



## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

### Senate Executive Committee

#### AGENDA

Tuesday, February 20, 2018

Provost's Conference Room, Bell Tower West 2185

2:30pm

1. Meeting Call to Order
  - 2:31 Chair called meeting to order
2. Approval of the Agenda
  - C. Wyels, S. Stratton moved and 2nded
3. Approval of the Minutes from January 30, 2018
  - C. Wyels:
    - Notes say that G. Chase – begin search after timeline. G. Chase: Will probably launch in the Fall 2018, with hope of filling during the academic year
    - C. Wyels move to approve minutes as amended; S. Aloisio 2<sup>nd</sup>
    - Approved

V. Adams: If ever anyone wants a paper ballot, please say so.

4. Update from Provost
  - Later this afternoon, will be sending out update on SI process to inform what's moving forward from that process. 4 big initiatives: Inclusive Excellence, Student Success (graduation rates, etc), Student Achievement, Capacity and Sustainability. Under each of those we'll see discrete initiatives that groups are already working on this Spring. Town Hall World Café on April 13, get feedback, talk about future directions.. That will be noted in the forthcoming update.
  - In Acad Affairs and across university, conversations about the budget scenarios, thinking ahead to next year and challenges we face – given Governor's proposed budget. More updates will come.
  - New Chief Academic Budget Officer starting March 13. Kirk Englund, Western Washington University. He is excited about the job.
  - Last semester several people got together to write a grant to CO to increase faculty diversity hiring. Successful effort, brought in \$200,000. To get that started, they will be looking for four faculty members to serve as a core group. These fac members will be given release time in Fall 2018. Want to work with Senate Exec, Virgil specifically, to come up with a list of names of interested faculty. Joint Senate Exec / Faculty Affairs effort.
    - Faculty roles: collegiality, ambassador role, best practices for diversity hiring

\*Please review an associated document or website prior to the meeting.

- If Senate is good with this, Kent Porter and Amanda Quintero will reach out to Virgil to figure out logistics for getting names
- Get information to Virgil in next day or two, review, Virgil will try to create a slot for this at Senate meeting next week. G. Chase will request this info from Kent and Amanda
  - S. Aloisio: Anticipating questions that may come up – are lecturer faculty eligible? If so, are part-time lecturer faculty eligible to do this? K. Tollefson – grant-writing committee defers to Senate Exec on establishing rules for faculty selection
  - G. Chase: Need to loop in Chairs and Deans – schedules are being made now for Fall 2018, don't want to surprise anyone

## 5. New Business

- a. SP 17-0X: University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy to supersede SP15-15
    - 1. Summary of proposed changes to University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (SP 15-15)
  - C. Wyels – recommend summary of changes be sent out along with policy in Senate materials
  - A. Jimenez: will be approved as a whole? V. Adams: Yes
  - V. Adams: RTP Policy ready to go
  - b. SP 17-0X: Unit Load Policy Draft
  - K. Tollefson question: #4 on p. 2 – lacking info about time for Chairs to override decision made by advisor.
    - A. Jimenez: suggest 3-day timeline for chairs to override such a decision. During those 3 days, a student could technically enroll in a class. If a Chair overrides the decision, what happens?
    - C. Wyels: Do we need to provide Chair opp to override, or do we trust advisor to make that call? V. Adams: As chair, if you don't have a 3.0 GPA, no case for overload. Case by case basis, decisions made.
    - Chelsea: Academic advising doesn't advise on majors; program chair would know which classes to go with others, which are too difficult to take with others.
    - C. Wyels: Second recommendation for 3-day timeline (business days) – whole process would then take place within 5 business days.
- ## 6. Time Certain:
- a. 2:45pm: Mary Adler and Chelsee Bente – Academic Dishonesty
  - Mary and Chelsee: PPT slides: “Academic Dishonesty” presentation to academic senate exec committee
    - J. Meriwether and M. Adler noticed in A&E big spike of cases reported to their offices. Chelsee sees whole campus reportings.

\*Please review an associated document or website prior to the meeting.

