

Senate Exec Meeting (3/11/2021)

Attendees: Dinesh Pinisetty, Bets McNie, Margot Hanson, Matt Fairbanks, Lori Schroeder (Provost), Frank Yip, Christine Isakson and Cynthia Trevisan

- Minutes Approval
 - Minutes for 2/11 tabled pending Christine filling in her comments on info sharing
 - **Minutes for 1/28, 2/4 are approved. (no objections)**
- Department Chairs' Policy
 - Dinesh thanked folks for their comments.
 - Margot gave another comment that something should be added to handle the case where no tenured faculty member is available to serve as Chair.
 - Dinesh changed the language around on the recruitment duties for the Chair. "Support..."
 - Margot thought the language of "as requested" was part of the objection, because it is rather subservient sounding – perhaps something like "in consultation with" or "in collaboration with".
 - Dinesh noted that the Chair isn't involved with everything in recruitment, so maybe that wouldn't work.
 - Others (Lori, etc.) suggested "as appropriate", which met with general agreement.
 - Other suggestion - "partner with" University Advancement (from Lori)
 - Dinesh noted these suggestions and made some changes to reflect them. New language will be reflected in the draft shared with Senators.
 - Dinesh reviewed his other changes to the policy and duties in response to comments from Senators during the first reading in the last General Senate Meeting.
 - This new draft will be advanced to a second reading at the next General Senate Meeting. Perhaps to a vote if there are no major revision proposed.
 - Dinesh moved on to the voting rights section of the policy. Noted Colin's objections to the WTU cut-off of voting rights for lecturers. Dinesh has changed the language to include lecturers as long as they have 6 WTUs and have a 1 or 3 year contract and have taught for the department in the past year.
 - Frank offered that perhaps the requirement that the lecturer have maintained a 6 WTU level for X semesters?
 - Dinesh – that's what the 'in the past year' language was meant to capture.
 - Cynthia – what about long-time lecturers who maybe fall below the threshold for semester or more?
 - Frank – what about a four semester threshold (at least 1 of the last 4) plus the existing requirements?
 - Margot – would they need to be teaching in the semester that the election occurs?
 - Bets – and it seems incorrect to have someone who hasn't taught here for 3 semesters to get a vote equivalent to a full-time faculty.
 - There was some further tweaking of the language to adjust for these concerns, and the result was language that includes lecturers that Colin (and others) were worried about as well as some of the 'edge' cases that were brought up.
 - I proposed having a simpler requirement, but allow departments to enfranchise lecturers with something like a majority vote. Frank noted that this could result in different

lecturers in different departments having different voting rights. He asserted that the language should be concrete and very specific to be fair.

- Next item – meeting between President and affected department *prior* or *after* the termination of a Department Chair's term by the President? Currently after, and apparently different CSUs do it different ways.
- Margot argues that in the interest of communication and mediation, perhaps it should be prior to the termination, giving an opportunity for resolution of the issue without taking more drastic steps. Apparently this is the way that East Bay runs things.
- There weren't strong opinions on the issue, but most agreed that the change to *prior* sounded good. Margot recommended we borrow the language from the CSU East Bay policy and adjust to our purpose.
- Dinesh made some other minor adjustments, and said that he would share the new doc with Senators prior to the next meeting.
- Margot asked if students would be consulted on it, and the answer was that there was no plan to do so.
- Committee Memberships
 - Bets presenting.
 - Tom Oppenheim on to H&S. Yay, Tom!
 - Overall, three more volunteers are needed for Scholarly Activities Task Force, Orientation, and Commencement.
 - Margot had volunteered for the Orientation Committee. Kudos to Margot!
 - Cynthia – I'd be happy to add myself to the Scholarly Activities, but I'm from the same department as Alejandro [Cifuentes-Lorenzen].
 - Other recommended faculty – Chang-Siu, Storz, Nordenholz.
 - Dinesh noted that it would be good to have faculty from the School of MTLM involved in that as well.
 - Bets will reach out to the three faculty recommended above.
 - Dinesh said he would speak with Keir Moorhead about the Sea-Training Oversight Committee. Bets said great, and that she would do the heavy lifting there.
 - Lori asked about the intersection of Budget Advisory (University-Wide) and Budget Oversight (Senate), and would we want someone to sit on both?
 - Bets – undetermined. The first job of the Budget Oversight Committee is to write their policy, which will determine those things.
- Leadership Off-Site
 - Lori is talking about this.
 - Seemed apparent to her that there needed to be another option for folks who wouldn't or couldn't attend in-person.
 - Noted that there was some obvious hesitancy about the in-person.
 - She also thinks the last minute communication of the information didn't help.
 - She also noted that going forward that sensitivity to the issues [with in-person meetings] brought up by Senate Exec and others would be considered more carefully.
 - She wanted some feedback from us about the new schedule of the off-site.
 - Frank offered that we hadn't really heard about why it was in-person at all? What's the advantage when there are face masks required, etc, etc?
 - There was general acknowledgement amongst those in this meeting that there are limited advantages when everyone is distanced and masked. Communication is not necessarily improved.

