Senate Executive Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 15, 2016

Provost’s Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

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

Guests: Beth Hartung, Dan Wakelee

1. Meeting Called to Order at 2:31pm
2. Approval of the Agenda
   1. Agenda is approved with an amendment referencing the previous Academic Senate discussion of the proposed amendment to the constitution;
3. Approval of the Minutes from February 23, 2016 (attached)
   1. Meeting minutes from 2/23/16 were approved;
4. Continuing Business
   1. Discussion: SP15-05 Conducting MPP Searches
      1. There was a request to change the name to MPP Level III and Level IV to make this edit, due to simultaneous PPPC review; rationale is that this would allow for a future policy on MPP Level I & II at a later date; committee agreed with no objections on name change;
   2. SP 15-06 Policy on Minors (Curriculum)
      1. Suggestion of a name change to “Academic Minors” to avoid any confusion (i.e. between individuals under 18 years old); committee agreed with no objections on name change;
   3. SP 15-07 Minimum Characteristics of Majors and Minors (Curriculum)
      1. Further noted that SP 15-07 and SP 15-06 above are items that we can move and entertain edits or changes on the floor;
      2. ACTION: SP 15-06 and SP 15-07 will move to Senate as second reading items;
5. New Business
   1. Affordable Learning Initiative Discussion: Dr. Jill Leafstedt (time Certain 3pm)
      1. J. Leafstedt stated there is money coming from the state, up to $50K to provide more access to affordable learning; J. Leafstedt’s team is working together with the Broome Library, but her team is heading the initiative; they are asking for a Senate Resolution to support the grant terms on this; recalled amazing feedback received on what the concerns were and needs are; summarized that her presentation is to come forward to Exec to see if the Senate would be willing to pass a resolution to make textbooks more affordable; her team will be writing the grants; brought an example of some of the affordable resources that are out there, such as a compilation of open textbooks on a USB-compatible flash drive (displayed physical example for Exec), observing that this vendor has higher quality and better peer review process than some of our publishing houses; also displayed a draft submitted to Exec that is based on a model from CSUN that was already passed;
      2. Grier clarified that we can’t apply for this grant without a Senate Resolution; asked if it is a Chancellor’s Office (CO) requirement – J. Leafstedt answered that it’s actually from the state (i.e. California Legislature);
      3. Exec concern that there’s no statement on academic freedom; suggestion to add a “Whereas” clause to reflect faculty ability to make their own choices; suggested draft language of “Whereas faculty have the academic freedom to choose the best options for resources for their instruction”;
      4. Related issues cited that it’s not the fault of faculty that the textbook companies are sticking it to students for not offering more books online; feeling like this may be using administration to deflect some of the costs; related issue that our library won’t put textbooks on reserve and they won’t buy textbooks;
      5. Suggestion to add another “Resolved” section at the end of the document to encourage the institution to “explore and implement further means of lowering the costs of student education”;
      6. Exec checked with J. Leafstedt to see if she would be comfortable if Exec is able to word-smith the document, then bring it to Academic Senate – no objections;
   2. Policy on Double Counting (Curriculum)
      1. Recalled that Exec previously saw this policy, we sent it back to ask Curriculum Committee to work with SAPP Committee; referred to the language stating that 50% of everything will count; noted that Curriculum and SAPP committees didn’t end up working this out; as such, the policy coming forward is what Curriculum Committee had in place;
      2. Question if we are to expect the competing policy to come forward from SAPP at some point – answer was no;
      3. Question if since SAPP is so backlogged, is there urgency that this go forward without their input, and we do have a current policy – reply was that it is the job of Senate Exec to see if it’s ready or not to move forward, not to examine its merits or to micro-manage Curriculum Committee; this policy came up from the normal channels, no reason why it shouldn’t go forward; further discussion of related committee by-laws;
      4. ACTION: Policy on Double Counting (as submitted by Curriculum Committee) will move to Senate a first reading item;
   3. Academic Calendar Results
      1. J. Grier reviewed for Exec whether the results of the survey indicate the need to go forward with a perpetual calendar; observed that there seemed to be consensus to go to a perpetual calendar and for a fall break; question is should the committee keep developing this;
      2. General observations that qualitative comments were interesting, staff were wondering about possible campus closures during a fall break, but would actually be like spring break without a campus shut down;
      3. Clarification that when these questions are analyzed and answered, is this something that would then move forward as a first reading to Senate – answer was Yes; observation that there was a poor response rate with students, noting a busy time period;
      4. Comment that we will not get a consensus from a survey, so the committee needs to put forward a policy and then we vote on it; cautioned against being caught in bureaucratic limbo if we go after this via a survey method; added comment that the committee needs to be explicit of what they’re trying to accomplish, comment on what their best-considered work is, not necessarily a majority-pleasing option; clarification if we happened to pass something this spring would it take care of the “hanging Monday” – answer that this would affect several calendars down the road;
