

Executive Committee Minutes

Tuesday, November 7, 2023, 3:00 pm

Approved: November 21, 2023

Call to Order: 3:00 pm

Roll Call:

Adam Rechs, Aleta Baldwin, Amber Gonzalez, Andera Terry, Bertha Vegas Castellanos, David Moore, Jeff Wilson, Matthew Krauel, Michael Mink, Monicka Tutschka, Raul Tadle, Tracy Dawn Hamilton

Open Forum:

Senate Agenda: How do items get placed on the agenda? Concern was expressed about unscheduled items taking up time during meetings. The Chair shared that the Senate Chair, the Executive Committee, the President, and the Senate as a whole may place items on the agenda. A member of the Senate also has the options at the approval of the agenda to motion to move an item. Until the agenda is approved by the Senate it is considered a preliminary agenda.

Testing Center Appointments: Raul Tadle shared a colleague's concern about the Testing Center: Some students who do not receive DAC accommodations have set up testing center appointments to hold exams. However, the testing schedule is not necessarily approved by the instructor. After setting up the appointment, the current system then proceeds with booking the exam then asking the instructor to choose from two options:

1. Approving the exam schedule (and provide a copy of the exam), or
2. Choosing the other option that asks for the instructor to contact the testing center (via email).

The process felt a bit like the student had too much discretion over setting up the testing appointment. This is in contrast to the testing appointment scheduling that students with DAC accommodations are able to set since those schedules are pre-approved by the course instructors.

The Chair stated it sounds like it is a procedure through the Testing Center and that the procedures do not address faculty being asked if they approve the appointment or not and that there is no option to address it directly. VP Hendrick offered to check with the Testing Center to see if help is needed. The Chair suggested that conversation take place with the director of the Testing Center. Raul Tadle will contact the director of the Testing Center and update the Senate Chair.

Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was amended to 1) move #10 to follow From the Provost, and 2) add to the end of the agenda an item Research and Creative Activities Awards. The agenda as amended was approved.

Approval of the Minutes – October 31, 2023 carried.

From the Chair: New Placer Center is a satellite campus. AVP Watson would like faculty input from the Senate in helping to determine the how faculty can be a part of the process. A time will be scheduled for a presentation at the beginning of Spring semester.

From the Provost: Sarah Gast, Deputy Director of Carnegie Classifications will be on campus to discuss the Carnegie Classifications of Higher Education on November 8, 1 pm at Cottonwood Suite II Union.

Faculty Senate Standing Rules – Proposal to Amend

The Senate Chair presented a proposal from a faculty member to amend the Senate Standing Rules Article III.A-B to address presentations/information items.

Discussion Items:

Regarding Open Form / Information Items

- An argument was made to place Open Forum and Information Items at the end of the agenda so that they don't impede the business of the Senate (especially if they go long).
- Arguments were made that Open Forum should remain at the beginning of the meeting to allow for the agendaing of presented items if warranted. Because there is a set time for Open Forum, people know when to come to speak. People wouldn't know when to come to share if Open Forum was placed at the end of the agenda.

Regarding Presentations

- The time allowed for presentation may be too much.
- Presentations should be limited to five minutes, if possible, and the presenter should be timed. Perhaps the Senate can again use a "quacking" sound on the timer to advise the presenter to conclude the presentation.
- Perhaps there could be a limit on the number of presentation slides.
- Presenters should be told that they need to adhere to the time limit and should be made aware that they need to get to the purpose of the presentation quickly.
- A best practice might be that presenters focus on their three key items.
- It was suggested that if no presentation materials are provided ahead of time, then individual does not get to do a presentation.

Motion (carried): Bring the Standing Rules amendments to the Senate at the November 16 meeting as a First Reading item.

Motion (carried): Standing Rules: Article III. A.3.i.

- i. Presentations/Reports: Presentations/Reports should inform the Faculty Senate of issues, action or policies that impact campus life. Ordinarily presentations/reports materials shall be provided to the Senate Office to be placed on the Senate agenda no less than 24 hour prior to the Senate meeting. Additionally, presentations/reports shall be limited to five (5) minutes, with a five (5) minutes question and answer period. Exceptions to this must be agreed upon in advance through consultation with the Senate Chair.

Motion (carried): Standing Rules, Article III. A. 3. h.

- a. Approval of Minutes: ~~The first order of business under the Regular Agenda is the Approval of the Minutes of previous meetings.~~ Motions to correct and/or amend the minutes are in order (typographical errors can be corrected informally by simply notifying the Senate Office). Minutes are approved by a motion to approve, a second and an affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators present. If minutes for more than one previous meeting are on the agenda, they can be disposed of with a single vote or, if requested by a representative, each set of minutes may be dealt with individually.

Motion (carried): The Senate will meet on November 30 during an "off Thursday" for a regular meeting. Senators will be notified.

Call for Nominations Wording re: Statement of Interest/Qualifications amended language (approved):

Suggested language:

“If nominees wish, they may provide a statement of up to 100 words addressing their interest and qualifications by the deadline. Statements may strengthen a nominee’s application.”

Discussion

- A suggestion was made to require all nominees to provide a statement of interest regarding their qualifications. The Chair stated that if it is required, the Senate should need to weigh in on the requirement.
- Do other campus have a rubric for these types of committee appointments?
- The Provost asked if service is incentivizing through letters of appreciation.

Program Proposal – Non-Degree Program: Certificate in Teaching Cyber Security for High Schools – Graduates

The item will be placed on the November 16 agenda on Consent Action with the following items corrected: 1) Remove fully-in person. 2) Fix footnote to make it clear that the table is the Footnote.

Research and Creative Activities Awards:

Concerned has been expressed that there have been challenges in the proposal review process. Some reviewer’s comments to applicants could be considered biased and possibly contain microaggressions.

Discussion:

- Look back at the older RCA practices. It might help with some of those problems.
- The Provost will speak with Interim AVP Jawaharlal about RCA, as he oversees that award.
- Standardizing reviews and have a norming process at the beginning.
- With the one-million-dollar funding if you are submitting a proposal, should you also commit to being a reviewer if you get an award?
- It was suggested that applications be anonymous to remove potential bias by the reviewers.
- Perhaps figure out an incentive program as the work is time-intensive.
- Only 18-25% of the applications are funded. Perhaps combine with the President’s Award.
- It was shared that the discussion is timely given the President’s Award can learn from these issues.

Motion (carried): Invite the Chair of the Research and Creative Activities Awards Committee to the November 21 Executive Committee meeting to engage in a conversation about some of these issues. That discussion will then guide a referral to FPC. Items for the discussion:

- A short overview of the review process provided by the RCA Chair
- When award recipients sign their contract are they also signing on to be a reviewer for the next year?
- Funding options for serving as a reviewer.

It was requested that the following people be present for the discussion: Interim AVP of ORIED, the Provost, the VP Inclusive Excellence, the President and his Chief of Staff. The Senate Chair will extend the invitations.

Adjourned: 4:53 pm