

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (3/2/2023)

Attendees: Elizabeth McNie (Chair), Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Ariel Setniker, Frank Yip, Christine Isakson, Wil Tsai, and Provost Lori Schroeder.

Absent: Victoria Haller.

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *2/14/2023 minutes slightly edited for grammar and approved by unanimous consent.*
 - *2/21/2023 minutes slightly edited for grammar and accuracy and approved by unanimous consent.*

- Senate Elections
 - Senk has a Qualtrics survey ready to go for the various elections. Her understanding is that the standing committees elect their own Chairs, so we don't need to run those elections.
 - She also has things ready for Department Chair elections.
 - The ET and MT interim Chairs are willing to continue to serve in their positions.
 - Provost Schroeder – IBL is due for Chair elections. GSMA as well. Both of them were interims.
 - Senk wasn't clear on the number of elections but is certain that McNie has it sorted out. She's been cc'd on messages that McNie has been sending to organize things for the elections.
 - Senk showed off the Qualtrics survey for ASCSU Senator and at-large positions. She also noted that all department Senate elections are finished. Elections were not particularly competitive – all candidates ran unopposed.
 - Tsai offered some edits to the Qualtrics survey to make sure that voters were clear on the technical aspects of the survey (*you need to click!*). There were also some minor adjustments to language to clarify the nature of each position. For example, the open lecturer-at-large position is being filled by a tenure-track faculty because there were no lecturer nominees or volunteers.
 - Some discussion of Qualtrics and its excellence. Yip suggested that our ASCSU Senators see if the CSU system could add Qualtrics to the list of collectively bargained software. It seems like a piece of software that enough campuses use or are interested in.

- Discussion of Proposed Appendix J Amendments
 - Provost Schroeder gave some context on the Appendix J issues and the requirements for new tenure-track hires. She's recently approved a couple tenure-track hires. She outlined the issue where faculty (typically in license-granting departments) were required to get an advanced degree in their first three years if they didn't already possess one. For these specialized degree programs, where relevant industry experience is common but advanced degrees are less so, this limited the pool of good candidates. She'd like to move back to the MVI model, but at the same time, we've got language in Appendix J that is unclear regarding what qualifies as service or research. There's identical language in both categories in the current Appendix.

- Setniker pointed out that it definitely causes issues, particularly when RTP committees involve representatives of multiple departments, and there's disagreement on what goes which category. Clarity is important. It helps both reviewers and candidates.
 - McNie arrived. She outlined the edits that she's planning to make to Appendix J. Her edits borrow language from Boyer's model of scholarship. She's planning to have a complete draft after Spring Break. The aim of the edits is to make the definition of scholarship relevant to all faculty of all departments.
 - Isakson asked whether having definitions of fundamental and applied research in the Appendix would be a good idea given the diversity of educational backgrounds for faculty on our campus. McNie noted that there are many, many definitions of fundamental and applied research. Her proposed language would look to explain this diversity. She agreed that some education for RTP reviewers would be a good thing.
 - Provost Schroeder – I wonder whether the policy could reference where this language comes from so that reviewers would be pointed toward further, more detailed reading. We also want candidates to justify why X work qualifies as a particular kind of research or service. That would require them to educate themselves, which is a good idea.
 - Yip asked whether we wanted to consider a layer of external review. He thinks it's a best practice, a sanity check, and would mitigate misunderstandings of faculty research by reviewers who don't share a candidate's research background.
 - Setniker – perhaps we should try to keep the Appendix relatively short and have supplementary materials available with all the supporting documentation.
 - Isakson agreed with Provost's and Setniker's comments.
 - Tsai – perhaps we should then edit the self-study description to ask for clarification of what work qualifies as what category.
 - Tsai also raised some technical issues with transitioning to Canvas for eWPAFs. Setniker offered to consult. Tsai also said he would float the template to the Senate RTP Committee folks as well.
 - Fairbanks asked whether this would be controversial – usually anything to do with RTP ruffles feathers. McNie explained that she is going to the Senate RTP Committee first after she has a draft. The purpose of the edits is for clarity and should actually benefit candidates by validating different forms of scholarship. Fairbanks agreed, but just thought that we should assume it will be controversial in our timeline if we're looking to get this approved this spring semester. We should try to circulate the draft well in advance of the March meeting.
 - Some discussion of the MVI classification. The idea is that it's a position that acknowledges that someone's industry experience is worthy of tenure-track. Provost Schroeder added that she has discussed with Dean Browne the possibility of licensed faculty being able to transition from an MVI to a traditional tenure-track or back to MVI.
 - Setniker – while we're talking about job descriptions, it's worth having DEI Council look at some appropriate universal language for job descriptions. She will approach Simons and Nance (the co-Chairs) about it.
- Discussion of Resolution on University Service

- McNie would like to propose that during the first two years, tenure-track faculty do not do service and have no advising duties. She noted that this was the policy at Purdue. Senk and Setniker noted that policies do vary per university.
 - McNie clarified that the resolution would be for University-wide service, not department service.
 - Yip proposed easing into department service only in the second year.
 - Regarding advising, there was general agreement that new faculty should not do advising in their first year.
 - Yip proposed adding a 'stick' to incentivize faculty, particularly full professors, to serve as befits their experience. He proposed specifically adding advising duties if they don't do service.
 - Tsai said he understood Yip's proposal, but that it might not have the desired effect. We also need advising training and materials for faculty. We need pressure at the Chair level to produce these materials.
- Provost Updates
 - The TIX position has been offered to a candidate. We're hopeful that they will accept.
 - Budget issues: A hiring freeze will be put in place. We'll probably hear this soon. She's gotten approval for the two MT faculty positions, but the budget will be flat next year.
 - Provost Schroeder said that she would announce the Interim L&S Dean soon.
 - She highlighted the reprehensible behavior that happened after Community Day and noted that administrators are people. These incidents have a real impact on people's lives and morale.
- Open Floor
 - Fairbanks – were the January General Senate minutes approved? And could someone send me the draft minutes from February's meeting? I should start getting them in shape for the March meeting. Tsai said that he has them and will send them. Also, that the January ones were approved.
 - Yip – a SCUBA class is being run by Joel Aldrich, new MT faculty. Right now, the class is a big hit. The issue is that the course is running through the SCUBA Club. It should be on the books, but speed was important in implementing it for the upcoming Oceanography IE trip to Roatan. The swimming pool here at Cal Maritime can't be used for the class for some reason. The SCUBA class will need to be completed off site.
 - Some discussion of why the pool can't be used. No one seems to know why it can't be used. Aldrich asked Athletics to make it a class, and he's gotten a refusal.
 - Provost Schroeder said that she had heard the roadblock was about who is paying for the class.
 - There was general agreement that the class should go forward. Great for students, the IE trip, promotional materials for the University, etc.
 - McNie brought up that a review of our HR department has been completed. The results are in and the presentation in CLC has occurred. Changes and improvements are already starting to be implemented in HR.

- The Faculty Development Coordinator position selection. Has this started? No. Senk will consult the policy and set up the nomination period appropriately.
- Meeting Adjourned