

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, October 15, 2020, 11 AM

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

I. CLC Update

- Chair reports that Chief Gordon presented for 45 minutes about investments in training. Police on campus will be using body cameras from now on. We should be hearing soon from him regarding a Cal Maritime Police Advisory Council, which will need a faculty representative.
- Chair reports that Leadership Assessment is being coordinated by David Taliaferro and IWAC-Member Tamara Burback
- Chair reports that new vessel budget estimate is 315M. 500-foot vessel will accommodate 600 cadets. President reports that we have a good probability of securing government funding for that initiative.

II. Gender Equity Committee Update

- Gender Equity Committee hired a consulting group called TNG who are conducting interviews and focus groups on campus and looking at issues of gender equity on campus. There will be a faculty focus group at some point. McNie will get an update tomorrow and can report next Thursday about progress.
- Yip asks if there is a timeline for the report. McNie says we can probably expect a report in January but will clarify after tomorrow's meeting.
- Trevisan asks if the group will be looking into salaries. McNie will ask tomorrow but says she believes they are focused on individual experiences; they may not be examining the entire salary list.

III. Feedback on Scholarship Resolution

- Senk reports that there were three responses to the Microsoft Form feedback request on the Scholarship Resolution, reviews responses.
- Committee discusses comment suggested faculty be provided with WTU credit for supervising student research. Committee noted that this support is already provided by the grants, which support release time and monetary compensation for student. Trevisan adds that often faculty do have to *train* their research assistants, and this takes time/effort. Fairbanks adds that having WTUs attached is a way to incentivize faculty to train research assistants. Pinisetty says if we add this, we will need to establish a source of funding. Pinisetty uses the example of the Wind Team; all WTU credits were removed from that project. In Engineering they count participation as part of the senior design project, so that's how faculty are compensated. Pinisetty is unsure of where the funding will come from, especially after Faculty Development Committee decided student support was last on the priority list for RSCA funding.
- Committee discusses comment recommending a resolved regarding administrative response. Yip believes the existing resolved already addresses this. Committee agrees.
- Committee discusses comment about clarifying "what is viewed as research." Comment said work that was done on the CARB grant was never considered research by our previous

provost.” Chair notes that the CARB grant was a contract, so it’s accurate to say it’s not *research*. But scholarship as we define it is broader than traditional research that leads to publication, and industry investigation like the CARB program should still count for the “scholarship” category of RTP. McNie says based on her knowledge, the people working on the CARB program were told that involvement in the CARB grant did *not* “count” for RTP scholarship, and they had to do research leading to publication. But McNie adds that this is not part of this resolution. Isakson adds that to have an expectation that someone untrained, who doesn’t have a PhD, is expected to do same type of research as a PhD is unfair. Senk agrees, notes at her last job the institution employed artists and filmmakers and the standards for “scholarship” did *not* include publications but included things like performances, acceptances at film festivals, etc. It should be the same way here: based on norms dependent on the field, based on ways people in a field maintain and showcase their professional expertise. Provost says that’s her understanding too. Yip notes that this is something tangential to this resolution.

- Committee discusses the resolved section about funding residing within each school. Comment on Forms asks if this might “create an environment that limits collaboration of faculty between schools” and asks, “how would funding brought in by a cross-disciplinary team be handled?” Trevisan suggests creating a formula dictating how percentages are allocated, but it may be too specific for this resolution. Pinisetty notes that a faculty member asked a similar question at the last Senate meeting. If we’re trying to come up with models we should also identify how it works at other universities; we can come up with a guideline model for the committee.
- Yip argues that we’re losing sight of the idea the main issue is using funding as seeds for new funding, and that discussions of territorialism are a digression.
- Pinisetty suggests we add something saying “the committee will look into different models about how funding will be distributed.” Yip says the essence is to regard funding as rewards and incentives for generating more. Committee decides we will not make these changes to the resolution, but will clarify that the task force
- Provost adds: “One suggestion I have is editorial. The resolution refers to “Financial and Administrative (F&A) but it is Facilities and Administration in the industry.” Yip will make that change.

#### IV. Health and Safety Task Force Update

- McNie reports that people who go to campus daily have to fill out a screening report before they get access to campus, and faculty get screened as they enter campus through the North Campus gate. It turns out that’s the only checkpoint, and informal surveys of students indicate that half the students never do that survey because they never go through the gate. The issue is that this is falling on the faculty to make sure students have clearance; faculty were told students would need to show that clearance to gain access to campus resources.

#### V. Strategic Enrollment Plan

- Provost and VPSA have been working on Strategic Enrollment Plan
- Provost says we need a faculty representative on the Enrollment team and the Cadet success team. There will be sub-groups as well, so there will be opportunity for others to serve in support positions.
- We will send out call to all faculty and Senate Exec will appoint.

## VI. General Education Committee Report

- Senk reports on Ethnic Studies Resolution implementation plan. CSU FAQ explicitly allows for Area F course to also satisfy American Institutions requirement.
- Senk reports that EO 1061 (American Institutions graduation requirement EO) says that courses meet the American Institution requirement if they “address the historical developments of American institutions and ideals” and must include the following: “1) Significant events covering a minimum time span of approximately one hundred years and occurring in the entire area now included in the United States of America, including the relationships of regions within that area and with external regions and powers as appropriate to the understanding of those events within the United States during the period under study; 2) The role of major ethnic and social groups in such events and the contexts in which the events have occurred; and 3) The events presented within a framework that illustrates the continuity of the American experience and its derivation from other cultures, including consideration of three or more of the following: politics, economics, social movements, and geography.” So, for example, an Ethnic Studies course about the institution of slavery and its legacy in the United States would do all three of those things mandated in EO 1061: it would cover a period of over 100+ years, focus on the role of major ethnic groups in US history, and illustrate how the American experience is derived from other cultures - not to mention covering politics [eg. the Civil War], economics [eg. the centrality of slavery to the US-American financial system], and social movements [eg. abolition through civil rights through BLM].
- Senk notes this is the simplest solution that will have no impact on any department, particularly since the existing American Institutions History courses (taught by Jen Metz) already focus predominantly on indigenous and African American history (two of the four groups explicitly mentioned in the Ethnic Studies resolution) and students *already* examine “race and ethnicity, racialization, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, etc.” across a long period of United States history, critically discuss intersectionality, “describe how struggle, resistance, social justice, solidarity, liberation are relevant to current issues,” *and* “demonstrate active engagement with anti-racist issues, practices, and movements...” – all through a focus on US-American history (AS-3438-20).
- Senk notes these are her observations, but that she has discussed this tentative plan with the General Education Committee at the most recent meeting, GSMA Assis Malaquias, who supported the suggestion (calling it “absolutely brilliant” in an email dated October 1) with Metz, who confirmed that she can submit a course for GE Committee approval later this semester, as well as AVP Graham Benton and ASCSU Rep Cynthia Trevisan. The committee will have to wait to formally approve the course until December when the executive order comes out.

## VII. Agenda for Senate General Meeting

- Advancement Presentation
- Scholarship Resolution Second Reading
- Academic Integrity Committee Policy – First Reading

Meeting adjourned.