

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 24, 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. Plan for Emergency Senate Meeting on December 3

- Trevisan starts by apologizing for “going rogue” at the General meeting and making the motion. Explains that she was thinking about the way the initial curriculum committee decision occurred and didn’t want the same thing to happen again couldn’t forgive herself if she didn’t speak up now.
- Trevisan describes ASCSU procedure where people make a motion and then a set number argue for and against.
- Chair asks if at ASCSU is if background information is provided to all members before motions are made. Trevisan says most decision-making is done via resolution and usually resolutions are posted ahead of time.
- Chair said he was hoping we’d have deliberations, especially since some senators were completely unaware this was happening.
- Trevisan says “the thought that terrified me was that what happened at the Curriculum Committee would happen again, that no one would say anything.”
- Committee discusses intention of Parsons’ presentation. Original intention as we discussed during early Exec meeting, was that Amy present information as part of general Curriculum Committee update. The purpose was to inform the senate (since all of these memos she was referring to were between the Curriculum Committee and the S&M and MT departments) of the events; it was expected that senators would report this information back to their constituents and any deliberations/motions would take place at the next General Meeting.
- Committee asks to confirm results of 12/3 emergency meeting vote.
- Senk reports that vote to hold an emergency meeting is 18-1 so we will be holding a meeting on Thursday, December 3. The vote to close the meeting was 7 in favor, 4 against, 7 abstentions (one came in late).
- Bylaws say that we need a 2/3 approval to close the meeting. Vote was 7-4, which is 63%, so the meeting will be open. Committee discusses whether abstentions count toward the total vote; according to Roberts Rules they *do not* (they are non-votes).
- Trevisan asks if it is an open meeting does that mean that it will only be senators allowed to comment. Yip says given the limited time the focus should be on Senators’ opinion. Chair adds that we have department senators, the expectations is that they will report back to their departments, get a department consensus and then return at the next meeting to vote.
- McNie suggests that we allow guests to comment in the chat.
- Chair: what information will be sent out *before* the meeting?
- Yip: MT Senator Maggie Ward asked a question about the due process, so we should include all of the materials that document the deliberations. Yip adds that it was a substantial point that the necessary documents about the curriculum change were only provided to the S&M department two days before they were due while other departments were consulted earlier. Yip suggests the packet the CC received in March, the packet the CC received in September,

all the Curriculum Committee minutes, and all memos sent by the Curriculum Committee about the topic.

- Provost asks if part of what the senate has to resolve is whether the breach was significant enough to warrant a full-scale reconsideration
- Trevisan says she thought Amy was updating the entire senate that “the work of the [curriculum] committee was not properly performed” [direct quote from the written statement Amy read to the General Senate]
- Senk notes that Parsons also stated explicitly that she was “bringing the matter to the Senate for discussion to ask whether Senate believes the procedure was followed and, if not, what to do.”
- McNie says it seems like it’s a tiered process: We need to first determine whether the Senate believes procedure was violated and then decide the outcome accordingly based on that determination.
- Chair notes that we also don’t have a policy in place for what happens if/when a committee does not perform their work. The vote has happened. So what do we do in the absence of a procedure. We also need to be mindful of timelines. Everything needs to happen before February; the Registrar’s office needs time to process these and there are lot of follow-up processes that need to happen.
- **Action items: Senk will email Parsons asking her provide the documents Yip mentioned. Senk will email senators notifying them of result of vote and will schedule the meeting.**
- **Chair will notify the whole faculty list that the meeting is open.**
- **Action items: Write out description of meeting protocol (Problem last time: some “raised hands” didn’t appear on Dinesh’s screen, and due to layout of Zoom he couldn’t see people raising their hands in person. Solution: all guests must turn cameras off so that senators all stay prominent on the first page of Zoom. All guests must rename themselves “Guest [Name]” and Senators “Senator [Name].” Guests will not be allowed to speak before senators but may add text in the chat.**