- Chelsea: About 40 academic dishonesty cases in this academic year, to date. Last year 59 cases in total, year before that 54. Don't know what explains significant spike in reported cases. We are building up a culture of reporting out these incidents; majority of what we're seeing is plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration.
- Numbers still relatively low for our size; research indicates that 2/3 of college students at some point will commit some form of A.D. of some kind, whether they realize it or not.
- Our policies need to match up to ensure our infrastructure supports timely, consistent response.
- Mary: Cases this Fall semester – apparent that we have procedures and policies that don't line up, esp when reaching across campus to Dean of Student, Records and Admin, Catalog, faculty. Talking with Chelsea – SP in 2013 and EO in 2015 that changes the way we need to be working with this issue. Wanted to bring this conflict, does Senate Exec want to create a committee to address?
- EO 1098 Student Conduct Procedures – Cases Involving Academic Dishonesty. Says how things should be handled by faculty. After action taken with student, reported to VP of Student Affairs or designee. Will look at full totality of students' conduct, not just academics (include housing, other misconduct across campus). Can also look to say, not just academic dishonesty in one class, but this one too – see pattern – evaluate interventions and maybe heighten interventions. This is what current EO says
- Current SP (SP 13-06):
  - Faculty report incident to Provost and VPSA: however, no mechanism to report to the Provost; Provost is not tracking these reports, would duplicate recording efforts in SA
  - Student may appeal charges through the student judicial process detailed in Univ Catalog: However, no such process is in the catalog; EO prescribes that faculty generate findings/non-findings of academic dishonesty; missing faculty review appeals, and in the case of a non-finding, apply a grade change; missing – student conduct reviews “so the circumstances of the misconduct can be considered in their totality” (EO) to consider additional sanctions and provide a secure record keeping function
- Mary: Another conflict with policy:
  - SP13-06 says student conduct shall “notify Enr Mgmt Svcs whenever a course grade assignment is due to a finding of academic dishonesty” : however, neither student conduct nor records if following this practice; Records does not know if they are able to flag records this way; SP 12-2 (grade forgiveness policy) depends on this process: (“Grade forgiveness shall not be applicable to courses for which the original grade was the result of a finding of AD)
  - Needs clarity of definitions regarding forms of academic dishonesty, which can look quite different depending on the discipline and media type

- Other issues: maintenance of files (Item 4): possible addition of consultation with program chair and/or dean (item 2); “guilty” language (item 3)
  - Program chair disagreed with faculty decision – Mary asked to talk with faculty member, faculty comfortable with their decision, no authority to override that decision – should faculty be required to seek consultation with chair, dean?
- Chelsee: Unauthorized collaboration – see these cases very often – students don’t always know when it’s not allowed
- S. Aloisio: Sounds like this is something you want to refer to SAPP? Comment, if understanding correctly, not flagging cases because our software won’t let us do that. We shouldn’t let software decide how academic policies are being enforced.
  - Mary: Didn’t say they couldn’t do it; just that we haven’t been doing this.
  - Simone: Have been doing this for 15 years – 2002 policy
  - G. Chase: Question – Do institutions typically, when a student has plagiarized or done other AD, is that forever on their transcript? Chelsee: Not always. In some places, student receives XF – X = cheated, F – grade. After a year could go through appeal process after completing Academic Integrity course to get X removed. Hangup in how we flag this information. We could figure out something to make it work – just a matter of how we implement. If tools don’t currently exist, then
  - Simone – issue isn’t flagging on transcript. Issue is can student re-take and substitute grade for calculating GPA. Don’t know how other CSUs handle that.
  - Chelsee: Transcript – equity issue. We aren’t receiving every case, being reported. If we do buy into this we need strong buyin from everyone to ensure consistency.
  - G Chase: Fac member who discovers AD and lets student re-take, another faculty reports and it’s on transcript forever. That’s the concern.
  - Chelsee: We can at least document and track when cases are reported. If pattern has emerged, can decide then to take action, beyond what faculty member may have wanted to do.
  - Antonio: Important to identify different levels of academic dishonesty within a class. If a student fails a class because they had an F in one assignment, but class allows it to happen – then 2<sup>nd</sup> F = F for class. But if student gets F on one assignment and that triggers F in the whole class – then if that’s in the record, that’s different than when there is an F in an overall class. We should be able to differentiate that, in terms of what AD effect is.
  - Antonio: Wonder about our repeat rule. If it happens in a mandatory course, mandatory in a program, and we don’t allow re-take... Virgil: They can re-take but not replace. Can’t remove F from transcript and GPA calculation. Simone: It’s on transcript, regardless. Virgil: Yes, just not calculated into GPA

