



## **General Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Time: 11:00 am – 12:15 pm**

**Location: ZOOM (<https://csum.zoom.us/j/95161544677>)**

### **Minutes**

**8/27/2020**

#### **1. Call to Order [11:00 am]**

##### 1. Roll Call

- In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice-Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steve Browne, Tamara Burbach, Colin Dewey, Matt Fairbanks, Margot Hanson, Mike Holden, Christine Isakson, Tony Lewis, Assis Malaquais Keir Moorhead, Ali Moradmand, Julie Simons, Wil Tsai, Margaret Ward, Frank Yip
- Absent: Cynthia Trevisan

#### **2. Senate Chair Announcements [5 min]**

- Chair Pinisetty reminds attendees that meetings are open to the public but voting rights are reserved only for Senators
- McNie moves to approve agenda. Tsai seconds.

#### **3. President Cropper's Announcements [5 min]**

- President Cropper welcomes campus community back to a new academic year, reminds attendees of Convocation next week online, welcomes new Provost Lori Schroeder, congratulates Senate on implementation of new set of bylaws and looks forward to the work ahead.

#### **4. Provost Comments [5 min]**

- Provost Schroeder expresses thanks to Senate for the warm welcome to Cal Maritime and applauds the work Senate is doing.

#### **5. RTP Supplemental Policy – Matt Fairbanks [15 min] {Approval Voting}**

- Chair introduces motion on the floor: RTP policy affected by COVID-19
- Chair invites a senator to move to skip the first reading due to the fast-approaching RTP deadlines since faculty preparing WPAFs need to refer to this policy before submitting their WPAFs.
- Browne moves that we waive the first reading. Suggests that in the future that the person presenting the item makes that motion (for efficiency). Yip seconds.
- **Vote to waive the first reading: 18-0 [with one absence].**

- Chair turns over the floor to Fairbanks, who will lead discussion on the policy: Fairbanks shares screen with policy, explains motivation that COVID-19 has brought challenges to everyone, notably probationary faculty undergoing review and individuals undergoing performance review; explains that Senate Executive committee wanted to offer guidance to people undergoing review and to reviewers. Key points include: change in modality and social distancing requirements in classrooms may affect teaching performance and evaluation so faculty undergoing review experience added level of stress. Regarding service, they may be opportunities that have been disrupted due to cancellation of live in person events. Regarding scholarship, people may be unable to travel, gather data, employ students working in groups, etc. Exec is proposing advisory language that doesn't change substance of RTP policy but ensures that everyone involved in the RTP process is aware of the challenges the pandemic has created (particularly for a faculty semester undergoing second-year review, who will have one sent of evaluations from Fall 2019, no evals for Spring, and online teaching this year). CBA requires student evaluations and Exec believes the provide important data. Method of evaluation will have to be adapted for mode of instruction, but evaluation will happen this fall. (Fairbanks notes that peer evaluation of teaching is something that the Senate is aware of, will be providing more specific guidance regarding what form that should take for a course that is entirely asynchronous.) Exec recommends that faculty contextualize their work and the impact of the pandemic and that reviewers take these factors into account during the review process. Fairbanks offers to field questions.
- Browne asks if we are allowed to amend the document now. Fairbanks says amendments are appropriate, particularly if we are missing something or if people are uncomfortable with any of the statements.
- Browne moves an amendment to change the language in various "resolve" from "Senate Executive Committee" to "Faculty Senate." McNie seconds the motion.
- Browne adds: "in our procedures that have yet to be written, we could write that if there are no objections expressed to changes like this that it can be accepted without a vote, but if there are objections than we would have to vote on minor amendments." Browne asks Chair if we will accept this amendment without a vote. Chair asks if there are any objections. There are none. Amendment is approved.
- Browne offers a second amendment: adds final "Resolved" clause for a distribution list to read that this resolution be distributed to the President, Provost, Academic Deans including the Library Dean, Senate RTP Committee, Dept RTP Committees, and CFA Executive Board. Hanson seconds the motion. Chair asks if there are any objections. No objections. Amendment is approved.
- Moradmam asks if there will be language for Lecturers in their periodic evaluations, asks if we can expand language in this document or if there will be a separate resolution. Fairbanks says that for lecturers undergoing springtime review we can write a second resolution. Not opposed in principle to adding that language to this resolution, but we want to be cautious and make sure we have something that is appropriate. A lot of this document references things specific to the tenure track, so we are included to create a second resolution. Moradmam says a lot of the language could be recycled. Fairbanks wants to assure all faculty that the Senate has an eye toward these issues.
- Tsai asks what the timeline is on the policy. Fairbanks says because we aren't amending the current text of the RTP policy, we are just adding an addendum that does not change the structure of RTP review, we don't believe it needs to go through level of review that changes to the RTP policy would have to undergo. Fairbanks invites Senators more familiar with the policy. Silence. Tsai says his concern is that if this comes out, it needs to be before Department RTP committee deadline to submit their letters. Fairbanks notes this is reason for haste and dispensing of first reading.
- Browne notes that if the standards for RTP change mid-cycle, the candidates can decide to abide by the previous version. We would have to communicate to candidates that they're not obligated to follow new procedures if they choose not to.

