

Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
Thursday, September 15, 2020

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Cynthia Trevisan, Frank Yip, Lori Schroeder (Provost)

I. Approval of Minutes

II. Grading Policy

- Pinisetty asks if we want to extend our Spring 2020 Grading Policy to Fall 2020. McNie notes that the Spring 2020 policy was an emergency policy meant to take into account the rapid and unexpected shift from face-to-face to online modalities. In the case of Fall 2020, students knew what modalities to expect. There is no sudden disruption, which the Spring policy was trying to mitigate.
- Fairbanks: we may want to consider something in the event that campus is shut down and a similar disruption happens.
- Committee agrees that for the time being we will *not* create a Grading Policy for Fall 2020. But we can create one in the event that

III. Faculty Staffing on University Committees

- Pinisetty reports that Mike Strange volunteered to be the faculty candidate on the Food Advisory Committee
- Senk asks “is that a university committee?”
- Senk: side note: it would be great to get a list of every committee on campus
- Pinisetty reports that Karen Yoder requested a faculty candidate for the Faculty-Athletic Representative. We will send out a call for service.
- Senk notes that we still have an unfilled Lecturer-at-Large position in Faculty Senate. We should send out a call for service inviting nominations by the end of the week.  
**Action items: Senk will draft email for Pinisetty to send to all-faculty list.**

IV. Revise of Resolution Feedback

- Committee reviews and implements feedback for Emergency Senate Executive Resolution on the Peer Evaluation Form for Asynchronous Courses.
- Committee reviews feedback and implements feedback on Resolutions presented during the August 27 General meeting.
  - o IBL Department Chair Decision Override Resolution:
    - Suggestion: “In the current 4th RESOLVED (which is now moved to be the 3rd), add the phrase, "will be a faculty member from a closely related department" McNie notes, I’m not sure we can limit it to a faculty member in a closely related department. Senk suggests we add: “Where possible, the conservator chair should be in a closely related department.”
    - Additional suggestions about phrasing implemented, as well as addition of a distribution list.

- One commentator suggested deleting the ‘resolved’ about the timeline for a decision. Executive Committee voted to keep this resolution because we believe it is important
  - Scholarship Resolution:
    - Recommendations include cutting down “whereas” paragraphs which are too long, and adding a rationale at the end to elaborate on the arguments
    - Suggestion to include in membership of committee: faculty, AA personnel, and A&F personnel
    - If we count the buyout time based on the lecturer rate, are we assuming the class will definitely be assigned to a lecturer? We can’t guarantee that the class is assigned to a lecturer. Trevisan points out that if another full time faculty member ends up covering a faculty member’s class, then a lecturer will still need to be hired to cover the full time faculty member’s class
    - Provost adds it’s important to add perspective from Academic Affairs (even if it’s not from sponsored programs). Having dialogue between faculty and Academic Affairs is important. Yip says “I think someone from SPEL would be necessary.” Provost says “I’m trying to figure out the best way for there to be a partnership between a faculty group working on this and administration. This is something I really want to champion, but I want to make sure that we set up according to best practices. I want to make sure there’s good partnership.” Yip recommends that Schroeder talk to Alex Parker who can at least be an informal liaison to start as we figure out how to formalize this.
  - Emeritus/Emerita Policy:
    - One commentator points out that this isn’t a Senate policy, so what are we voting on? Suggests making a Senate resolution that states, “The Senate endorses the Emeritus Emerita policy in its current form and recommends approval by the president” or “the Senate recommends and requests the following changes to the policy.” We can vote on that. Pinisetty says he doesn’t think it’s necessary. We were just asked for feedback. Pinisetty will provide that feedback to the Provosts’ Council. Fairbanks says that it’s a little weird, why does Section 1 exist in that policy. Pinisetty says we can ask for that to be changed, to say that faculty should be included in the first part. Senk asks how do we formalize that feedback if not in a resolution? Pinisetty suggests we create a written document with a list of feedback.
    - One department compiled feedback from multiple members: "The emeritus/a policy is confusing, and unlike other campuses policies. Most start with faculty, chair and/or dean recommendation, not an application initiated by the retiree that’s rubber-stamped by academic personnel and decided by the president. There should be clear procedures at each step, and opportunities for challenges to the decisions. The Dean writes a letter? What does the letter say? Does it

support or deny the application? What is the basis for approving or denying application, especially under the first process?" Pinisetty says that the recommendation starts with the tenured faculty in the department, then to Dean. Fairbanks notes that the policy doesn't mention the Chair; it just says they send application to the Dean of the School. It looks like for section 2 where the qualifications are different, there's some faculty involvement.

V. Mural Policy

- McNie reports that last year the committee wrote a policy, which has stalled on the Captain's desk, and nothing is happening with it since the Captain is in charge of the mural committee.
- McNie asks if Senate Executive can reach out formally as a committee to help nudge this along.
- Senk asks how long since the committee drafted the policy has it been on the Captain's desk? McNie can find out the exact date but it was early Spring 2020 if not end of Fall 2019. It's been around for a while.
- Mural committee is not a Senate Committee (otherwise we could ask the mural committee to write a letter to Senate). **Action items: McNie will write a letter and bring it before Executive Committee next week for review.**

Meeting adjourned.