Present: Donald J Bolger (HDQM, Chair), Kellie Rolstad (TLPL), Richard Prather (HDQM), Jennifer Rice (Dean), Dan Levin (TLPL, Chair-Elect), Michelle Espino (CHSE), Blesilda Lim (at Large, Admin Prof Rep, exempt), Lawrence Clark (at Large), Kelly Lee (CHSE), Robert Lent (CHSE), Charm Kinya Mudd (Admin Prof Rep, non-exempt), Elisa Klein (HDQM), Jessica Chew (at Large, Admin Prof Rep, exempt), Peggy Wilson (TLPL).
Absent: Olivia Saracho (TLPL), Hong Jiao (HDQM), Margaret Peterson (at Large), James Groff (TLPL, Graduate Rep)

Meeting called to order. Introductions. Senate secretary position is open; Kellie Rolstad was unanimously elected to serve as secretary.

11 present; quorum is majority plus one (9/17 is quorum).

I. Dean’s Update
Strategic Plan. Dean Rice wants advice from Senate on Strategic Plan and key initiatives. Might involve ad hoc committees. She has Council of Chairs but also needs Senate. Considered creating dean’s council, but Senate can serve this role. Wants us to be informed and take information back to our departments.

Steering committee will be critical to our vision; outside people only as needed. Dean Rice envisions having work groups – at least 3 (the pillars); they’re work groups or study groups, and will address questions such as: what are we becoming, what are our barriers? For example: Professional development for educators – why is there a decline nationwide? How do we grapple with all of these economic and political problems we are facing? What are some possible solutions? We could have speakers, open forums; maybe we could reach out to external stakeholder groups? Dean wants to be inclusive for buy in, but also needs to be efficient. Timeline? Dean says that by late Jan or early Feb we can have an open forum for the college, hopefully. Then there will be a chance to get feedback.

First outreach to the college community – sharing visions and mission statements. What will be the role of the Senate? As we take these steps, we’ll get feedback and revise.

Michelle asks whether there will be a role for students. Dean replies: yes, it will include students and all areas and representations. Maybe not all on the steering committee or work group, but students will be consulted. Communication with college assembly is crucial, so as not to duplicate activities, but will be working together.
Plan of organization? First we will launch the website, then the Plan. It's been nearly 4 years so it's a high priority. Dean Rice, Dan and DJ have been meeting on this. The Dean says we have to meet compliance, not just to be compliant and clear, but to be discerning. This is an opportunity to get to where we really want to be. For example: consider the committee structure of the senate. Do the existing committees really work? What do we really need? Maybe ad hoc committees suffice for some things, it doesn't have to all be standing committees.

Nothing to report on budget yet.

APT/PAE Policy update: Professional track policy. Composition of college committee for Professional Track: The problem is that if no one is of the highest rank, (as is the case in CHSE, which lacks anyone of the highest rank) we have to go outside, which is an issue of fairness to the people under review. Has been reframed to say “at or above the rank of the individuals being considered” instead of “at the highest rank” This year, all are going up for associate level. DJ provides clarification: “committee members must be at or above the rank the candidate will be promoted to.” Blesilda suggests turning to a retired professor, which may solve the CHSE problem. Dean Rice: fairness is the preeminent value. DJ: for TTK at the college level, the person from that dept has to recuse her- or himself. May need to get staff from other colleges, but this can also be unfair. We need to fix this policy. DJ asks for motion to amend the current PTK policy, seconded by Dan Levin. Discussion? None, move to vote? Bob Lent seconds, 13 for. Motion passes.

II. Regular Business
Minutes from April 2017 Senate Meeting DJ: approve minutes from April? Dan asks: Should draft language be kept in plan of organization? Answer: Steering committee will bring that back to the Senate.

(Lawrence Clark points out “Larry Clark absent” is incorrect.)

Motion to approve, one abstention, motion carries.

III. College Plan of Organization
DJ: the 2012 approved plan and the 2014 plan (never approved) have inaccuracies and need updating after last year's changes.
Dan talks thru the previous plan. How do we optimize our Plan? Handout showing existing Plan structure and an example proposed structure. Example of problem: We always have diversity and inclusion committees in the senate, and this category should be elevated to the level of a committee, unlike some of the other categories. James Groff is helping align GSO plan with the Plan of Org. Steering committee is working on bylaws.
DJ: Some of the revision is stylistic, and some is conceptual. College Assembly will be the same, the Senate will be the same, but how do we form an advisory body to the Dean? DJ’s sense is that the Senate’s role in communication with Dean, or organizing the College in terms of the faculty, lacks direction. How are we growing? Why was the international initiatives office (Koziol and Greenberg staffed) folded into this other office? Outreach programs? Entrepreneurial programs? Why is the Dean’s office doing this, individual depts doing that... there is duplication and lost knowledge because we’re not acting as a college body. The Senate should be that place. We should develop subcommittees to study and promote what we think is important. The 3 pillars in DJ’s vision: becoming 21st Century COE – how are we doing teacher prep, and handling declining enrollments? Meanwhile, other institutions are encroaching. Teacher Prep units across the college should come together. Do we go to online models for post-bac, for masters? We can have a body that studies this and reports back to the Senate and to the Dean.

Second pillar: Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
Third pillar: Entrepreneurship and Innovation. Changes in funding, federal and other. EDMS workshops generate revenue. Online programs could generate revenue. Do we agree that these 3 pillars are worth going into? Are there different areas we should consider? Bob: We started out talking about the Plan, which could be very straightforward. Then we moved into Senate functions, so where should we focus? Dan: we should talk about timeline soon, but we should reduce the number of standing committees. What are our top 2 or 3 ad hoc committees? That’s the tie-in, what can we jettison in favor of substantive work we can do this year? Lawrence: here is the history of this document: We submitted a draft in 2014, they responded to it with recommendations without approving it. How do we break this cycle? Dan: met with university committee for suggestions. We may farm out little pieces of language to different groups. Over the next several months we will finalize it, paring it down until it’s clear, concise and accurate, perhaps basing ours on BSAS document. Nov 1 deadline with university committee.

Discussion: Dan says Senate Standing Committees are bare bones, we don’t have to specify ad hoc committees in our document. University standards do not require all the stuff we have in the current Plan, so let’s trim it. Dan has created Google Drive folders that have been shared with the steering committee that he can then share with the full senate.

Dan: when you open a word file with Google Docs it will make a new document, so PLEASE delete the existing one. This will help prevent useless file proliferation.

DJ: after Nov 1, University Senate ERG will give us feedback, which the steering committee will then bring to the Senate.

DJ will hold until next month’s Senate meeting the discussion of the mission statement revision. Senate meeting adjourned.