



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

Senate Executive Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 1, 2015
Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185
2:30pm

Attendees: John Yudelson, Gayle Hutchinson, Jeanne Grier, Colleen Delaney, Jim Meriwether, Simone Aloisio, Cindy Wyels, Jacob Jenkins, Stephen Clark, Antonio Jiménez Jiménez, Travis Hunt, Genevieve Evans Taylor

Guest(s): Beth Hartung

Staff: David Daniels

1. Meeting Called to Order
 - a. Meeting called to order at 2:35pm; welcomes by J. Grier, noted multiple other items since original announcement, asked Senate Exec if we want to add things to agenda and then approve it; C. Wyels agreed; J. Grier wanted to talk about senate elections, especially Fiscal Policies which will not be a complete committee; C. Wyels asked to move up Faculty Development section in agenda, moved with no objections.
2. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Additions made by moving up Faculty Development, along with adding Fiscal Policies review and SRSC
3. Approval of the Minutes from April 28, 2015 (attached)
 - a. Meeting minutes were approved with no objections
4. Continuing Business
 - a. J. Grier noted that as this is the first meeting, there is no continuing business
5. New Business
 - a. Introductions
 - i. T. Hunt welcomed as senator of academic affairs; he is a business major with minor in Political Science; T. Hunt asked Senate Exec what the qualifications are to be a full-time faculty member; J. Grier answered that it is different for tenure track and lectures. For lecturers it is the number of courses taught, e.g. 15 units in one semester.
 - b. Presidential Search process (Grier)
 - i. J. Grier - with the news of President Rush's retirement, noting in the letter from the Chancellor, two members would be elected by faculty to serve on this search committee, we need to talk about eligibility; hearing feedback

from various faculty on whether eligibility comes with being a senator, or if all faculty should have a vote; C. Wyels thought it should be a tenured person, aware that it may leave some people out, but noted broad campus perspectives and longevity of their experience as being important; J. Yudelson gave his voice on behalf of lecturers, noting that they are 70% of the head count – he was open to full-time lecturers versus part-time, but also noted that we get two slots; J. Jenkins agreed that with two tiers that would be possible; A. Jiménez agreed, observing that it is an advisory board, so not charged with final decision, but rather in an advisory role; J. Grier advised that if we say “senators” we would have the range of tenure track plus lecturer representatives, feasibility of non-senators may not be likely to be placed on ballot; J. Yudelson asked if would you then say current and past senators; J. Grier answered current; J. Yudelson observed that there may be an issue with the 115 tenure track versus only 5 lecturer representative, so he would let the faculty decide; C. Wyels recalled that she doesn’t normally do anything to exclude lecturers, but felt that people who may be more informed about a Presidential search would be tenured, and are those that are also more apt to speak their mind freely;

- ii. C. Delaney noted her concern that the composition of our committee needs to be representative and be respected by the Board of Trustees; S. Clark recalled that in politics symbolism is important, thought it was important we send a message that on this campus we include lecturers; J. Yudelson was not as concerned with gaining tenure track positions, but we’d rather be partners and colleagues, rather than a “we’ll protect you” stance; S. Aloisio suggested that maybe we err on the side of being inclusive for both composition and voting, let’s make it as simple as possible, agreed that there is something that says “commitment” when someone is tenured i.e. if I am tenured I’m more likely to use my voice under this protection; C. Wyels further noted that her argument is not about being the most inclusive, it’s being the most informed; J. Jenkins offered that there should be considerations about length of service for lecturers; J. Yudelson voiced that he is open for open elections;
- iii. G. Evans Taylor noted that there’s a lot at stake here, so think about your role with this committee, think about who are the best people to write the presidential job description on behalf of the committee; J. Meriwether asked if this committee writes the job description; G. Evans Taylor answered yes, and that they play a greater role than originally considered;
- iv. J. Meriwether thought that on a broad level it exposes some of our faults, i.e. tenure lines versus lecturer positions, doesn’t have a clear path for this one, inclined for tenured or longevity requirement for composition; G. Hutchinson agreed that this advisory task force is very important, must be a corpus that understands the broad nature of this University, with focus

on the entire academic enterprise – having those individuals serve with more experience, let's be moving towards identifying this criteria, i.e. experience / longevity / broad university perspective; J. Meriwether agreed this criteria to be important, not sure how to crystalize it; S. Aloisio observed that we may be talking about whom to exclude, although this may be a more strong term for it, but when I think about criteria I'm not thinking about the most qualified, I'm thinking about who shouldn't be on it – if we have this identified, we could decide who should vote – I think having it as all faculty get to vote, all faculty get to be eligible, would bring perspectives representative of the campus;

