevieve Evans Taylor, Cindy Wyels, Gayle Hutchinson, Colleen Delaney, John Yudelson.

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:31pm
 - a. J. Grier asked for any amendments to the agenda; welcomed new members Sean Kelly (one-semester replacement for Antonio Jiménez Jiménez) and Michelle Dean (one-semester replacement for Jacob Jenkins); general reminder that Exec takes a look at policies to see if they're ready to move to Academic Senate; trying not to debate the merits of said policy, but are looking for inconsistencies and potential structural improvements.
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda was approved with no objections.
3. Approval of the Minutes from February 2, 2016 (attached)
 - a. Meeting minutes from 2/2/16 were approved with no objections.
4. Continuing Business
 - a. Policy on Conducting MPP Searches
 - i. Summarized that changes were that we included definition of MPP, asked Exec for any other comments;
 - ii. J. Meriwether confirmed that it went before PPPC, as he was able to attend the meeting yesterday; comments were that maybe a more specific title could be used; should be changed to something that mentions the word "faculty" since there are HR processes involved;
 - iii. ACTION: this will move forward to Senate as a second reading item as SP 15-05;
 - iv. General questions about process followed; discussion that there are two administrative policy making bodies on campus, Senate and PPPC (University level), which sometimes can be problematic; noted that there were a few comments from PPPC on this policy, albeit minor, asked if we should attempt to reconcile these here before it moves to Academic Senate; suggested action was that if things were to change on the Senate

floor, then that is the document that will go to PPPC as a second reading item; support from PPPC was further noted.

5. New Business

a. Constitution Revision (SP 07-17)

- i. This is being presented as a result of attempting to revise the constitution in case of a possible representative senate model; task force focused on the membership section in order to try to make it more flexible; timeline is in place to reflect our desire to have elections in time to implement this next academic year; noted that this has to be passed by 2/3 vote;
- ii. Suggestion to please clarify what is meant by the “this group” language – answered tenured and tenure-track faculty; further discussion of suggested language in Sec. 1.10.(a) and (b), ending with suggested edits for clarification;
- iii. Discussion that changing this constitution doesn’t necessarily lead to one model or the other, it just provides the necessary language to move to a representative model if that is the desired choice;
- iv. Suggestion to put in language of “faculty unit employees,” since this would include coaches, etc.;
- v. Considerations on Sec. 2.2, where each campus gets two statewide senators, but do we need both to represent Senate Exec – committee agreed to consider this issue and to keep it in mind;
- vi. Discussion on how senate officers would be elected under representative model, if the constitution changes, we will elect our officers a little different, but at the moment, it doesn’t specify how they will be elected; suggestion to end Sec. 2.2 after the first sentence; reply that we’re ok with this in both places, as this constitution states the minimums, if we reduce down to the first sentence then we may be missing some constituencies; noted that we’re not trying to fix the constitution of all of its problems, we’re trying to make it more flexible to allow for a representative model;
- vii. Observation that by-laws can’t trump the constitution, consider specific language on whether ex-officio members have a vote; recap of suggestion to specify “non-voting” within the constitution for President and Provost – answer was Yes; further noted that the President, Provost and statewide reps have not been elected to this body, so they should not vote; consensus that “non-voting” should be added in the constitution next to “ex-officio” to specifically state that President, Provost and statewide representatives do not have a vote;

b. Information/Discussion Item: Restructure Draft

- i. Original gives us 49 voting members; Option B has a representative for every five people – this model also provides a model that when you grow, you get to add a representative; comment that proposers want to include a

model that reflects the people who are participating now; Option C is a hybrid that puts a +3 in each category;

