



**ACADEMIC
SENATE**

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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 22, 2015
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: John Yudelson, Jeanne Grier, Colleen Delaney, Jim Meriwether, Greg Wood, Simone Aloisio, Cindy Wyels, Jacob Jenkins, Stephen Clark, Antonio Jiménez Jiménez, Travis Hunt

Guests: Blake Gillespie, Beth Hartung

Staff: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order 2:32pm
 - a. Provost and Chief of Staff not attending due to D.C. meetings, but chair expects J. Barton and B. Gillespie later; B. Hartung will join us in lieu of Provost; introductions for G. Wood as new CFA representative.
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda was approved with no objections.
3. Approval of the Minutes from September 1, 2015 (attached)
 - a. J. Meriwether offered edits to Section 5b.(iv.), noted by D. Daniels, no objections from Senate Exec.
4. Continuing Business
 - a. None
5. New Business
 - a. Conducting MPP Searches (Meriwether)
 - i. J. Meriwether: wanted to think about this more last Spring when there was a new policy, but bringing this to Senate Exec because it seems like our campus could use a fleshing-out of the policy on MPP Searches – i.e. we have a very detailed document on Presidential searches, elaborate guidelines on faculty searches, but almost nothing in comparison for MPP searches;
 - ii. G. Wood asked if MPP refers to a small group of people, i.e. if B. Hartung wanted to hire an assistant – B. Hartung answered that they are in different ranks; J. Meriwether summarized that it is those administrative positions that have a connection with faculty;

- iii. J. Grier recalled that we passed SP 14-15 last year about the composition of MPP searches; J. Meriwether added that if we have an administrator with extensive contact with faculty, that the procedures be spelled out more within the policy; C. Wyels added to ensure a transparent process for faculty involvement;
- iv. J. Grier cited MPP position levels 3 and 4; B. Hartung added that these would be deans; J. Grier summarized that you're talking about faculty participation on MPP searches – J. Meriwether agreed that we don't want to go from point A to point B without faculty involvement; S. Aloisio asked for clarification; J. Meriwether answered that in reference to our most recent search for MPP level 3, didn't see any announcement for faculty involvement in the search, nor announcement of an open forum; S. Aloisio summarized that the point is that the existing policy isn't comprehensive enough to include this faculty involvement;
- v. J. Grier noted that the policy wasn't signed by President Rush before the time of this search, policy was signed on May 5, 2015, further noted that it was the role of Faculty Affairs on how they wanted to be involved in such searches; J. Meriwether observed that even with a policy in place we still got from point A to point B without faculty input, asked Senate Exec if there was a formal call to put faculty on the search committee – J. Grier answered no, but she was requested to nominate faculty in consultation with exec officers; J. Meriwether didn't recall there being a formal announcement; J. Grier confirmed no formal announcement yet on this position; J. Meriwether asked what happens when we get the next position, recalling that the last two or three MPP searches had no faculty involvement;
- vi. S. Aloisio suggested that if the policy is lacking here, maybe we either need a new policy or an amended one; J. Grier recalled that the search composition is what we asked it to be, but there is no open forum piece, summarizing that the way it's currently written that the search did follow the policy; G. Wood recalled text from SP 09-11, noting that the whole text is that "all searches shall have faculty members on committee" and that it's the level 2 position that has cross-campus constituents; J. Meriwether observed that the current landscape is that we could have a new Dean of the School of Education without any faculty input; J. Jenkins agreed that the problem may lie in the lack of specific language within the existing policy; B. Hartung added that if there was a search underway for the chief of police, you would certainly want faculty input; J. Yudelson asked if there are faculty on 12-month contracts; B. Hartung answered not many; J. Yudelson clarified that there are; B. Hartung answered librarians, counselors; J. Meriwether noted that we have lecturers on campus that cannot go to tenure track without a national search, but that we don't have

an equivalent practice with MPPs; J. Yudelson asked why can't the faculty choose the faculty representative, because right here in the policy it's charged with the VP; J. Grier recalled the Title IX director search that wasn't announced widely that contained faculty members on the search committee, but those that she didn't know about; G. Wood added that he would like to know how many MPP levels 3 and 4 there are;