- v. A. Jiménez read about the composition, it was two faculty members and the chair, one staff, one student, another member of campus advisory board, VP or academic dean, one alumnus... seems like the objective is to have the different voices, because each entity is representative in this make up, and each have their different issues they face;
- vi. J. Grier noted that we have until Oct. 1st, and today is Sept. 1st, so do we wait or decide today – we should work to voice our opinion on participation; J. Meriwether asked in terms of voting, is it by head count? J. Grier answered we haven't got there yet; J. Meriwether asked if this is a weighted vote, say if 3WTU's; J. Yudelson commented "or a vote at all"; J. Meriwether inclined to side with S. Aloisio, e.g. what about the person with 27 WTUs and has been teaching here since 2004?
- vii. C. Wyels commented that we're using "full-time" or "tenure" as proxies for something else, suggested to maybe stop using proxies, and then we define a list of desirable qualifications or some way of measuring how involved a particular faculty member may be; most of these tend to be more frequent for tenured people, which is why I mentioned this preference over lecturers (but with no disrespect to lecturers), noted also omitted tenure-track; G. Hutchinson agreed that if you have this criteria it will help guide those who want to run for this and for those who want to elect; J. Jenkins considered how to quantify this, maybe it is a "job call", i.e. a laundry list to shape into a job call; G. Hutchinson liked this approach, might not have all qualities, but this is what we're looking for;
- viii. J. Yudelson commented that then if longevity is important, do we decide on this timeframe, if we come up with a list of qualifications, if one is full time you might not have the time to do much else to boost their other qualifications; J. Meriwether recalled that some things are beyond our abilities;
- ix. J. Grier commented that she didn't know if eligibility is the right word, but maybe "preferred" is better – process-wise would be easier, because if "eligibility" then we'd have to check each ballot; J. Jenkins suggested that defining a minimum might help to clean it up; C. Wyels if the term

“expectations” is used, it might open up another can of worms, noting that there’s a lot of things an applicant could do, such as run a Center, etc.; J. Grier suggested that a simple approach may be when putting out the call, if we say to please give your name and a nomination statement, which would list their qualifications, rather than lots of time spent on defining the criteria; J. Grier noted that it would be wide open, but then the question would come back to voting / percentage voting; J. Grier asked Senate Exec if we can maybe make a small group to follow up via email? J. Yudelson offered to be on this sub-committee;

- x. S. Clark opined in favor of reserving one spot for a lecturer and the other for a tenured/ tenure-track faculty member. This would send a strong message that this campus values lecturers. C. Wyels asked whether the message wouldn’t be stronger if a lecturer got elected, without stacking the deck – J. Yudelson answered that a lot would depend on how we would vote, wouldn’t mandate a lecturer position, should include scholarship, service and longevity – and then we let the faculty decide; J. Grier plan to put something out by next week; S. Aloisio suggested / asked if the letter from the Chancellor go out when the call goes out; Senate Exec agreed;
 - xi. C. Wyels asked have we discussed who would vote; J. Grier answered no, just eligibility; S. Aloisio asked if a weighted vote is making it too complicated; J. Grier suggested with this option you could do three separate elections for lecturer status, to separate by WTU; J. Meriwether noted that he does like minimum qualification, likes proportional voting by WTU; J. Yudelson suggested that this could be sorted into two categories of half-vote and full vote based on part time and full time; S. Aloisio noted that he is ok with proportional voting if it can be done;
 - xii. J. Grier thanked Senate Exec for their participation in this very important discussion.
- c. Report from Senate Structure Task Force (Grier)
 - i. J. Grier summarized that the recommendation was to develop Model B, which was a representative-based Senate; many thanks to C. Wyels, J. Jenkins and S. Aloisio for their work on STF-I (if you’d like to volunteer for STF-II would love it); will put out call for this participation along with the first senate newsletter;
 - d. Academic Master Planning Update (Grier)
 - i. J. Grier recalled that there was a group this summer talking about AMP procedures, met last week, Curriculum Committee will be working with this group, because we have all the chickens and eggs running around we’ll have to shift things around to make sense of it all – working with B. Gillespie about a process to use their representatives as people who can look forward to decide what can be consent items versus what needs to be

opened up; A. Jiménez asked if this includes conversations on the graph on what is pending; J. Grier noted discussions talking about getting rid of Short Form, replacing with letter of intent, i.e. doesn't get on the AMP until an approved Long Form;