- ii. Question on why do we need at-large tenure-track positions, could this be too large and too similar to what we have; answer was that people are generally resistant to change, say if we went to only 13 reps like Humboldt, then that might cause a reaction due to a drastic change; further noted that this allows for ample faculty service opportunities; we've also heard considerable worry i.e. "what if I can't get on," so this is a transitional time; the biggest concern is that this is going to "concentrate power" into a "small group of people";
- iii. Option D may help to answer feedback re: a program-based representation, but this model is a messy one, using the example of Education having 11 named programs, so do you go by the number of program chairs, which could add complexity as well;
- iv. Suggestion that what we may want to do is to eliminate one or more of these models today, to simplify it for Academic Senate by maybe giving them two options instead of four;
- v. Question on when the brown bags are – answer that brown bag is on Monday, Feb. 29th at 11:00am; also at Community Time before Senate;
- vi. Suggestion that the column that reads 'elected' should read "constituencies"; question then who elects them – answer that their constituents do; further noted that then we would have to write this in; language suggested to see it explicitly written in that they "keep the best interests of the university in mind in addition to their constituencies";
- vii. Observation that in Model B shouldn't it be 44 total voting senators – committee agreed; further discussion of other model variants or "Model E";
- viii. Comments that some members of Exec like the smaller model, because the expectation is that everyone needs to show up and be well-read; a group of 60 people in the room could be unwieldy, even if they are all well-read and prepared to discuss; noted that quorum figures have yet to be discussed;
- ix. Observation that the Exec membership expands according to this document; discussion of the new size, and also that it may be problematic to reduce statewide senators to one; recalled that we've never had a lecturer designee, but this could also be the chair, vice chair, or any number of existing members; suggestion that committee chairs should be tenured, not just tenure-track, as we shouldn't be saddling junior faculty members with this responsibility; observation that changing the number of Exec from 13 to 15 members will not make a huge difference;
- x. ACTION: reminder message to attend brown bags for further discussion.

6. Chair Report

- a. J. Grier noted that two mission centers are looking for directors, CME & CIA; last year Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) wrote a policy on how to appoint center directors, but then the policy wasn't followed, so it was sent back; now a wide call for nominations will be coming; there are qualifying elements that will go into the call; there will also be a shortened election period as well;
- b. Question if the directors of the centers are elected by faculty – answered Yes; follow-up question if there is a term limit defined; answer came from reading excerpts from SP 14-16, which indicates it's a three-year renewable term, but no term limits set at this point; comment that it would be good to get some of that in writing – answer was that a plan is in place to put an Executive Summary in the body of the email text that reflects the policy, and also that the full policy is attached;
- c. Recalled that an email was sent to Exec re: the history of the curriculum committee's work on Policy on Minors and Double-counting policies; observation that Curriculum Committee didn't set any limits on double-counting, and SAPP used a 50% of total unit benchmark, which some exec board members said would not allow for double majoring;
- d. Question if right now we can have people take the same set of classes and get two majors – answer was yes, if the program chairs agree; comment that it may give arbitrary double major rights; observation that an example may be where the popular thought is that Math and CompSci are very similar, but after further analysis they really aren't;
- e. Summarized that the other response is that it sounds like a curricular issue, not a policy issue, i.e. it wasn't designed properly on the front end to allow students to do this;
- f. Question if that means that up to 50% of my courses can be applied as credit to other programs – answer was yes under the definition of "other program areas," which is broadly defined; comment that the question may be how much we want to water down a double major; observation that high unit majors wouldn't necessarily be watered down, as some are 95 unit majors, so if 50% of these count to other programs, they're still completing a 40+ unit major;
- g. Last sentence of the Curriculum Committee policy was highlighted that basically says that nothing can be written to preclude double counting; suggestion that we may not want to decide which of these policies goes forward in this committee, we still have time to send this back to Curriculum;
- h. Question if the minimum characteristics and policy on minors still needs to be held back based on the outcome of the double-counting policy – answer was that it seems like you need to define what a minor is before you address double-counting, so we may not need to hold the policy on minors and minimum requirements for majors and minors;

- i. J. Grier asked if there are any objections to forwarding these two policies on our next agenda – none voiced;
 - j. ACTION: We'll put forward these two policies (Policy on Minors and Minimum Requirements for Majors & Minors) to Senate as first reading items;
- 7. Other Business
 - a. Summarized that presidential search committee wrapped up our part yesterday, and that we're going to get a good new president; three candidates were put forward to the BoT, pleased with this outcome because we were able to influence in a number of ways, but faculty voice was very well represented; noted that most likely the new president will want to have a meeting with campus in an open forum format;
- 8. Meeting adjourned at 4:27pm