- Chair Pinisetty says he is optimistic this policy will be in place before reviewers receive WPAFs. Invites any other amendments or questions.
- Question in Chat from Dean Neto: Is this a policy or resolution? Pinisetty explains that the senate wants to conduct senate business in resolutions. Fairbanks notes that we use the word “policy” in the headline, so can certainly understand the question.
- Hanson asks if instead of saying policy in the title we can call it “supplemental guidance,” especially if the intention to add it to the RTP policy. Fairbanks says that is not the intention; this was written specific for the COVID-19 situation. Going in and changing the RTP policy language would require a lot more process than this resolution is looking to evoke. Because it is essentially advisory language rather than substantively changing process of review, Exec Committee believed it could go through as a resolution.
- Simons makes a motion to change the wording to remove “policy” and replace it with “guidance.” Hanson seconds. No objections.
- Browne asks: in the last “resolved” (referring to the creation of the policy), are we changing *that* to guidance? And if we are producing such guidance, how would that be different than what is already in this resolution?
- Hanson moves that instead of having an action item to create a supplemental policy for each affected semester, we just review this resolution document on a semester-by-semester basis instead of creating a supplemental policy.
- Senk clarifies in chat: this is a holdover from when the document was a memo about the need for a policy.
- Holden asks “our best parliamentarian” Steve Browne to advise. Browne offers replacement amendment to delete that entire “resolved” section. Senk seconds. No objections.
- **Pinisetty motions for a vote to approve the resolution. Yip seconds. All in favor of approving this policy as amended: 15. All opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0.** Senk notes she counted 15 but there are 18 senators present.
- **Motion for RTP Supplemental Resolution is APPROVED.**
- Fairbanks thanks committee for attention and for careful review and edits.

## 6. First Reading of the IBL Chair Senate Resolution – Sarah Senk [15 min]

- Chair: Next motion on the floor is the first reading of the IBL Chair resolution. Discussion will be led by Senate Executive Secretary and ASCSU senator Sarah Senk.
- Senk begins by noting that we did things a bit out of order: we should have explained the protocol for resolutions before Matt’s presentation. Reminds committee that for the Resolution that Matt just presented we voted to skip the first reading, but typically we will have a first reading, where items are displayed on screen and contextualized. During a first reading Senators *may* offer suggestions or ask questions at the meeting but we do *not* amend or vote then and there. In between meetings, individuals may provide written feedback to the author(s) [in this case, the executive committee, who will send you a Microsoft Forms feedback form] who may or may not adopt the suggested changes. During the second reading the item will be displayed on screen again when it can be amended and voted upon.
- Senk notes technically this is our first resolution of this academic year, hence the title: Resolution 20/21-01. Introduces background: “On Monday, May 11, Dr. Nipoli Kamdar, outgoing Chair of the IBL Department sent a letter expressing concerns with President’s decision to override the faculty vote and appoint MTLM Dean Don Maier as Chair of the IBL Department. Senate Exec agreed an explanation was important given the unprecedented nature of the decision at Cal Maritime. We drafted a formal letter to the President, which we shared with the Interim Provost on May 14. The Interim Provost expressed reticence about whether a letter was necessary and suggest a meeting instead. The President met with the Senate Exec Officers and members of the IBL department on

May 15 to offer an explanation. In late July Exec received another letter from Dr. Kamdar calling into question the explanations provided on May 15. Exec agreed her concerns had merit and this is why we drafted the resolution.” Senk adds that for additional context senators should check out the detailed minutes of these summer conversations on May 11, May 14, and May 15 2020.

- Senk explains that “Senate Exec determined that explanations provided for the decision (notably, claims that IBL department had the worst retention and enrollment) didn’t seem to hold up when we looked at institutional data; there are issues about the lack of an existing policy indicating that retention/enrollment was ever a point of evaluation for prior chairs.” Additional concerns about shared governance and RTP review.
- Senk adds “We have already been alerted to problems ranging from the banal (like issues with workflow forms requiring separate Dean and Chair signatures) to the more serious shared governance issues (like having a Dean at the meeting between the Provost and Faculty department chairs, potentially cutting out a space for chairs to talk about issues they may have with Deans). There is some general confusion we hope we can resolve. Our recommendation is fundamentally that a faculty member needs to be appointed in that role.”
- Senk shares screen to review resolution. Highlights Gary Reichard’s recommendation (Reichard told Senate Exec that it’s highly unusual to override a department’s decision, that typically it only happens when a decision is almost evenly split, but this vote was almost unanimous at 6-1).
- Senk summarizes the “resolved” section: “We are urging the President to appoint the faculty choice. We are also requesting that the Administration create a policy regarding the roles of Deans. We on the Senate will be working on a Chair policy; right now, one of our biggest issues is that we don’t have a document detailing the roles of chairs and the roles of deans, and that is complicating the issue. We’re working on that on our side; what we’re asking the Administration to do is to create a complementary policy to our Chair policy in which they clearly state protocols and guidelines describing under what conditions a department might be chaired by someone outside that department. We would also like the administration to describe specifically how and when the IBL department will have a faculty chair: what is the pathway for getting out of conservatorship? For us I think the most importance piece is that we believe department chairs should be faculty members, not administrators, that even in the event that a clearly delineated policy indicates there isn’t anyone appropriate in the department for the role, then it should be a faculty member from another department appointed as conservator.”
- Senk reminds the committee that we will be inviting commentary in writing.
- Pinisetty explains that we will set up a digital form for all faculty to comment on the resolution. That will be sent out next week. We will accept these comments before the September General Meeting, we will make changes as appropriate, and we will discuss the resolution again during the second reading. Pinisetty invites Senators to bring up concerns or questions. No concerns or questions reported.

