Members Present: Andrew Carlos, Paul Carpenter, Karina Garbesi, Julie Glass, Edward Inch, Mark Karplus, Michael Lee, Jeff Newcomb, Ian Pollock, Stephanie Seitz, Jason Smith, Meiling Wu

Guests: Jake Hornsby, Mark Robinson, Maureen Scharberg, Angela Schneider, Mitch Watnik, Shirley Yap

Members Absent: Leroy Morishita

1) Approval of the agenda
   - M/S: Glass/Carlos
   - 7b strike “director”
   - 7a - ii to b, iii to c, iv to d, b to e
   - Motion to add 18-19 BEC 7 (handed out as hard copy) as business item 6f (Carlos/Newcomb)
     - Discussion about how pressing this is; is it customized for EB, or just Humboldt language (is customized)
     - /P unanimous
   - /P unanimous

2) Approval of 2/19/19 minutes
   - M/S Garbesi/Smith
   - Attach amendment line 111
   - Add “begin the” after Excomm line 189
   - Misspelling of Watnik line 106
   - /P as amended unanimous

3) Reports:
   a) Report of the Chair
      - Went to as many standing committee meetings as possible
        - went to FAC to help address Monday class issue
        - FAC chair discussion to amend bylaws to close loopholes and address eligibility issues
   b) Report of the President - no report; President is in Taipei
   c) Report of the Provost
      - Colleges have done a good job with budgets; all coming in under budget
      - Should be uptick in enrollment next year
      - Would like to have conversation with COBRA to have transparent multi-year budgeting
- Should have last feedback report about pilot workload program by Friday, should have $1M allocated, goal is to provide research opportunities for probationary faculty

d) Report of the Statewide Academic Senators - no report

- Question about GE taskforce report discussions, resolution against passed at Stanislaus, Chair Lee will share information he is getting with Statewide Senators and eventually Excomm
- There will be a normal 2 reading process; will make a report at earliest at plenary in Nov.
- Discussion about whether Statewide will follow tenets document, test of whether campuses can do this together
- In the future should set aside time to discuss at Senate
- Already under discussion at GEOC
- Seems that substantive background information is missing from report

4) Appointments/Approvals:

a) Spring 2019 CEAS replacement for Talya Kemper on GEOC and CIC
   - Linda Smetana, Educational Psych for GEOC
     - M/S Garbesi/Carpenter
     - /P 1 abstention
   - Cathy Inouye, Kinesiology for CIC
     - M/S Garbesi/Carpenter
     - /P 1 abstention

b) Schedule for Spring 2019 Election 2 of 2: College, Lecturer, SSP, Emeriti and Staff election
   - M/S Karplus/Smith
   - /P unanimous

5) Information:

a) College Representative Distribution to the 2019-2020 University Tenure and Promotion Committee memo
   - M/S Smith/Garbesi
   - Discussion:
     - Clarification that intention is we accept and put as information item for Senate
     - Is there rule that there should be 5 members? Should be tied to actual number as opposed to percentage.
       - At FAC there was memo that proscribed five as membership model - is in RTP document
       - Not an issue of workload, but representation
       - Should there be membership from Library since it’s a college, would be discussion about changing constitution/bylaws and RTP document
       - Might be something wrong with numbers/representation given percentages
       - Historically membership has been based on majority gets two
     - Senate office will change CSI to CSCI in table
   - /P unanimous

6) Business:

a) 18-19 FAC 8: Proposed solution to Monday only courses in Fall 2018 having only 12 class meeting days
M/S Garbesi/Wu

Discussion:

- Second paragraph of background - misspelled Watnik
- Section D, should read “so that class meets until later at night”
- Paragraph below A/B on 2nd page
  - Departments’ should be singular possessive (department’s)
- Under Recommendation: FAC recommends that: 1
  - Should read “restore lost contact time” rather than 1/15th
- Subsections of CFR are not referenced, questioning accuracy of statements
  - Will ask FAC chair to amend prior to Senate meeting to include citations
    of subsections (or explain on Senate floor)
- Registrar’s office guest - discussion on feasibility of some recommendations -
  some recommendations giving responsibility to registrar are not things that
  registrar can do
  - Registrar does not have responsibility/purview to make changes to
    schedule
  - Room scheduling has to be taken into account
  - Staff of scheduling would make changes (contact department schedulers,
    then sent to room schedulers)
  - Language of Recommendation 3 - delete reference to registrar and
    include contact with schedulers
- Classes that fall outside of regular time modules are scheduled last
- What would be implication if no policy is passed?
  - No makeup for lost contact time unless unofficial changes are made at
    department/faculty level
  - Can’t guarantee contact hours
  - WASC would have to check via piecemeal process
  - APS would have to work with each department and would be time
    consuming
- Number 4 - does that refer to option D
  - Could be amendment proposed on Senate floor
- If no policy is passed, would potentially fall to APS and/or administration to make
  decision unilaterally
- Did FAC refer to previous remedy
  - FAC had issues with it not working well at other campuses and may have
    impacts on lecturers
- Is doing anything you want a better solution than an imperfect policy solution?
- Point 5 cannot be done from the registrar
  - It’s up to the department to communicate with students; will only happen
    after enrollment; may cause some student consternation; will be
    inconsistent and confusing
    - Would have to be done by department scheduler
    - Feasible to appear to student at time of enrollment
    - Language must be changed so that does not include registrar
FAC did not understand what could/could not be done by registrar