- Mary: Staff in past have been asked to take this up by Dean of Students, but they declined to do so, beyond their purview. Requires larger, campuswide conversation. This is why the issue is brought to Senate Exec, to decide if to send to SAPP. If so, someone from dean of Student office should sit in on that conversation (they're not a member of SAPP)
- b. 3:00pm: Ivona – Math response to 1110
- See handout
- Ivona: request senate time re how CI will address EO 1100
- Category 4 –
- Previous meeting with several people, this handout simplifies based on feedback from that conversation
- Summary
  - Applies to Math and English. Ivona only addressing Math
  - In past, ELM requirement – required a student to pass ELM test or equivalent (SAT, e.g.), to not be put into remedial math courses. CO wants to get rid of remediation. CO wants to put students as quickly as possible in college level course. Remedial courses did not carry credit to graduation.
  - Students will have 1 unit of extra remedial work attached to regular course, or they will go into Stretch, where remedial work is included in regular coursework.
  - CO table (see handout) – tells campuses how to place students into these courses.
  - Students divided into 4 categories
    - 1: Very good students, high SAT/AP scores
    - 2: Met standard – will have to go first year into B4 course
    - 3: Need some remediation – recommended to go to course, a 1-unit correct course (light green on handout) – no credit toward BA – can opt to go to stretch courses
    - 4: placed into stretch courses – like a stats course, take for 2 semesters instead of 1; while they are doing this course, gaps in math will be filled as they go “in-time teaching” as required
  - Placement works like this: for Category 3 and 4 (no work needs to be done by any major)
    - STEM students have to be placed into pre-calc class
    - Students whose majors require statistics: they could be remediated, meet B4 requirement, via stretch courses
    - Most special group – take a lot of different math courses (e.g., for teachers, for poets, etc. not so heavy on math): requirement for these students is lowered. They have to meet only Algebra I standard, as defined by California Common Core standards. (Other students must meet Algebra II or Pre-Calc.)
  - The arrow between two courses on handout – stretch
  - Two lines – can take at the same time those two courses

- Simone: Have these courses been submitted to Curriculum? Ivona: Yes. Already in system.
  - Simone: Co-requisite system, do they have to be non-credit-bearing? Ivona: Can be 1 credit. Because CO – this is content from high school so cannot carry college credit. In the past, the students would come underprepared, have 2 semesters of non-credit-bearing math prep. Clarify: This is CO mandated, not from our campus. We will now offer only 1 unit of help, versus in the past 2 semesters. This will affect a lot of our students. We are one of a few campuses not impacted – we take students other campuses won't admit.
  - Simone: Let's say a major decides we don't require stats, but we want to. We want our students to take the stats path. Is there flexibility for a major? Ivona: If a major adds a stats class, then their students will automatically get tracked to this. Admire our Admissions Office – they have to do this tracking by hand, implementing CO placement table. They are planning to place students into courses at the very beginning; student comes on campus placed. Students can move. A student can move to Stretch. A category 4 student can move up – take ALECS (sp?) placement test and move up.
    - Student takes test: gets modules to improve. Computer-identified modules, student tests and retakes on own; then comes to campus to take supervised test.
  - Virgil: CC does curriculum, not programs. Ivona: Meaning what? Virgil: It's CC job to decide what we do with curriculum moving forward. It's not a program. Simone: Yes, that's why I asked about whether courses submitted to CC. Ivona: Yes. Virgil: Unless this is CC approved, not a Senate agenda item. We will discuss it and I'll let you know in next day or so. Ivona: Up to you if you want to see this or not. I'm just offering. This was initiated last May; people worked on it for 7-8 months. CO is pushing everyone to complete the work ASAP. Virgil: Yes, we're aware we have to do something. We will discuss and let you know if Senate Exec decides to put on the agenda. Senate next week must end by 4pm, so if we bring to agenda may be the meeting after that. Ivona: Fine either way, if Senate Exec wants Senate to see this at this point or not. It is a big change. Faculty members may have questions about how we are going about this. That's why we want to present it. Virgil: And I'm saying CC oversees what we do with curriculum, not a program. Ivona: Not clear what you are saying. CC doesn't design courses, they approve them. So, you want CC to present this? That's fine. Talked to Blake and Jeanne, they should be part of any presentation. Ivona on CO Advisory Committee on this, don't care who presents at Senate. Virgil: Will get back to you.
- c. 3:15pm: Frank Barajas – SR 11-03/ Chancellor's Letter 1/29/18
- Frank: Based on conversation I had wanted to have prior to last Senate meeting during Community time. Had understood this to be a time when faculty could talk to each other, not just socialize and listen to music. Since there was opposition to Frank speaking at end of All-Faculty meeting, am running out of venues in which to try to have a conversation