## **7. First Reading of Faculty Scholarly Activity Resolution – Frank Yip [15 min]**

- Yip introduces Resolution to better streamline grantsmanship on campus and availability of scholarly resources. We believe scholarly activity to be important, it’s enshrined in the RTP process, it’s noted in the academic master plans that it’s a high impact practice, particularly for STEM students. Yip explains that most direct benefit to campus from an external grant is what are called “Financial Administrative Costs” (F&A) – money that gets returned to the university. Part of the reason for this resolution is that we don’t have a policy regarding what happens to that money. At a lot of universities, that money is seed money to help fund additional grants.
- Yip explains that CSU grants are relevant as well. We want to create an environment in which this becomes a self-sustaining process. F&A can also help ameliorate lack of startup funds on our

campus. Currently we have a policy but it's not very amenable to pursuing grants; it is cumbersome, it heavily influences the nature by which we as an institution collaborate with other scholars external to Cal Maritime. That current policy is not well suited with practices in their current form. Policy as designed now tends to involve way too many people at stages where it's not relevant to include them. We should be looking at a model that keeps people in the chain where they should be. Yip notes there has been reputational damage, that some institutions no longer want to work with Cal Maritime due to our being "the bottleneck" where grants fail to get out the door.

- Yip reviews resolution. Budgets in the future should reflect the importance of scholarly activity. "Resolved" section includes changes to replace cost of faculty member buyouts at the rate of lecturer replacement, not the rate of the faculty member's salary. (Yip gives example of some RSCA grants that can fund a lecturer replacement but not a tenured faculty member salary.) Yip emphasizes that limiting factor on scholarly activity is time, and we must prioritize time as a resource. Resolution proposes creating a committee to study different models across CSU and find process that works best for us.
- Yip says we welcome feedback from rest of senators. Pinisetty explains we will establish a Microsoft form to solicit feedback not just from senators, but all faculty. We [Senate Exec] will implement them as appropriate and present the resolution again for a second reading in September.
- Lewis asks for better understanding of what the problem is that we're responding to. Lewis asks if there is some reason outside of faculty that is causing some grant-funders and research partners to not want to work with Cal Maritime faculty.
- Yip clarifies that this is true regarding collaborative grants – grants that are housed within Cal Maritime but then sub-awards happen with other institutions. Our grants office and theirs have to align with certain things. And it's been the experience of faculty in S&M that have submitted those that our grants office has frustrated the other grants offices; the grants were not finalized or submitted at the eleventh hour, and it was not an efficient process. So that's a substantial reason for wanting to revamp this process.
- Lewis asks if that's a problem on the administrative side.
- Yip responds that it's a problem regarding the administration of our grants, the chain of how a grant goes from the faculty to the agency awarding the grant.

## **8. First Reading of Emeritus Emerita Policy – Dinesh Pinisetty [10 min]**

- Pinisetty presents Academic Affairs policy that Provost Council initiated. Process is to confer Emeritus status for all eligible faculty and administrators. Pinisetty reviews policy, invites feedback to pass on to Academic Affairs.
- Browne says that since this isn't an academic policy, we could pass a resolution saying the senate does or doesn't support the policy in its current format. That could be proper policy.
- Browne adds that on many campuses, lecturers can get Emeritus status. Perhaps we can suggest an amendment to include lecturers.
- McNie says she would like to see something explicit about the use of the Cal Maritime email address, retaining email privileges.
- Hanson says she has feedback from her department and posts in chat: "The emeritus/a policy is and unlike other campuses. 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?"

## **9. Faculty Ambassadors Program Fall 2020 Launch – Elizabeth McNie [5 min]**

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MARITIME ACADEMY

200 Maritime Academy Drive, Vallejo, CA 94590-8181 • PHONE (707) 654-1000 • FAX (707) 654-1001 • [www.csum.edu](http://www.csum.edu)

- McNie reports that new program has been launched, faculty are working with groups of incoming freshmen funded by a CSU-grant to improve retention rates. There are 15 ambassadors. McNie invites ideas about how to improve program. Instructs colleagues to get in touch if they want to learn more about the program. McNie thanks volunteers.

## **10. Adjournment [12:15 pm]**