8/29/12 Minutes

In attendance: Highsmith, Karplus (acting as Chair), Watnik (acting as Secretary)

Article XVI:

- Section 11-12 (getting at comments from the last meeting): A special subcommittee that will last more than a year may be formed as a “regular subcommittee” or might be part of the committee’s report (suggesting a reconvening the following year). The online evaluation subcommittee was brought up as an example. Suggesting that the subcommittee should last longer than the committee that formed it is problematic. Namely, any subcommittee should be reformed every year. Better yet: How has this been handled in the past? Should this practice be continued? Does it need to be codified in the Bylaws?

Article XVII:

- The committees should each consider their Policies and Procedures to ensure that they are in compliance with the corresponding bylaws.
- Section 1 A 4, if there is a SALO, this clause suggests CIC consulting with SALO. (Perhaps the Chair of CIC should be the SALO?)
- Section 1 C 3, why is the Librarian called “representative” and not “member”? Why is Presidential Appointee listed second when other committees list that later. (General consistency of membership listing would be a good idea.)
- Section 1 c 6 should be changed to “Division of Continuing and International Education”.
- Section 2 a 2, few programs are actually meeting this 5-year deadline. Additionally, some externally-accredited programs have been granted reviews at longer than 5 year intervals by CAPR. What are the WASC views on 5-year reviews? Are they okay with longer intervals for external accreditation (or even general programs)? Should this be changed or should practice CAPR be changed.
- Section 2 a 2, the 18 month deadline is often missed, too. CAPR review its own workings?
- Section 2 a in general, should CAPR review and update its charges?
- Section 2 a 8 overlaps with section 5 a 4. ExCom (with input from CAPR and COBRA) should consider whose purview is program’s human resources (it is explicitly noted for COBRA, but CAPR has been doing it) and recommend changes to the bylaws accordingly.
- Section 2 c 2 and 4. Does the faculty have the right to name the administrator (section 4)? Is this the reason why there are 2 administration seats on the committee? The committee in fact has been operating with 1 administrator for a number of years now (a director in APGS, not the AVP; should the Bylaws state “or designee”?). Refer to CAPR.
- Section 3 a 1 b: has FAC ever made recommendations regarding financial support? Does this overlap with Research?
- Does Bylaws Article I, section 4 supersede section 3 a 1 h?
- Section 4 a 2 refers to a specific Senate policy. Is this reference updated each time the policy changes? Should the reference be there? Was there a vote on the bylaws change in 06-07 or
was it considered pro forma? Removing the reference to the document ensures that the Senate will always have a current Policy on Faculty Support Grants.

- The Task Force feels that the Bylaws state that Centers and Institutes must still go through the Senate, pending a change to section 4 a 3 d, despite the assertion of 11-12 CR 2. Some body (Committee on Research or ExCom) should put a proposal to the faculty for this change.
- Section 4 c. membership order and calling library “representative”, rather than “member”?
- Section 5 (COBRA) b 2 and section 2 (CAPR) b 2 are the same?
- Section 5 e. Has the lack of term limits outlived its purpose? Refer to COBRA.
- Section 5 e. The chair being a faculty member need not be specified anymore. Also, the Chair of any committee is expected to serve at least a year. Perhaps the second sentence should be deleted. Refer to COBRA.