about inclusivity and equity, having tenure-track faculty that reflects the demographic shift that has occurred. Not happening. It has occurred. Wanted to bring up at community time our resolution 11-03 in which, almost unanimously passed. But Was not able to do that. Would like that resolution to be reformulated into some sort of policy, have some traction to be implemented at the University. Right now, little to no policy/procedures when it comes to hiring tenure-track faculty. That's one of the most important things we do here, but not much to guide us. We have a tradition that is extremely fluid and inconsistent. Asking Senate Exec to be a leader, not the leader, in making this place a better place for historically under-represented. Look around this table and you can see the lack thereof. We don't need tokens. We need a critical mass to reflect where I come from. Where 60% of our students come from. What is my ask?

- My ask: Have a conversation in which we can convert Resolution 11-03 into a policy. In that policy, have some sort of language in which... as soon as possible, if not immediately, hire VP of Faculty Affairs, that is current and up to date in latest innovations for diversifying faculty. Not one oriented to compliance, but one that brings institutional change in making this a more democratic and reflective tenure-track faculty.
- With Academic Senate's help, with new Fac Aff AVP, that we can work with the task force that the President created at the start of this academic year, with Prof José Alamillo, who leads it, and that the admin play another leadership role that faculty can support. That the admin hold units/depts./programs accountable in regards to interviewing, bringing onto campus, forwarding to admin for hire – of the historically under-represented. At this moment, there is no accountability whatsoever to advance inclusive hiring of historically under-represented. No looking at pools. No looking at job descriptions to see if they conform to best practices.
- It's no one group that's going to do it. It's us collectively – Senate, Task Force, President – she wants to sign off on people who are historically under-represented. But they don't come to her desk. If there is no top 3 from
- If I was president – I would go back to my Provost and say why am I getting only names that are white? Prov to Fac Aff. Fac Aff to DSCs. Who approved this pool? Learned this at Cypress College 25 years ago. This is basic accountability. This is not even a conversation here.
- That's my ask. How can we work together? How can Academic Senate be a leader in advancing candidacy for historically underrepresented candidates.
- John Y: If a policy were to be written, would this go through Faculty Affairs Committee? Who would take leadership? Simone: Yes, FAC. Senate Exec would send this to FAC to look at.
- J Yudelson: Exemplars? Frank; Yes – Cal State Bakersfield seem highly regarded. We don't have to reinvent the wheel. CSUN has policies about this, too. If Cal State Bakersfield is amenable, adopt it, make it our own over time. C Wyels: Boston College. Simone: UC Riverside.
- J Griffin: How do we avoid legal requirements, re. we don't consider race? Do we open ourselves up to some kind of backlash if we create policy that gives priority to certain racial demographics? C Wyels: What we are not doing is following best practices for

attracting as broadly diverse pools as possible. We are not advocating for preferential treatment but for fair treatment. If we are not held accountable for minimal implicit bias, etc., if we are not doing research-based best practices... We aren't asking to swing the pendulum so far over, but to examine if we are doing basic fairness best practices.

- Frank: We can take race into account. Prop 209 defers to federal law, which allows for consideration of race as one criterion for consideration of hiring. Even our Fac Affairs person awhile back was mistaken about Prop 209 and how we can allow for consideration of race/ethnicity.
- S Kelly: How do we know when we're looking at files if someone comes from under-represented populations? Frank: That's easy: Organizations, training, community service, Spanish surnames. Sean: From personal experience –daughter's last name is Kelly. Is she a person of color? Frank: Look at file holistically, ... interruption... When you look at application as a whole, you get clear indications of who this person is and their background. In filling out application, asks how do you view diversity in terms of the University. People of Color will indicate in clear and certain terms. If you look for that, you will find it. Simone: I see your passion and disagree with it. I think it's hard. I have friends who don't self identify. There are things in our hiring practices that we can change, that will draw out diversity. Points to that we do need have this conversation across campus. Frank: History, we have no problem finding diversity. Other programs, it's like we're looking for a unicorn. Look at mathematics – there was intent, and they brought in two Latina faculty members. Simone: Supportive of that conversation.
- K Tollefson: Support taking this to campuswide conversation – structured conversation to find out where and how we are meeting basic fairness
- Virgil: Will get back to Frank within next couple of days.