- ii. G. Hutchinson noted the importance of cleaning this up, the public is confused when students and parents call and ask about a degree that doesn't exist, the future will be a more confident one when it's sent to the CO; A. Jiménez asked if there were conversations on strategic decisions, i.e. what we're going to be teaching in the next five years; J. Grier answered that these conversations need to take place, but are still in process; T. Hunt asked if emphases can be added; J. Grier answered that we're trying to clean up the criteria by which items are added to the AMP; T. Hunt used an example that e.g. more English classes need to be offered; J. Meriwether suggested that it not be pushed out too far, as this clean up needs to happen quickly;
- e. Academic Calendar Update (Grier)
 - i. J. Grier recalled that a group will be reconstituted in Spring, with a focus on / interest in a perpetual calendar to be developed;
- f. Honorary Degree Process (Evans Taylor)
 - i. G. Evans Taylor highlighted the importance of this process being strictly confidential, to ensure that we do not embarrass the prospective honoree or embarrass the University, which includes any and all conversations; at next Academic Senate meeting, may want to open up to offer more names for honorees; J. Grier is on the committee and offered to make an announcement at the next Academic Senate meeting; G. Evans Taylor added that she would then take this information and turn it around in a week, so maybe just a single paragraph; J. Meriwether wasn't aware that he could have submitted a name, asked what about a message from the President's Office, noting that he would not mind if it came to the entire Senate Exec, but suggested maybe just the Senate Officers if you want to keep the circle smaller; further suggested to swap the VP of Advising for the Senate Chair, due to it being more of an academic honor vs. giving an award to a corporation;
 - ii. J. Jenkins asked for clarification if there needed to be three candidates; G. Evans Taylor recalled only having one candidate last year; J. Jenkins asked if this could then be changed to be a maximum of three; G. Evans Taylor answered yes, but maybe for next year, hesitates to do it in the middle of this term; J. Yudelson asked in terms of process, what will the Senate officers be reviewing, will it be the one paragraph or will it be the more extensive research version; J. Grier answered that the role of the committee is an advisory role; J. Meriwether added that there's a group of

people discussing each applicant's qualifications, which are then narrowed down to a few recommendations;

- g. e-portfolio pilot for RTP (Hartung)
 - i. B. Hartung recalled that last year there was discussion on an electronic portfolio format, optimistic of a pilot rollout this year, wanted to get the information out to everyone about the actions of Faculty Affairs, as the new CBA gives a blessing to an e-portfolio format; discussion started by asking if there's an internal way to do this portfolio more cost effectively; over the summer an investigation led to a pilot of six individuals going through this process, via a process management product called TaskStream; a preview is forthcoming in the next chair's meeting, which is to give us a window into what this could look like – each of the six are at different stages in their classifications, they will report back to senate via brown bags, etc.; these discussions are also taking place system-wide – Humboldt is interested but still deciding on the product portal; our TaskStream product will give us a chance to decide on the product and the time commitment;
 - ii. S. Aloisio asked if this is just for tenure-track; B. Hartung answered yes; S. Aloisio asked if it could also be piloted for full-time lecturers; B. Hartung answered that she didn't see why not; J. Grier recalled that she's been using TaskStream since 2006, lecturers would be a different template, but product would have this capability; B. Hartung summarized that it's becoming increasingly difficult to keep hard copy files for all RTP-related actions; right now J. Petralba has to manually turn on and turn off their access, but could be improved down the road; we'd like to know from Senate Exec in terms of getting information out to Academic Senate; J. Yudelson noted that the access question is the big one, to keep in line with CBA, in terms of the review process and who gets access and when and how does one know; B. Hartung recalled that this is the reason we chose Task Stream instead of an internal solution;
- h. Faculty Development at CI
 - i. Questions on the status of faculty development since we don't have a faculty developer; B. Hartung recalled several meetings last year, what is the Faculty Development Advisory Committee – we are an advisory committee that has no officer to report to; we also have faculty development happening through teaching and learning and the mission based centers; do we need this office or something formal? Let's discuss this; it was clear that people at different stages of their career have very different needs;
 - ii. C. Wyels used an example of a colleague discussion about what faculty development opportunities existed on campus, and what we thought was lacking was a generic place where we could go to discuss how to help

students learn more effectively, currently everything is specialized; B. Hartung noted that we threw up a shell website trying to pull together everything that is faculty development related – do the faculty want an office or an officer for this, or have we moved beyond a one size fits all; J. Yudelson didn't see this as a dichotomy, but could be one with a very broad brush, almost like a clearing house, could see an officer who is a go-to person; noted the other point by S. Aloisio was that 3 out of 4 classes here are taught by lecturers, so for most students they are the faculty, because that's what they see every day;