      5. Noted that it would be advisable to do this by action of the Senate rather than by action of administration; no issues with the committee continuing to work on it, clearly positive comments in general;
      6. ACTION: Academic Calendar committee will continue to develop from data collected and will submit policy to Exec for further review;
   4. SRT Instrument and Process
      1. Recalled that process follows previously passed SRT Policy (SP14-01); read aloud an email excerpt from P. Hampton; final version of this must be completed by 8th week of semester and distributed to all senators by the 10th week re: whether this instrument should be implemented by Fall 2016; if not, AY16-17 Faculty Affairs Committee with new members would need to revisit this in AY2016-17;
      2. Clarified that we’re not voting on the instrument itself, just reviewing to see if it’s good to move forward; no objections;
      3. ACTION: this request for review of the proposed revisions to the SRT instrument will be announced to all faculty via email;
   5. Policy on Second Baccalaureate Degree (SAPP)
      1. Committee noted revisions and adherence to Executive Order; we can ask for some purpose and some background when reading item comes up in Senate;
      2. ACTION: Exec agreed to move it forward as a first reading item in Senate;
   6. Policy on Reinstatement (SAPP)
      1. Highlighted italicized section as the portion being added to the existing policy;
      2. ACTION: no objections to this moving forward as a first reading item;
   7. Policy on Evaluation of Temporary Counselor Faculty (FAC)
      1. B. Hartung introduced policy as ex-officio on Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC); what the campus is asking counselor faculty to do is not reflected in their policy-outlined job description; concerns raised that there needs to be a two stage review; noted that Psychology program is serving as a first-step; final signatory in process will be the Director of Counseling; it’s been challenging because so much of their work is work that can’t be shared, as it is protected;
      2. Observation that it seems like items #1 through #7 are a stew of everything; for example, when you get to #6 & #7, this seems to be an outline of the process, and perhaps shouldn’t be numbered at all; B. Hartung answered that it is in line with our process, and those first numbers are highlighting the job description, but point taken on the latter numbers, asked if there are suggestions here – answer was to possibly extract from 6 & 7 on what folks need to do to be evaluated, then bring it up more toward the top; further suggestion to maybe add a separate header, like “Process” or something, which may help to organize it better;
      3. Observation that most lecturers do not have to attend staff meetings, how does this work with counselor faculty; B. Hartung replied that these are different, and their job descriptions are different; this is due to the stipulation that they perform student professional services, and as such they have greater expectations placed on them;
      4. Question on what happens if someone checks “unsatisfactory” on the form; B. Hartung answered that this is contract language, and checking “unsatisfactory” is akin to “dismissal”; Exec follow-up, so then on the form would there be objections to adding clarifying language on this section; B. Hartung replied that she could look into this; committee clarified that the form itself is not part of the policy;
      5. ACTION: we will see this coming forward as a first reading item in Senate;
   8. Amendment to agenda re: previously proposed amendment to the Academic Senate constitution
      1. Regarding the amendment to the constitution, there was a suggestion to place it back on the Academic Senate agenda; recalled that there is no “first reading” and “second reading” in Robert’s Rules; the design of it is by the time of the second reading people can come together as an informed body to make a decision; so, let’s come back with a first reading again so that people have a greater opportunity to do this;
      2. Question on what would be changed by doing this, sounding like we didn’t get the results we wanted, so let’s try again – reply was 1) the focus is on how Senate makes decisions – should there be votes on no notice, with limited information, and 2) with respect to the specific issue, that there would be new information on a second reading, with time for people to inform themselves, data and evidence were not at fingertips on no-notice vote;
      3. Agreed that there may be some folks who didn’t read it that carefully on the first reading; if we wanted to make this permanent, we can amend the by-laws to clear up the first and second readings and to include language that may target when indefinite postponements are allowed; Exec recalled examples of people emailing them that wished they had more time to consider this who were in favor of a representative model; the desire remains to be a better deliberative body, that is the reason it should be considered to be placed back on the agenda;
      4. Observation that it was framed as a straw poll, and there was a vote with great majority that communicated that folks were not ready to amend the constitution; comment that this was ironic because that is the system that we wanted to install; other comments that are in favor of a second reading item, because the item did come up; still there is concern about the optics and how it would be framed; ironic i.e. the will of 120+ senators are decided by the random 30 senators who happen to walk into the door that day; referenced Robert’s Rules that strictly speaking, it just says it has to be read once, it doesn’t say that that any substantive discussion needs to be made;