#### Senate Exec Discussion

- Academic Dishonesty: C. Wyels doesn't need time on Senate floor; ready to take that to Committee. Special committee was request. S Stratton: This one should be with SAPP. Simone: If request comes from Senate Exec they'll probably do it. S Stratton: We can suggest an administrator from SA.
- Ivona:
  - Chelsea: Univ Catalog B4 is Computers and Tech; B3 is Math and Applic. Simone: That's changed. Chelsea – we're using old materials in advising. Stratton: Old is still applicable through this year.
  - Chelsea: Other B4 courses, students will be confused about which courses to take. Will need more guidance – which ones are exclusive, which ones not, upper/lower division
  - Virgil: Aren't there hidden prereqs in this model? Simone: Not really. Not everything you take has to count toward degree. Math major: can assume that 120 required course in major can be calc. Don't have to start with 105. So CO allows you to make some assumptions of the student who's going to come into your major, whether those assumptions are realistic or not. Is this going to add 4 units to every single major? Right now, that's a legitimate



question. But the answer, I would push back on CO, and say the answer is no. We are assuming students are not coming in Category 3 and 4, that they're coming in 1 and 2. Even though the reality is not that. I would point to STEM. Chemistry is saying students are Calc ready, even though 60% aren't. If CO doesn't buy that, then (couldn't hear)

- Stratton: These other pathways don't have to be followed. Anyone can create a quantitative reasoning course. Simone: Yes. If Art wanted to make their own QR course and it was approved by GE and CC, they could do that.
- Chase: Critical that we make sure, because CO is intent on 120 unit issue, we don't want to get into position where we are inadvertently requiring more than 120 to complete. Due diligence: we need to make sure that's addressed up front. Stratton: Are we changing degrees already requiring more than 120? Simone: Kind of like Stretch Composition, something like 2/3 of our students take Stretch. We're not adding those units. Even if all majors take that option. The analogy is that. If CO makes us change Stretch Math, and comes back and says now your majors are over 120 units, I would push back on that. Maybe that's a day that'll come, but now, would push back hard. And they're not saying that right now.
- Stratton: Ivona's handout needs to go to Blake and Jeanne. Virgil: Clear in bylaws that it's CC job to tell us. In the Fall we said CC, GE and GEAR Task Force would lead the way in helping us conform to these two Eos. But this handout not approved by CC yet.
- Wyels: Category 3 and 4 (CO determined categories) that's a smaller category of students than previously placed in 194 and 195. So it's a reduction in total number of units. Previously could've been paying for up to 10 units that didn't count to graduate. Point 2: This has changed since submitted to CC. Math 97A and 97B tied to (missed this). What CC has to consider is a little bit different from what's on this sheet.
- J Yudelson: Any impact on transfer students? Virgil: Incoming freshmen. Stratton: Transfers should have already met lower division requirements.
- Virgil: Do we need to give Ivona time on Senate Floor to discuss this? Consensus: No. Message to Ivona: Thank you, we look forward to proposal from CC. Really no proposal – just a change to submit.
- SR 1103
  - Stratton: Fine if Frank addresses people before Senate. Disagree with some of what he says. Job descriptions have to be put together early, run by AA, etc. I think we are doing these things. Can get better. Don't want him to create this world where this is not happening because it is.
  - Simone: Task force created to address this issue last semester? Kaia: Advising Pres, not doing the work is the charge
  - JGriffin: CFA long-term commitment to this; we need more than one-time facilitation
  - [I got into this conversation – lost track of note-taking]

