

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

Tuesday, April 24, 2018
2:00 – 4:00 pm
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

N. Schürer, J. Pandya, D. Stewart, A. Colburn, R. Fischer, R. Frear, E. Guzik, K. Janousek, E. Klink, J. Doering, D. Domingo-Forasté, S. Olson, J. Hamilton, A. Kinsey
Absent: C. Bowles, J. Moran, J. Nino, P. Soni, S. Apel, B. Jersky, J. Cormack,
Guests: S. Kim, P. Marayong

1. Called to Order 2:06 PM
2. Approved Amended Agenda secs. 7.3-7.6
3. Approved Amended Minutes: Meeting of April 17, 2018
4. Announcements and Information
 - 4.1. See room change on 5.1.
5. Reminder
 - 5.1. Puvungna meeting Project Thursday, April 26, 10:00-11:00 am (AS 125)—note room change!
 - 5.2. Academic Senate meeting on May 3, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, PSY 150
6. Special Orders
 - 6.1. Report: Provost Jersky
7. New Business
 - 7.1. **Agenda for Academic Senate meeting on May 3, 2018**; Two meetings, one organizational (@ 2:00 PM) for new Senate officers (have a power point to explain process); one for regular business. **The second, regular business meeting will start at 2:30 PM.**
 - 7.1.1. Possible GE policy preparation work over the summer discussed.
 - 7.1.2. **Voting on nominations in the Senate.** Some positions are not yet open to nomination (as candidates haven't been pre-screened by the Nominating cmte to meet required qualifications; or, the position is restricted by college or other criteria that can't be addressed on the floor. ACTION: Place an asterisk next to positions that cannot take straight nominations from floor; have a .ppt slide explain the protocol for exceptions.
 - 7.1.3. RSCA policy ready for Senate. May take time to discuss? ACTION: Defer to next year.

- 7.2. **Certificates from non-academic units:** AVP for Research and Sponsored Programs Simon Kim—TIME CERTAIN 3:15 pm BUILD funded by NIH.
- 7.2.1. We have a six component certificate program, including courses on scientific writing, research professional development training, research presentation, advanced research methods, etc. These have the RSCH prefix. This is a second UNIV prefix. Courses are three units. Students from CLA, CHHS, COE, and CNSM have participated. It's not a formal but an informal certificate program. It does not show on the transcript [but could have a "badge"]. These are research infused course for BUILD undergraduates. All courses with RSCH prefix are in CNSM. RSCH 361 is crosslisted. The BUILD program requires student to take three at most, i.e. one per year. Some are GE certified. We are hoping we can expand the offerings—not just for sciences.
- 7.2.2. Question JP: Why are you here? Are we talking about an Undergraduate Certificate? Or, maybe not a certificate program—just people taking classes.
- 7.2.3. NS: this is a huge problem if teaching assignments are not housed in depts. SK: CNSM is "coordinating" two courses for biomedical. BUILD is responsible, meaning the PIs for BUILD who work with individuals. The problem is to formalize undergraduate research. BUILD serves 150 students in four cohorts right now.
- 7.2.4. EK: English has technical writing courses. DS: Undergraduate research courses exist in multiple disciplines now, e.g. RST 403, another in HIST, etc.
- 7.2.5. DS: To institutionalize, could follow the Honors Program model.
- 7.2.6. AC: this is an "old/new" infrastructure issue.
- 7.2.7. Q: RyF: What are other universities doing? Why can't anchor BUILD in one department or college? PM: Tried crosslisting in a college and came up with issue of resources. RyF: Could buy me out as an instructor (as in the Honors model). SK: if multiple masters don't know who's calling the shots and if there are enrollment issues, we would get caught. Needs someone at the University level. We have a PI until BUILD runs out. SO: The University has experience with the UNIV prefixed courses where they are approved by CEPC [in place of a college]. The University has experience with the Honors cmte. too. The Honors model is a good one.
- 7.2.8. DDF: Crosslisting is awkward but object to administration taking over the curriculum. Have a problem if not faculty run. The architecture allows someone other than faculty to run the curriculum. This is really about the faculty running curriculum. Wants the architecture be faculty driven.
- 7.2.9. RECCOMENDATIONS to ORSP: Go look at the honors policy (AS 16-16) and talk to the HVDI student engagement task force.
- 7.3. **Online SPOT Issue:** DDF: someone has complained about the three week evaluation period for an online class [partially mimics three week opportunity to evaluate sit-down classes]. See AS 17-05 sec. 5. Policy is the place to address this.
- 7.3.1. AC: response rates are very low. JD: students don't know why they should do it. Tell them how it actually affects them. **OTHER POSSIBLE ACTIONS** (1) Make SPOTs private, but not anonymous, so students could win a gift card? (2) FPPC did not know that the length-of-time to complete online SPOT was understood as a problem. Thus, task next year's FPPC to rethink a better way for teacher

evaluation? What would actually be a good practice for evaluation and feedback for a professor? (3) AC: Policies may *not* need a change but just need to be followed. (4) NS: Do instructions to RTP cmtes. stress broader teacher evaluations and not just SPOT? The problem is not policy but implementation. The CBA says SPOT can't be the only evaluation technique. Talk to Mark Wiley?

- 7.4. Timing of system update PeopleSoft—no discussion
 - 7.5. FPPC Schedule—no discussion
 - 7.6. Develop questions for Associate VP Faculty Affairs—NS looking for questions from prior interview.
8. Old Business
- 8.1. GE survey and forums—no discussion
9. Adjourned at 4:02 PM