      5. Question on now that we’ve postponed this, how do we un-postpone this; referenced Robert’s Rules that mention whomever sets the agenda can put it back; consideration that if the discussion was postponed then by default it is not ended – this may be an argument for a first reading item because the item itself was never discussed / was never ended; other comments that is may be a second reading item, since we didn’t vote on the item and first reading items are not voted upon; Exec recalled that we are charged with setting the agenda, recognizing the merits of the item might be best as a first reading item, because we want to encourage people to do the reading;
      6. Recalled that previous feedback sounded like people went too far in their fear of not being able to serve on committees; also that there was a large percentage of fairly new faculty, what was heard was not a lot of data and more concerned voices;
      7. Proposal that it be put on the agenda as a second reading item, then it can be voted up or down; proposal seconded to put it on as a second reading item with the intent to vote on it at the next meeting;
      8. Follow-up question if you can put something on the agenda as a discussion item not as a voting item; further question asked how long this discussion has being going on; Exec member recalled that he was put it on the task force in 2005, so ten years; other comments against putting it on the agenda, as this was a postpone indefinitely, it doesn’t seem like the right thing to do;
      9. Comment that we keep hearing about the additional information that people didn’t have last time, what is this new information; reply was with recollection that we sent a lot of info but that the fear is no one looked at it; comment added that people don’t generally make rational decisions based on logical information; this being said when you table it, you haven’t killed it outright;
      10. Comment recalled that it was not framed as a referendum on whether we move forward with it or not; reply that since we needed 2/3rds vote majority and if we didn’t have half, then it didn’t seem worth it; next time it may be a good strategy to keep the focus on whether you add this to the constitution, in case we want to move forward, forgetting about models and such, and keeping to that narrow question;
      11. Noted that realistically there’s no way to move forward to a different senate model this semester; reply that it’s not out of the question to move forward with a proposed amendment to the by-laws, and then fix the constitution later; comment added that waiting for this until later may be a better strategy, if you put it forward now you’ll have a lot of people that will say that “we already voted on this, so the answer is still no”
      12. Summarized that there are two options: we add it to the agenda now and could even have someone object to it to spawn further discussion; 2) we can wait until later to do it, is there a third? Answered that the third option is to do nothing, and thus the proponent of amending this agenda is withdrawing the original request, as this discussion has failed to convince this group of the main point of the argument;
      13. Observation that we’re going to run out of space if we keep our existing model; noted that we seat 120 in Del Norte, but request of Senate was to relocate to MVS Decision Making Center;
      14. Concluded that our Academic Senate agenda is now set;
6. Chair Reports
   1. J. Grier recalled that it recently came to her attention that there was a student group that had some unrest and were making demands for space; the SCAN (Student Corrective Action Network) group; info source was B. Grice and shared by S. Stratton; they have a meeting tonight; J. Grier read demands from SCAN as outlined:
      1. #1) A comprehensive strategic plan for 2016-2020 which focuses on justice by means of an effective and progressive commitment to provide for the diverse needs of Black, brown, indigenous, and Asian students. This will include measureable goals and plans to recruit and retain students of color, in addition to cluster hiring of educators of color into tenure-track positions. This will also include mandatory training for staff, faculty, and administration in intersectionality, race, gender, ability, sexuality, class, privilege, and accountability.
      2. #2) A complete restructuring of Associated Students, Inc. to better integrate diversity and justice into its mission and hiring. We expect to have staff who are knowledgeable in intersectionality, who are effective and proactive mentors to student leaders, and who place the needs of underrepresented students, especially as it relates to programming, as top priority.
      3. #3) A safe space for underrepresented students which is able to facilitate the unique and diverse needs of each individual community. We require a space for Asian students, Black students, brown students, indigenous students, women students, and LGBTQ+ students, respectively, along with staff members who can effectively oversee those spaces, provide for those students' specific needs, and advocate on behalf of those students to faculty, staff, and the administration.
7. Other Business
   1. C. Delaney announced we’ll make the ballot for Senate Exec Officers early before the strike, and will extend voting period;
   2. D. Wakelee announced that on April 12th, Chris Mallon (Academic Dean of CSU) will be coming, recommended attendance for anyone interest in any new programs;
   3. J. Grier announced tentative date of April 4th for new CI President Erica Beck to come to campus;
8. Meeting adjourned at 4:33pm.