- iii. J. Meriwether not sure when the last time the faculty development met (B. Hartung answered last Spring), output was a 7-8 page document, concerned that the ship is adrift and has been for a while, asking good questions, but was hearing that it's going to drift for another year, would like to encourage conversations that will help the ship move; asked what about the Fit Studio involvement, can something be done to pull it into a direction; B. Hartung answered faculty mentoring program was funded by ISLAS, Faculty Affairs is funding this for the coming year, minimally; those who participated were contacted; J. Meriwether noted that except one of the two people is on sabbatical, would like to encourage less drift and more mastery; J. Grier asked if committee has met yet this year; B. Hartung answered not yet; J. Grier was waiting to stir this pot along with other committee memberships;

- i. Service on URTP (Hartung, Meriwether, Grier)

- i. J. Grier had a question last year about eligibility to not serve, asked what is the criteria for you if you think you're too busy; B. Hartung expressed disinclination to be the one to make that decision – every year when the call goes out, there's a statement that goes out, i.e. if someone is on sabbatical you cannot serve, but there are other cases where people want to opt-out for other reasons; J. Meriwether asked what percentage of people asked to not be on it; B. Hartung answered for this year maybe ten percent; so in the case of business, there are three eligible, one is on sabbatical, one stepped up, and one came back; A. Jiménez asked do they have to be eligible for the two-year term? B. Hartung answered no, in some cases we have some academic units that are thin in terms of full professors; J. Meriwether suggested that the Faculty Affairs Committee look into language on the types of criteria that is used; J. Grier agreed that B. Hartung shouldn't be determining who was allowed to opt out;

- j. Conducting MPP Searches (Meriwether)

- i. Tabled, please see item #7, Other Business

- k. Revisions to Administrator Evaluation Policy (Meriwether)

- i. Tabled, please see item #7, Other Business

- l. MA in Psychology changes—return to senate?

- i. Note: please see item #6, Chair Report
 - m. Presentation request: (Dr. Kirsten Olson—counseling services)
 - i. J. Grier recalled that this request relates to services available to faculty, aware that B. Hartung encouraged her to come talk to us; B. Hartung added that she's new on campus, trying to reach out, thought it would be good to come to Senate; J. Grier suggested maybe limiting to 3-5 minutes for a presentation; J. Meriwether asked if faculty have served on search committees for counselors? B. Hartung answered Yes; J. Yudelson added that they're all Unit 3 faculty employees, criteria for searches is irrespective of instructional requirements;
 - n. Campus teaching and/or research awards with faculty voice (Hartung)
 - i. B. Hartung offered to share this list with J. Grier and for distribution to Senate Exec;
 - o. Fiscal Policy Committee review (Grier)
 - i. A. Jiménez recalled that didn't they feel powerless; J. Grier agreed that was their feeling, but felt that progress is being made; C. Wyels suggested maybe let it go small and allow it to conduct its business; A. Jiménez asked if that would then make the committee be moot; J. Grier observed that we can't have election after election, would move to appointments; J. Meriwether cited access and compiling of information between FPC and Cabinet, asked if there been any movement in the direction of having this information available this year – we could “beat the bushes” and go small, but the bigger question might be how meaningful is this, especially if we can answer if this information is coming or not; J. Grier noted that some of these committees are waiting for this committee to get started so that they can then conduct their business; A. Jiménez added that this is where he was concerned, because it seemed like previous committees were able to make a recommendation that was then ignored – if they're going to be paid attention to, then he's all for it, but if not there is cause for concern; C. Wyels added that we may not have to stress ourselves to fill the committee if it's just as effective when kept small; G. Evans Taylor recalled that Cabinet didn't intend to ignore, but that time limits were exceeded and a timely response was not possible;
 - p. Student Research Steering Counsel (Grier)
 - i. J. Grier asked if everyone was ok with adding this to the Academic Senate agenda; no objections from Senate Exec.
6. Chair Report
- a. J. Grier asked is there anything left that we need to discuss; A. Jiménez was curious about MA in Psychology; J. Grier recalled that CO recommended changes, still waiting for a summary from V. Adams on what those changes are, same case with GPS... when changes are made they still have to come back

through Curriculum Committee, we need to think about a review process, not necessarily Senate, but maybe back to Curriculum Committee due to it being a program modification; A. Jiménez suggested that maybe this could be a Curriculum Committee decision to either perform the program modification or send back to the Senate;

7. Other Business

- a. Other business not discussed on the agenda is tabled until next Senate Exec meeting;

8. Meeting adjourned at 4:40pm