- Margot shared a list of some of the issues that came up in our conversations by email since the CLC meeting.
- Lori said that she would take these to her discussions with the Cabinet.
- Frank pointed out that for continuity, for health and safety, etc, it would be better to have two virtual, consecutive meeting days.
- Lori noted that she is trying to be careful to push back against the bias (unconscious, or not) against remote meetings, instruction, etc. Frank and others noted their appreciation of this.
- Bets noted that last off-site at the Anchor Center ended in many people in quarantine. Also noted the last minute nature of scheduling this retreat and the invitation to the CLC meeting was not really valuing faculty time or input.
- Lori said she was cognizant of these issues, and she's advancing these points with her colleagues.
- Senate Elections
 - Dinesh said we need to start moving on these.
 - He will start the RTP Committee elections next week.
 - We also need to think about the by-laws for the Senate Committees. Some of these haven't been written. Some have been committed to (Amy Parsons for Curriculum Committee), but others have not. Someone needs to take the lead on these.
 - Frank proposed rolling dice to place Senators in bins as far as running this year or next (meant to be two year terms, but offset).
 - The General Education Committee apparently has a draft set of by-laws ready.
 - Cynthia – we also need to move on the ASCSU election so that scheduling can proceed with some certainty (ASCSU Senators get some buy-out of their time.).
 - Dinesh said it's on the schedule for 3 weeks from now.
 - Cynthia – do you know the date for submitting scheduling info to Shari? Dinesh: that's a good point, I'm not sure, but that is something to consider in terms of scheduling the election.
- Open Floor
 - Frank wanted to congratulate Lori for proposing the Provost 'office hours'. Dinesh said that it was Lori's idea and noted that she's had a weird intro to the campus – difficult to know people unless she's seen them without a mask, etc.
 - Dinesh noted that Lori's work on Cabinet is to be commended. Apparently many others in the Cabinet are not much for remote meetings, etc. She is the reason the adjustments were made to off-site.
 - I brought up the apparent distribution issue (to Department RTP committees) of Senate Exec Resolution 20-21/02 concerning the fall semester evaluations and RTP review. This spawned quite a bit of discussion. Dinesh noted that he had sent it out to the distribution list, but not *directly* to Department RTP committee members, because he doesn't have those names. Others pointed out the various issues with the Fall data and the manual 'cleaning' of the data that is having to occur.
 - It was noted that some people are swamped, and may not contextualize appropriately for the oddness of the fall semester in RTP review unless this document (Senate Exec Resolution 20-21/02) is placed directly in front of them.
 - Dinesh noted that the 'N' (number of students filling out the survey and total enrolled students) is not showing up on the student evals, which is a problem for contextualizing it properly.

- Dinesh will send (re-send) the Resolution to Provost, Deans, Chairs, and ask for forwarding to department RTP committees.
- Meeting Adjourned