



## **General Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Time: 11:00 am – 12:15 pm**

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

### **Minutes**

**9/24/2020**

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice-Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steve Browne, Tamara Burback, 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

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

- Browne moves that the agenda be approved. Isakson seconds.

#### **1. Approval of Minutes**

- Senator McNie moves to approve the minutes. Isakson seconds.
- Steve Browne notes the standard procedure is to take a vote. Pinisetty suggests asking if there are any objections.
- No objections.

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

- Chair reminds Senate that WPAF closing date is fast approaching – September 28. Brightspace access will be cut off by the deadline so make sure to include all material by 9/28.
- Chair reminds RTP candidates that classroom evaluation is a requirement. This is the first semester at Cal Maritime when we have predominantly online classes. Chair highly recommends Department RTP committees to rely on Senate Exec Resolution, which provides recommendations for evaluation of online classes. Use the recommendations and evaluation form provided in that resolution.
- Benton says setting will be midnight evening of September 28.

#### **3. Vice Chair Announcements [5 min]**

- Vice Chair reports faculty are needed for University Committees. Fairbanks and Bakhar have agreed to serve on Budget Advisory Committee and we need someone from Engineering.
- Honorary Degree Committee – Simons / Sinha already serving, need two additional from other schools other than L&S
- Browne asks if this will be widely disseminated. Yes.

#### **4. Secretary Announcements [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)

- Senk presents reminders about Standing Committee Policies and reviews policies applying to all Standing Committees since implementation of new bylaws this fall:
  - o Leadership (III.A.3) Checklist: all standing committees must schedule regular meetings during the semester; all standing committee chairs must deliver brief written progress reports to the Executive Committee before each monthly Senate Meeting
  - o Membership (III.A.2) Checklist: all committee members must be up-to-date in HR-training regarding discrimination.
  - o Policies (III.A.1) Checklist: Committees must create their own policies before the end of this academic year. Policies should include a description of membership, whether members are elected or appointed or ex officio, whether there are term limits, whether there are eligibility requirements for membership, whether committees will have a chair and secretary, how voting work on the committee, etc.
- Senk recommends that committees begin submitting policies as soon as the next senate meeting so that we have time as a Senate to review them all. Policies must be implemented before elections can happen on April 15.

## **5. ASCSU Representatives Report [5 min]**

- Senk delivers report on ASCSU September Plenary
- Pinisetty: reason they asked for feedback about learning outcomes

## **6. Second Reading of the IBL Chair Senate Resolution and Voting – Sarah Senk [25 min]**

- Senk presents Resolution on behalf of Executive Committee for second reading
- Senk inputs suggested changes.
- Vote to approve resolution. Approved: 16 / 0 / 1
- Lewis asks follow up question: what happens now? We've had a couple of unprecedented things happening. This happened after I gave a critical report on the floor of the senate. Lewis suggests the chair-denial was an act of retaliation. Asks if faculty can feel safe bringing sensitive issues including critiques of admin to Senate.
- McNie: I don't think it's unusual for faculty members who are not yet tenured to feel unsure about commenting in public. This is such a small institution that we interact much more frequently with administrators.
- Browne: I think we owe our administrative colleagues the benefit of the doubt of the best intentions, even if we disagree with the specific decisions they've made.
- Hanson: I do know that anecdotally there is concern/fear about retaliation, which stifles communication.
- Lewis: I just wonder what evidence would be concerning. If multiple false statements are not problematic, what evidence would be?
- Tsai: asks clarifying question: "are we talking about evidence of retribution, or evidence of misstatement of fact." Tsai says that Colin gave a good example in the chat – tenure denial. Tsai is not sure if that's on the CFA's side or the Senate's side.
- Dewey: asks the Chair to clarify the scope of the conversation. If the claim is that it's unsafe to raise concerns.
- President Cropper asks to comment: says he does not appreciate characterization of statement as lies, so would like to share info about decision-making. Says there were two incidents of personal behavior that became HR personnel matters, "that led me to the decision that the Departmental candidate was not suited. I cannot say anything else. There is no retribution."

- Yip clarifies: if the President cannot discuss that matter with us. But perhaps he can discuss it with the candidate.
- President agrees.
- Senk adds that we've deviated from the agenda, that this should be discussed under "good of the order," and that senators should contact Executive Committee if we want to devote time to this discussion at the next meeting.

## **7. Second Reading of Faculty Scholarly Activity Resolution and Voting – Frank Yip [25 min]**

- Chair notes he met with President and Provost who indicated to him that they wanted to come up with a handbook that can be provided to newly hired faculty to discuss the processes, about the way different funding agencies work.
- President adds that we also believe that the processes and procedures are not aligned to help faculty get off to a good start with scholarly activity. But F&A is reimbursement that covers things like insurance, facilities wear and tear, so some of that money is used institutionally to underwrite costs. On our campus F&A was used to build out machine shop. A good bit of 500K was used to build out oceanography laboratory. We are reinvesting that money back into the academic enterprise, and I understand that money might not land where you like it, which is why I think this is a good resolution.
- Yip appreciates that feedback and says it is the goal of this resolution to streamline this process and have the monies generated by F&A reinvested to create a sustained research process.
- Neto adds in chat: It is also important that these \$\$\$ are included in the grant proposal budget and award, and it needs to include the buy-out time from instruction.
- Fairbanks suggests tabling the resolution to have more time to deliberate.
- Yip encourages feedback.

## **8. Good of the Order [5 min]**

- Hanson returns to prior discussion of chilling effect of threat of retribution. It's difficult to provide evidence of retribution. I think that earlier communication about justifications that the administration makes. That kind of communication could be handled at a department and individual level. Bringing up HR issues at this level is incredibly inappropriate.
- Dewey adds that if there are incidents where people feel they have been harmed, they should report that to Senate and we should be investigating.
- Tsai adds that one thing we need to be better at is getting things documented and getting things on the record. If we don't get things on the record, for a procedural standpoint there's nothing we can do. Let's have these conversations in the open and in the minutes and let's start dealing with them.

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