



ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

JANUARY 20, 2026

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

MH-141

Present: Bono, Childers, Gradilla, Graewingholt, Jarvis, Kanel, Kleinjans, Milligan, Swarat, Wood

I. CALL TO ORDER

- Chair Jarvis called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- The Executive Committee went into Executive Session.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- M/S/P (Kanel/Graewingholt) Motion to approve the December 16th minutes. Motion passed.

3.1 EC Minutes 12-16-25 (draft)

IV. CHAIR'S REPORT

- The President vetoed UPS 210.000 - Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures. I met with the President last week; a couple of things came out of that. One, we came up with an idea of solving the issue of the absent chair problem, and that was using associate deans. The nice thing about that is at least the completion check will get done, because now that it falls to the deans, the deans aren't doing it at all because they are too busy.

The other part, the President is going stand firm on is FAC had written it so that fifth year reviews or full reviews shouldn't be done punitively to punish the faculty. It should be done with an eye towards helping them get the promotion or the tenure, he didn't want any kind of tying their hands on that.

I explained to him the part where there is a reason to do a full review for someone for teaching and for service is because they can actually do things after they get that review in November to change it. But for all practical purposes, an abbreviated review is identical to a full review for research because you have the CV in there, which is the only thing you truly need to evaluate research. He sort of saw it, but it looks like he's still going to hold his ground. So, what I'm going to do is go to the council of either deans or the Provost Council. I prefer Provost Council because then the deans will have other people in the room like FAR and FPC so there to sort of back me up on the basic principle, which is stop giving full reviews just because they haven't published something in year four.

- (Graewingholt) First, I have no problem with associate deans playing that confirmatory role. However, there are associate deans on this campus who've never been department chair and who have not had their hands on the department standards in a while and would not actually know anything about that process. So, I worry a little bit about that, but I also am more concerned with the conversation around ineligible chairs. That seems to me, from the veto, to be that we're just getting rid of this entire section because we don't think it falls in the CBA, even though CFA has said, we're okay with a chair serving in this role.

My biggest concern is that at least in my department, and I'm sure I'm not alone across campus in this instance, we do not have enough people to evaluate those wanting to go up for full. A lot of our assistant deans and associate deans may not know the work that librarians and counselors and coaches do, so it makes it a little harder if you don't have that extra bit of evaluation. If this is not going to be fought on the Senate floor, I do feel that it will be a loss for faculty and it also will prevent full faculty from going up for chair.

- (Jarvis) This UPS is going to have to go back to FAC. I'm the liaison, so I inform them what the president was saying.

- (Kanel) Maybe the chair of FPC can help provide training for incoming faculty on how to put their files together.
- (Jarvis) I'll suggest it to Mark.
- (Bono) The CBA requires a department review, not a separate chair, and department, and DPC review. In fact, other campuses, there is no separate review there it's just the DPC. So, in those cases, if anybody's checking for completeness it has to be the DPC chair. I don't think they have a checking for completeness.
- (Jarvis) That's something else we've added. Our practice is actually way more faculty-friendly than other CSUs.
- (Graewingholt) I feel like we're going backwards. We're losing that entitlement of a good system by removing that ineligible chair process.
- (Jarvis) We're trying to fix that.

Q: I'm on the DPC this year and additional material was added by a faculty, approved by the FPC, and we were given seven calendar days to review that. They sent me that last Wednesday, FAR provided the files on Thursday, and our review is due tomorrow. It's four working days, and it's the first week of the semester. Can we propose to change this seven business days or two weeks?

- The Executive Committee went into Executive Session.
- The Executive Committee was invited to tour the ECS/dorm construction. I will send out an email with a google doc to determine a date that works best for the majority.

V. STAFF REPORT

- An announcement will go out today for the special election to fill the vacant Humanities Senate seat.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.1 Revisions to UPS 100.015 - Review and Revision of University Policy Statements

1. Guidelines for UPS Review and Revision

- (Jarvis) Our sentiment was the guidelines need to be in the UPS because it needs to be a Senate process, not DEI making their own guidelines. So, I took their guidelines, and I tried to boil them down because six pages is too much.

A: (Jarvis) Why don't we sit on these changes for another week? We will put a pin on it, and we'll come back to it next week. But I think this is making some progress on it.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 Revisions to UPS 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturers

- Exec agreed to table this document until FAC reviews the feedback from the chairs and deans after this cycle has actually happened.

Suggestion:

It would be good to let the chairs know that we're looking for feedback while they're going through the review process so that they can make notes of what was challenging for both the DPC chairs and department chairs.

7.2 Revisions to UPS 300.016 - Withdrawal Policy

- Exec had an extensive discussion on this document.
- (Jarvis) Line 157: reinstate the words "may be" and delete the word "is".
- This document will be added to the next AS agenda as a new business item.

7.3 Revisions to UPS 411.400 - Educator Preparation

- Exec began discussion on this document, discussion will continue at next week's meeting.

- The Executive Committee went into Executive Session.

7.4 Revisions to UPS 650.000 - Intramural Research Grants

- Exec began discussion on this document, discussion will continue at next week's meeting.

7.5 Revisions to UPS 103.004 - Computing Resources Use Policy

7.6 UPS 300.021 - Academic Dishonesty - (Discussion Item)

1. Memorandum - UPS 300.021

7.7 Senate Forum - WordPress - (Discussion Item)

7.8 UPS 210.000 Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures

1. Memorandum - UPS 210.000

7.9 Memorandum ASD 25-114 Recission of UPS 230.000 - Reaffirmation of Statement of Professional Responsibility

7.10 Election of Appeals Panel Members - (Discussion Item)

VIII. URGENT BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.