- Bulk of scheduling will change to W/F; chairs may decide not to schedule M classes
- Should recommendation 8 be the only solution?
- Can we use this opportunity to collect data on solutions and consequences for future
- Call the question - no objections
- /P 1 abstention

b) 18-19 CIC 14 & 18-19 CAPR 9: Religious Studies Minor

- M/S: Wu/Carlos
- /P unanimous

c) 18-19 CIC 15: Approval of SOC 330 to satisfy GE Area D4
d) 18-19 CIC 16: Approval of SOC 340 to satisfy GE Area D4
e) 18-19 CIC 17: Approval of SOC 360 to satisfy GE Area D4

- Bundling c-e
- M/S: Wu/Carlos
- Substitute Motion to put all 3 on consent calendar: Karplus/Wu
  - Make sure to remind body that they have the ability to pull it if controversial
- /P unanimous (substitute motion)

f) 18-19 BEC 7

- M/S Pollack/Newcomb
- Motion to postpone to next meeting: Smith/Garbesi
  - /P unanimous

7) Discussion:

a) Ongoing Constitution/Bylaws review
i) Procedures to determine criteria satisfaction to serve on Senate Committees

- Proposal to put together checklists for every position for which there is an election/appointment (could be self check, followed by check by excomm prior to election/appointment)
  - Anything to create more clarity is important
  - Should be job of senate office to check eligibility to streamline process
    - Excomm has responsibility to determine eligibility
    - Mechanic/logistic process to capture nuances in documents
  - Loopholes regarding, for example, term limits must be clarified prior to making checklists
  - Marketing issue - don’t want to discourage anyone from participating; shouldn’t be seen as “crack down” on rules, simply clarification
  - Simplicity and clarity is paramount

b) Standing Rules Clarification

- No discussion

c) Documentation re: approval of University Requirements

- Handout from Garbesi re: process for approving GE and overlays
Do we know of examples where faculty have felt constrained? Is this hypothetical  problem?
These have been developed over a long time. Do we want to consider a change regarding the “teeth”, would that be a direction to CIC to review?
Assumed to be examples, so changing wording shouldn’t be a problem
Conflict between too prescriptive and then not prescriptive enough
Need conversation about what it means that outcomes be thoroughly incorporated into course
  Resolve inconsistency between courses as approved and offered
Forms may be completed during planning stage of course, and might not reflect actuality of course, so appropriate words to use are “could” and “might” as opposed to directing
Should have review process to see extent of deviation between planned course and actual course offering (5 years)
ILO assessment may reflect learning from other classes, since data collected at institutional level. Could be assessed within the context of class taken.
As it stands, there are loopholes. Example - sustainability means a specific thing, shouldn’t stretch to use on class
  Intention of overlays is to be broad - shouldn’t cause sustainability to be more narrow than others
  Course must have some artifact through which students develop on outcome
Rollover to discussion at next meeting due to time certain
e) Excom review of Honors Program Director (3:30 PM time certain)
  Dr. Yap presentation
    Is job description accurate: would add to job description
    Has been talking to UHP advisory committee
    Showed marked up document of job description with proposed changes
      Red: may not be appropriate under UHP director job
      Purple: Should be changed/added
    Director/Staff work ratio
  Questions to Dr. Yap
    Might add goals/priorities/vision for 2 year term
    Should consider percentage of students from each major
    Business processes issues - if they were resolved, how would that affect workload
      Dr. Yap has been spending a lot of time automating processes, much of staff position work is now automated
      Funds may be able to be redirected from staff position to other faculty who are now doing work to mentor students as goodwill
    Is extra coursework in individual classes best model?
    Excomm should meet with incoming director to continue conversation, and have conversation more frequently.
    May be appropriate to send to CAPR for program review.
  Will send out updated job description based on Dr. Yap’s suggestions
d) Possible Ad Hoc Committee on Housing
8) Academic Senate 3/5/19 draft agenda (3:50 PM time certain)
● M/S: Karplus/Garbesi
 ○ Approved items will be added
 ■ Information item
 ■ Consent calendar
 ■ 18-19 FAC 8
 ■ Religious studies minor
 ○ To include election of DELO
 ● /P unanimous

Motion to extend 5 minutes Wu/Garbesi
/P

Meeting adjourned at 4:05