- vii. J. Grier suggested that we could either ask a small group of Senate Exec members to help with this, or we could send this to Faculty Affairs; C. Wyels suggested that a small group of Senate Exec could create the outline of proposed modifications; J. Meriwether asked if Faculty Affairs has a chair – J. Grier answered it's P. Hampton; J. Meriwether offered to work with P. Hampton to create a draft version; J. Grier added that she'd be happy to coordinate this work together; S. Aloisio noted that Faculty Affairs just drafted a policy last year, which they were tasked with this last year, doesn't want to exclude them, but since they came up with what they came up with last year that we could just draft a policy that comes from Senate Exec; J. Grier noted that this is a shared policy with the PPPC, so it would need to be routed accordingly, further noting that they came up with this in consultation with HR; J. Jenkins summarized that they did it for composition, but not a change for how these searches are conducted; G. Wood agreed that these would have to be in partnership with administration.
- b. Revisions to Administrator Evaluation Policy (Meriwether)
 - i. J. Grier recalled at previous year's administrator review, the Provost requested changes to policy to avoid personnel records of administrators on public display; J. Meriwether recalled current policy is an ad hoc committee to contribute to the annual review from the Provost, and whatever is on the report is open for anyone to read it for a 30-day period; the Provost was uncomfortable with this, citing an example is when faculty are under RTP review our records are not similarly displayed; alternative language was discussed to potentially remove 30-day period in favor of advisory meetings; plan is to submit this change in language to Faculty Affairs to come up with a less public solution;
 - ii. J. Grier suggested that a final letter could be in place that affirms status of review, but that the change would be to remove the 30-day window, noting that our RTP files are not on review for other folks to see; C. Wyels asked if people would have any recourse, e.g., if such a meeting would have minutes or other records; J. Meriwether added that this is where Faculty Affairs input will be valuable; J. Jenkins asked if the letter would be simply a statement that the process is complete; also asked what was the purpose of the 30 day period to begin with – Senate Exec answer was

- to increase transparency; C. Wyels commented that this parallel seems to resonate, but having a difficult time expressing its terms;
- iii. A. Jiménez asked if there are other administrators outside of Academic Affairs who faculty reviewed– answer from Senate Exec was no; J. Grier noted that on an HR level you’re talking about someone’s confidential evaluation on display; the example referenced included more negative info than anticipated, which caused the level of embarrassment; J. Grier offered the example that if you had a negative teaching evaluation, the chair can come talk to you in confidence; C. Wyels added that MPPs are much higher paid and have much higher responsibility, so this makes the parallel not fit exactly; J. Yudelson added that not one lecturer would attend such a meeting that is scheduled with the Provost and dean for fear of not being able to speak their mind; J. Meriwether read a draft that indicates a meeting with a healthier interaction within a 30 day time period; S. Aloisio agreed that it’s important that faculty have the input; J. Grier observed that it’s distilled, B. Hartung added that it’s not verbatim on the report; J. Meriwether recalled seeing the letters from one full page to four pages, and that this data is not seen by anyone outside of the committee, including the Provost;
 - iv. T. Hunt asked how detailed these evaluations are, recalling his experience on Rate My Professor, adding that these administrator evaluations seem like they can go much deeper and more personal; J. Grier answered that it depends on how people respond, there’s the strengths vs. weakness measure, but it’s up to the committee to weigh this and see what the trends are in the data;
 - v. J. Meriwether suggested some context of how these changes came about; C. Wyels summarized that faculty’s RTPs are not made public and that we’re being asked for a parallel, but my critique is that ”parallel” alone isn’t reason enough to change as there we don’t expect parallels in responsibilities, privileges, pay, etc.; J. Meriwether suggested that this could be a two-year staggered committee;
 - vi. J. Grier offered to send this to Faculty Affairs to work up some language.
- c. Honorary Degree Candidates (Evans Taylor)
- i. J. Grier summarized that our job is to look at these names to see if they are acceptable, we don’t need to make recommendations at this time; A. Jiménez asked if part of this is to look at what they’ve done at CI, or overall; J. Grier answered could be criteria not necessarily related to us; J. Yudelson commented that if we’re going to give someone an honorary degree, I’m looking at their level of involvement rather than their financial resources; J. Meriwether suggested maybe we focus on our internal benchmarks, not clear from the information given; J. Grier added that these selections are bestowed degrees from the Board of Trustees, they can

