Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Tuesday, August 25, 2020

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair AY 2020-2021), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair AY 2019-2020]), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Wil Tsai, Frank Yip

Absent: Cynthia Trevisan

I.   REVIEW OF 2020 "TO DO LIST"
- Standing Committee Policies: Senk reminds committee that we intended to have drafts in by the end of Spring 2020, that several faculty standing committee members (including McNie, Holden, Parsons, Tsai, Pinisetty, Moorhead, Isakson, Lewis) met the evening of February 12, 2020 and Senk met with Malaquais and Kamdar earlier that week in February to review the policies for the committee dealing with International Experience oversight. But we were unable to finish the work in Spring 2020 due to the pandemic scramble. Senk reminds committee that when the new bylaws were approved, we agreed that AY 2020-2021 would be a "transitional year" for Standing committees "to minimize disruption of ongoing projects and to allow committees time to finalize their own policies." As we said in the February 2020 Senate Meeting, "Starting in Fall 2020, existing Standing Committees must follow the Procedures outlined in Sections III.A.1, III.A.3, and III.A.5 of the by-laws." If committees failed to create their own policies by the end of this transition year, they will have to adopt the policies proposed in the original Senate by-laws draft.
- Senk suggests setting a December deadline for Standing Committees to propose new policies. That way we have plenty of time in the spring for first and second readings.
- Committee discusses plans for first General meeting on Thursday: we can't move to immediate voting on RTP resolution; we need to add an agenda item to waive the first reading. Rationale: RTP deadlines are fast approaching, last deadlines are end of September, so faculty need to have some clarify before they prepare their WPAF
- Committee agrees to use Zoom polls
- New bylaws say we operate in terms of resolutions not memos, so we're making it in the form of a resolution rather than a memo. [Committee revises memo on teaching policy to turn it into resolution form.]

II.   RESOLUTION 20-21/02 RTP Supplemental Policy Due to COVID Pandemic
- Should we keep extension of clock in this resolution? Committee discusses and decides no. rationale: disruption in cycle, greater flexibility.
- Lori: are we thinking of a second resolution? Or just let the union MOU. We can communicate formally with the union that we support it? Does it have to be a resolution? It's something that has to be negotiated between the union and president cropper and provost. Dinesh can ask other senate chairs to see what the norm would be.
- Matt: Graham sent that email not to invite a resolution but to know that senate was not actively opposed to the idea. It's more about checking the boxes of shared governance on this issue.
- Dinesh: will email Graham mentioning that Senate Exec supports that, will discuss with senators on Thursday to make sure they're informed.

III. RESOLUTION 20-21/03 Structural Changes to Foster Better Support of Faculty Scholar Activities
- Yip explains the issue is that there are way too many people involved in grants at the submission stage, slows things down tremendously, it's just not standard policy among the CSU campuses that we think handle grants well. Right now, we're too depended on paper, with way too many people in the chain of signatures, deadlines are missed, other campus grant officers are frustrated by our lack of efficiency. Goal is to make this better, to make it easier to submit. Experienced faculty can inform this process a lot, which is why we're calling for a faculty committee to make recommendations about the process.
- Lori: is this meant to be an ongoing committee or a task force? Frank: it's the latter: an ad hoc group. Lori: I'm pleased to hear that. It's a good move to streamline the process.
- Dinesh: question about the buy-out
- Provost adds that she hopes we also put something in place about opportunities for faculty to get into grantsmanship. Yip expresses appreciation for the comment, scrolls down to another part of the resolution, which speaks to that point by proposing the creation of a budgetary model where there are funds set aside to support all faculty in the school.
- Yip credits Julie Simons, Alex, and Alejandro for their help
- Isakson asks about how we do a comparative study of other universities. It's very important to know what budget model we employ and what budget model other universities employ. That can help us determine if the budget model we're using is the most appropriate for the type of university we are hoping to become.
- Yip will take the lead on discussion regarding this resolution on Thursday.

IV. EMERITUS POLICY
- Pinisetty will take the lead on that discussion during Thursday's general meeting.

V. CURRICULUM / GE POLICIES
- Chair asks where we left off?
- Senk reviews options presented at last February's General Senate Meeting. Notes that we anticipated completing these policy drafts by the March Senate meeting which was cancelled due to the pandemic and scramble to change modalities. Senk reminds the committee that in addition to proposed changes about membership, we need to rethink the way curriculum proposals are processed. In past practice all Gen Ed decisions are all up to the GE Committee; all Curriculum decisions are up to the Curriculum Committee, and that's the final decision. One option – and the one we adopted last year since I started chairing the General Education committee to promote transparency and shared governance is create a clear recommendation process where the General Education votes but that decision is not final; the decision is *recommended* to the Curriculum Committee, who must review and vote on it before sending to the General Senate for final approval.
- Chair says he supports that option.
- Isakson emphasizes the need for clear policy about overturning: on what grounds would the Senate overturn a curriculum committee proposal.

- [Senk amends minutes after meeting to clarify that in models where the curriculum committee makes a recommendation to senate, the senate serves much in the way that the Provost does in the Cal Maritime RTP process, working to confirm that all rules were followed and the review process was fair and that nothing was left out.]
- McNie adds: that makes a lot of sense, enfranchises faculty senate in these decisions
- Yip expresses concern that it could be too cumbersome
- Senk mentions that this is how the process worked at her last job, and seems to be the way the process works at most universities.
- Provost adds: "every place that I've ever worked has the model Sarah described, and the number of times that stuff is actually voted down on the floor of the whole faculty is pretty rare, and you get the added benefit of an informed faculty and a faculty that is buying in more. For something like curriculum, which the faculty really own, it's important that there's buy-in."
- Committee agrees to table discussion for October Senate Meeting but make it a priority then.

VI.   IBL RESOLUTION
- Committee reviews draft resolution, agrees to highlight the need for metrics that motivate decisions like the one to put a Dean in a Faculty role.
- Pinisetty notes to remind faculty in the meeting that they can find the minutes on the Senate website for additional context.
- Committee discusses importance of precedent and how we don't want this to become precedent: regardless of whether the Presidents' decision is based on measurable or personal issues etc., the outcome of a dean chairing a department is a problem.
- Senk will take the lead on discussion regarding this resolution on Thursday.

VII.   Additional Business
- Executive Committee has received complaints about a Dean been moving students into sections, surpassing enrollment caps.
- Provost: "I'm on that one." Provost adds, "I don't know if you're aware but I spoke with the three chairs in that school yesterday afternoon. The longer-term issue is coming up with protocols. I don't see a lot of very visible policy or guidelines for that." Provost emphasizes the urgency of creating guidelines because "in the moment this doesn't feel right."
- Pinisetty adds that during that discussion we must also figure out whose role it is to make those adjustments. Provost agrees, adding that "right now we've got chair, dean, and registrar. At different institutions it's set up differently. We need to set up what's best and then live with it."
- Committee members agree.

Meeting adjourned.