

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Minutes**

Tuesday, November 5, 2019  
2:00 – 4:00 pm  
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

J. Pandya, N. Hultgren, M. Aliasgari, N. Meyer-Adams, C. Cummings, ~~D. Stewart~~, P. Hung, N. Schürer, ~~K. Janousek~~, E. Klink, ~~P. Soni~~, J. Phillips, ~~D. Hamm~~, ~~K. Bonetati~~, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, ~~B. Jersky~~, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda- MSA
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of October 29, 2019 – MSA as amended
4. Announcements and Information- NMA there are 5 seats available at a CCEJ awards ceremony. Commencement committee meet recently with NMA, Construction wall around Hall Center for upcoming construction, going up May 2<sup>nd</sup>, will block commencement area. Can the date be postponed? College coordinators are concerned that this is the largest event of our campus and perhaps can be postponed. Dec 10, January 14/21 shall we have EXEC meetings, NC suggests waiting until the last moment to cancel if not needed. Extra Senate meeting 2-20-20? Is this needed, will announce at next AS meeting. AK to put on Senate website. JZP, NH, MA met with CHHS staff council chair Friday, what they want is a “program” version of the GR’s. They will put forth an amendment for this. NH states that their accreditation is the main reason for concern on their part. They state they will achieve the standards through their programs. NH states that there was consensus as the meeting progressed. JC states that the courses could be met with lower division courses, NH said this was mentioned. Josh Chesler proposed that upper division D be put in GE. DS amendment, is this necessary or not. JZP asks if it is possible to move to a later section of the policy since there are upcoming amendments for the early sections. EK asks what the CO thinks, JC states that the CO thinks GR is OK as long as upper division and pretty much all campuses have some sort of GR requirements. NS feels faculty are uninformed on GR. He suggests we move forward ad seriatim, there has been plenty of time to put forth amendments. MA states that accredited programs have a mindset of curriculum vs. courses. SLO based works for them for this reason. Loss of category F creates fear in some majors. MA suggests on Thursday to open up discussion, so that “fear” will go away. JZP say you should write an amendment. NH says nothing crucial was changed from CEPC to now, he states this is a curriculum based approached. NH says the general ideas are there. ***JC proposes a programmatic implementation of GR, content to be as listed in the SLO’s assessment approved by GEGC/PARC or rubric.***

5. Reminder
  - 5.1. Academic Senate meeting November 7, 2019 – JZP put
6. Special Orders
  - 6.1. Report: Provost Jersky- not present
7. New Business
  - 7.1. Retreat debrief- NS states there was lots of participation. NH says someone said to rename office hours as “student hours” perhaps this would lead to more compassion. Classroom and faculty are not compassionate according to his table discussions. CC says she has changed her grading policy in certain areas, with this he has seen positive development from some students. Table discussion included collaborative community across campus, how to address the problems, perhaps a discussion board, or a best practice. She felt it was very productive over all. JC says 4 students at her table and she was very impressed with them, it was inspiring for her. Students and faculty team up and go to the senate to learn more about the University.
  - 7.2. Anti-Bias faculty reps- move to approve all four candidates by AS, MSA
  - 7.3. AS planning for 11-7-19
  - 7.4. Review of Academic Administrators (17-08), Permanent Reassignment of a Tenured or Tenure-Track faculty member (96-09); Natalie Bersig AA, TIME CERTAIN 3:00- **Policy-17-08** policy has left out Vice Provosts, NB states that the term “acting” or “interim” speaks to the nature of the appointment. The policy needs to address this issue. Consultation should take place in appointments. Interim suggests that consultation takes place before appointment, acting doesn’t necessarily have prior consultation, NS states. JC states that the terms need to be defined. Filling in for someone “on leave” is “acting” the regular appointee will return. “Acting” is on behalf of someone, a regular appointee. For HR purposes, the two are equal. “Interim” is someone filling in until a permanent person is found. For an acting appointment, there is no consultation required, for example when a position is vacated during summer. JC suggests having an emergency convening body to meet during summer, for example 12 month faculty would be appropriate for these instances. NS states that there is currently no LatinX faculty as a Dean or AD. JZP suggests passing to FPPC, and time limits need to apply to these appointments. NB sees no issue with time limits as long as consultation happens. NS feels that time limits are important. For Dean Searches some departments would like more representation on the committee. NH asks about review letters and do they need to be held at the AS office or can they be online. NH states that review letters CAN be kept on OneDrive as it is a secure site. *MSA to send PS 17-08 to FPPC for review.* **Policy 96-09** JZP suggests that there are many problematic sections of policy. NB states this policy has 30 day limits to begin the process and vote, she is not sure of the purpose of the time limits, perhaps change the timelines, perhaps Chairs need to be added to the list of those notified. JZP says “seniority points” might want to be removed, SA says they refer to layoff issues and perhaps salary issues, they are part of CBA. JZP suggests sending to FPPC.

7.5. Beach Action Plan- EC needs to come up with an action plan by 11-20-19. There is currently no vision of the Senate in 10 years. Funding can be requested for the goals we come up with. Community building/re-visioning service are two possible ideas. The future of shared governance, to strengthen community, why is service important? MA says shared governance/anti-silos/service, bringing more equal participation of service from all units. NMA says that in RTP some do not value service, service needs to be re-framed. Goal #1- exemplary shared governance. NS suggests look at 15 policies per year to see if still relevant. Strategic policy analysis plan. NS suggests asking for funds for a possible speaker series.

8. Old Business

8.1. Honors policy (16-16) potential amendments – Honors has sent amendments to CEPC, is EC ok with having CEPC work on amendments. MA suggests continuing with CEPC. Will send to CEPC for amendments.

9. Adjournment- 3:50 pm