even provide who the candidate will be on our campus; A. Jiménez asked how the nominations were collected; J. Grier answered by the people on the committee; S. Aloisio commented that this is not supposed to be controversial, I don't want to imply that we're making any recommendation, as it is not something that has been vetted by the faculty; J. Meriwether added that he was wishing there was some benchmark, e.g. if I'm sitting in the audience as a parent of a graduate, will I say that this person is inspiring or not; J. Meriwether recalled another award that went to a bank, whereas this one could be more than who gives us the most money; J. Yudelson added that this is also my concern, particularly with Advancement's level of involvement with this; S. Aloisio suggested that we could write a policy or resolution for future where we outline these benchmarks or other criteria;

- ii. G. Wood added that it would be good if we could be able to recognize those with a service-oriented life; J. Grier noted that they're trying to include us in the process; S. Aloisio suggested that we tell them thanks for providing this level of information; J. Grier thought it would be nice to talk about their connection to CI during our graduation ceremony, noting that a list of everyone receiving such degrees is searchable online; B. Hartung added that it's interesting to note that an institution that doesn't grant many doctorates is determining honorary doctorates;
- d. Open Presidential Search Resolution (Aloisio & Yudelson)
 - i. S. Aloisio introduced resolution draft, noting that J. Yudelson did most of the work, based on a Sonoma State policy in place; there are four presidential searches currently underway, Sonoma was the first to put something in place; noted that it's possible to have an open search if all of the finalists agree, which has never happened; this resolution is asking the Chancellor to make this an open search; the CO's counterargument is that it undercuts a sitting president's ability to fundraise and/or the confidence in the position (should it be known he/ she applied for another position); this resolution would provide more transparency, adding that he would like the President to know that they're a good fit for the campus beforehand, rather than several months into the job; J. Yudelson offered two things to add, first that the CO's argument may be assuming that the only candidates that you would get would be other Presidents, and second that this resolution has been passed at San Jose, Sonoma, Humboldt and Long Beach; S. Aloisio added that he would be surprised if this wasn't adopted system-wide;
 - ii. J. Meriwether commented that in the first Resolved section, he felt that the public announcement criteria is less important than the meeting of the candidate opportunity; G. Wood added that once you get to the point where there is a large portion of people who know that they are on

campus, the public announcement criteria is less important; C. Wyels recalled that a few years ago when the Board of Trustees revised their policy, it was assumed to be public; about a month ago interacting with our current President, it was known in Florida that they were hurt by their Sunshine Laws in that they did not get quality applicants in their Presidential searches – this issue may go a lot deeper than just transparency, imagine a scenario where a current Provost has applied and everyone knows about it, but then what about the current responsibilities of this post in the year during the search; it would seem that the CO argument may not be able to be dismissed; S. Aloisio clarified that he wasn't dismissing it, J. Yudelson also agreed; J. Grier interjected that even right now campus visits are not mandatory; C. Wyels summarized her desire to have the best President, a process that achieves this, along with transparency; J. Yudelson recalled that Sacramento State just got their hire, in a closed search and that president then expressed he'd have preferred an open search, also wants our new CI President to believe in transparency and wants to live it;

- iii. J. Grier noted that she called Lars Walton (C.O.S. to CO), who relayed that all searches begin as closed searches; there's a Trustee's Committee and there's an Advisory Committee – it's now been confirmed that they act as one committee; Nov. 12th they are coming to campus, everyone is invited to attend and give their input; S. Aloisio noted that this is just a resolution, but sends a unified message to ask for more faculty input into the process, the details can be modified, the idea is to send a unified voice to the Board of Trustees that we would like more campus involvement;
- iv. J. Grier was informed that after lunch the committee discusses whether or not they want it as an open search – the policy will not be changed, since they have four open searches, but it is up to the individual search committees; Nov. 12th will be videotaped and will be sent to the candidates; J. Grier added that she doesn't have confidence that a cut-and-paste resolution will have any traction, so let's maybe we ask for what we really want, in agreement with S. Aloisio; T. Hunt asked if students are invited to ask questions at this forum; G. Wood answered that if it's a closed search then we can't participate; J. Grier clarified that we do have representatives, so wouldn't say that we aren't participating; J. Jenkins agreed that this resolution could represent solidarity with other campuses if we push this through;
- v. J. Meriwether commented that he's not hearing strong agreement with this version, but if there's value to add language to this we could work with this; J. Grier asked if there's guidelines on determining the community member; S. Aloisio answered that they want to round out the diversity of the committee, and that the community member is chosen last;