- Skelly: (1) Have brought up with Kent that we need a policy on hiring; disturbing when needed guidance on an issue and couldn't go anywhere than to an email sent to me – not good practice; (2) investigation of PoliSci process was completed, no irregularities found – were none, so none should have been found; (3) 3 of last four hires offers have been to Latino candidates. Only this latest one went to a white candidate first. Very sensitive on this issue and doing all that we can; hiring in a field where 20 of 202 candidates had Latino last names. Not a valid way of identifying.
- J parry: Bigger conversation needs to happen is one issue; fixing our hiring practices is another. Having more transparency and guidance in our hiring practice is needed. Getting people to think reflexibly. Some of these experiences – we did due diligence, this is what it yielded. Is everyone embarking on a search committee understanding due diligence, what constitutes a good pool? Getting advice here, there is no answer.
- Virgil: Serious allegations made a few weeks ago; asked him not to present prior to senate because I fielded complaints. We have great people whose hearts are in the right place. Don't subscribe to accusations... 87 of our hires post-resolution.
- CWyels: We have no policy, regularly followed guidance on how to do things. Until we do we will have investigations after the fact.
- Simone: We should have this conversation about how to improve our practices, how do we get there vs. whether Frank is right or not. Come back to Inclusive Excellence Task Force – they should facilitate this conversation
- Kaia: IE Task Force struggles with this – Pres explicit charge is to advise her.
- Stratton: Advise the president – give her a policy. Have never sat on a committee that has not done due diligence. That committee is perfect for advising that policy.
- Chase: Faculty Affairs is working on hiring guidelines. They're already working on these issues – not only for diversity, but other issues (e.g., confidentiality, timelines, etc) – to regularize, make sure we're doing things by the book, make sure faculty committees understand their role, the charge. That's already underway. Other part of this – as Kaia said, this tension, \$200K specifically to address this issue – but it came after the start of this semester. Part of the problem is that we're having to rush and slow down at the same time. Critically important. Like the idea – bring in an outside facilitator this spring. Bakersfield, Riverside, Boston College, Georgia Tech – a lot of institutions are doing good work in this area. Talk to them about how they got to where they are.
- Antonio: Faculty important, but conversation is bigger, university-wide. Same when hiring admin or staff. Should be all-inclusive. Not only at faculty hiring level.

- Genevieve: Brinign in an expert is one thing – a listening thing, Geoff – Kaia talking about another thing, helping us get through painful conversations. Simone: I'm interested in best practices conversation. If we could get that happening. Re mediator to smooth out this situation, don't know if that's Senate business, but that needs to happen, too.
- Virgil: What do we want to do? Give Frank time before Senate?
  - Kaia: Frank's ask was to have a conversation about converting Resolution 11-03 into a policy
    - Virgil moved, John Y 2nded: send SR11-03 to Faculty Affairs, see if they can convert to policy
    - Simone: Hopefully after we've had some conversations on campus
    - Virgil: Not realistic to get policy through this year, but conversations can begin – discuss what policies can come out of that resolution
    - Virgil: withdraw motion as stated. Restated motion: Send to Fac Affairs to begin discussion about how we can convert SR11-03 into a policy. Ask Kent to incorporate policy he's drafting points in SR 11-03. Geoff: Fac Aff Cmte – Frank's ask was to turn SR11-03 into policy. Kent's task as Interim VP for Fac Aff and what he's now working on is broader guidelines around hiring process – he's already in a fact-finding mode for that. May not want to conflate the two.
    - Virgil: Send to Fad Aff and have them start the conversation.
  - Virgil: Also, can talk about bringing a facilitator here
  - Geoff: Will work with Fac Aff, research possible names
  - Simone: John Griffin mentioned bringing Cecil Canton, Sac State here. Yudelson: He works in Criminology, powerful, African American, wonderful speaker. Simone: He would be a great facilitator.

#### 7. Chair Report

- Will include depth this conversation (i.e., sent to Fac Aff, Cecil Canton coming to CI)

#### 8. Senate Agenda Review

- a. Note location change to MAL 100
- b. Please note Academic Senate MUST end by 4pm – There is a class being held in MAL 100

#### 9. Other Business

- a. Call for Applications for Exceptional Service to Students for Fall 2018
- Ready to go; Virgil will send out today or tomorrow
- b. Simone Aloisio: Tenure Density

\*Please review an associated document or website prior to the meeting.



## ACADEMIC SENATE

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

- Will report next meeting
  - c. Senate Committee elections: Request to include meeting times
- We like this – esp for GE, CC, big committees
  - d. Call for Nominations for Honors Convocation Planning Committee
- Want to have Bob Bleicher's role be selected faculty member, someone selected to be the Honor Marshall and Card Reader
  - Antonio: Good to have open call to invite others who can read cards rather than go to same people repeatedly
  - Cindy: senate Exec should come up with criteria and process
  - I had to leave 😊

\*Please review an associated document or website prior to the meeting.