II. IBL Resolution

- Provost says she is not sure if the President is aware that veto is an option.
- Provost says we have to make sure that the President responds in writing to the resolution. Sense is that he wanted to wait until he had a faculty chair identified to fill that slot. He has made it clear to everyone that he does not intend to put the department’s choice into that role. He plans to go with a faculty member.
- Seemed obvious that Don would be tapped to find a new chair for the department as the Dean of that School. Since Don’s been trying to do the work to identify a candidate, why shouldn’t he be the one to give the update.
- Provost reports that the President is committed to finding a faculty member to fill the role. Provost reports that to her understanding Former Provost Mahoney had looked through the CSU to find someone we could bring in to chair the departments, so it’s not strictly external.
- Senk explains that the reason her Department was confused is because we didn’t actually get a response to the resolution before we were informed that Don was searching for a new candidate. So it seemed like the presentation was skipping a couple of steps. We were surprised to hear that Don was conducting a search because we never got a response to the

resolution saying explicitly that the President was vetoing it. And it's still unclear to us whether the whole resolution has been vetoed or just parts. Senk notes it seems like it's just parts – that the President will not be appointing the Department's choice but *will* be replacing the Dean with a faculty member, but that was never clarified for us before we learned that Dean Maier was searching for a new candidate so his presentation seemed to come out of nowhere.

- Provost said that at the end of each resolution we include a specific desired response date. Provost suggests that we
- Trevisan asks if the members of the IBL department will be consulted or if this will be a new “king or queen” who comes in. Isakson adds that no members of the department were consulted so far or aware of what was happening.
- Provost responds that she recognizes the concerns but part of the difficulty is due to the complexities in the department, that not all members of the department will ever agree on who would be an appropriate chair.
- Trevisan says she doesn't understand all the tip-toing in mystery, asks why there seems to be so much secrecy.
- Provost says the intention was always to identify possible candidates and then to allow them to have conversations with the senior members of the IBL department. In the case of some of the internal candidates who said “thanks but no thanks” we didn't want to put them on the spot. With the external candidates – and by external candidates I mean candidates in other CSUs who are FERPing – we weren't sure they would have enough time. So it was about making sure the people involved had the confidentiality they needed.
- McNie asks if the department will have veto powers.
- Provost: from a certain point of view the vote was already taken.
- Chair suggests that we need a good policy to prevent this from happening. For instance, if the President decides to override the Department vote, he needs to give the department a set amount of time in order to select another candidate within the department.
- Yip thanks the Provost for getting more involved. Notes that junior faculty are in some ways more impacted because of the Chair's role supporting RTP, etc. And for that reason Yip encourages the Provost to allow junior faculty members to weigh in, too.
- Provost said she has thought about different scenarios, like what happens if an external chair is appointed and the faculty in the department is not happy, is there a way of requesting that a new chair be appointed?

III. Good of the Order

- Senk learned from some of her students that students who are going home for Thanksgiving are planning to return to campus.
- Provost said that we are discouraging students from returning after Thanksgiving and if they do come back there will be regular testing and will be firm about it. Around 120 students are planning to come back.
- McNie said the idea behind ending face-to-face classes at Thanksgiving was to minimize potential for spread.
- Fairbanks said that it wasn't explicitly written in that they wouldn't be coming back or that campus was shut down after Thanksgiving, but it was assumed that students wouldn't return because of the cost of travel, threat of community spread, etc.

- Chair said that his impression was that students who left campus for Thanksgiving wouldn't be returning before the end of term.
- Yip expresses concern that we only got the message that there was spread on campus today, just a few hours ago. In the past we received the results of that testing batch within 48 hours; it was noteworthy that more time went by. Chair speculates that with cases on the rise more people are being tested and the companies are overwhelmed.
- McNie says there is a poor understanding of the impact a vacuum of information has. In the absence of information, people fill in the blank. That's something McNie wants to talk about with the Health and Safety Committee.
- McNie reports that she's attending the ASCMA meetings this semester. Their response to having a senator rep there has been really positive; they're excited. McNie has informed them that they should appoint an ASCMA rep to Faculty Senate.