- vi. S. Alosio offered that he can tighten up the language with further modifications, J. Yudelson and I can take a look at this; J. Grier recommended that the chair of the trustees committee is a good person to keep on there, as this person has a lot of power and is deserving of primary focus; S. Alosio summarized that this is looking long-term;
- vii. A. Jiménez recalled that they've been doing these types of searches for some 50 years, so the policy is coming from somewhere, but maybe we can ask that our interaction is maximized, potentially with a level of anonymity; S. Aloisio recommended that if we're asking for a campus visit, then we should be consistent, then we can ask for maximizing ways for interaction; J. Grier acknowledged wanting to have as deep a pool as possible; J. Yudelson clarified that deepest possible means no one talks about it and there's no transparency;
- viii. S. Aloisio summarized that we'll tighten this up and bring it back for next Senate Exec;
- e. Update on IGER
 - i. Tabled due to time constraints.
- f. Issues to consider for AY 15-16
 - i. B. Gillespie: Curriculum Committee is considering how and what business to conduct this semester, in light of Senate committee restructuring and AMP questions and issues; could also take a look at structure as well, i.e. does there need to be levels of Curriculum Committees, it seemed wise to come here to take an interest in shaping this discussion, asking Senate Exec for input on possible focus areas;
 - ii. S. Aloisio answered that he doesn't think anyone knows exactly, if there's structural changes then this should be addressed ahead of revamping forms; let's determine what kind of things does the University committee need to be looking at, versus other levels of committees; B. Gillespie recalled that we spend too much time with clerical tasks / management of forms instead of curriculum management;
 - iii. G. Wood have you considered a curriculum technical sub-committee, not just clerical tasks but asking if the units add up, etc.; B. Gillespie answered that we do have staff involved in this, but maybe reorganizing forms to capture the right kind of info;
 - iv. A. Jiménez was glad that the committee is thinking about these kind of issues, another task may be to propose new programs that have not been represented on campus, thinking that we've done a good job with improving existing programs, but not a careful look of how the campus needs to be represented; J. Grier agreed that there's a lack of planning; A. Jiménez planning for this could involve looking at number of students, data, COAST reports, etc.; B. Gillespie answered that this has been in the purview of the Academic Planning Committee, but historically has not

been implemented; new programs don't make it very far because as proposers don't have all the info / tools to forecast the necessary resources – no one wants to spend the time on three sets of forms without any idea of what kind of resources they may have; A. Jiménez recalled that he didn't like the discourse with Psychology, i.e. we have the money so we can afford it, but what about other programs that don't have similar resources; B. Gillespie agreed with need for more faculty involvement of what programs are needed, and he'd like to hear more feedback about how we should be proceeding; in absence of this we'll need to come up with a general outline, and a lot of time was spent on this in discussion; G. Wood encouraged to just implement the changes, we can modify the Senate by-laws if necessary; C. Wyels agreed with G. Wood to proceed with implementing any good ideas that you have; B. Gillespie concerned about doing something ahead of other committees; J. Grier reassured to not be too concerned with this.

6. Other Business

- a. J. Grier asked what to do for next week in terms of what business to put forth to Academic Senate; J. Meriwether suggested that it could be cancelled due to no business, or there could be a topic provided that is a meaningful topic; A. Jiménez asked if we have responses from Intent to Raise Questions that are time sensitive – J. Grier answered no, and not all responses are in from our follow-ups; J. Grier moved that we cancel Academic Senate, but that we can still meet for Community Time; C. Wyels added that she would come just to see colleagues; G. Wood observed that we may run into a problem with quorum if we call for a meeting; J. Meriwether we could hold a shorter meeting, regular business will be suspended, but then we have a forum on what input there may be on the Presidential searches; J. Grier agreed that next meeting could be a Special Session; G. Wood suggested to place this as an official topic so that we can keep people focused.
- b. C. Wyels moved to adjourn, second by A. Jiménez, meeting adjourned at 4:36pm.