



## General Faculty Senate Meeting

**Time: 11:00 am – 12:15 pm**

### Minutes

**4/22/2021**

In attendance:

Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Wil Tsai, Margot Hanson, Julie Simons, Cynthia Trevisan, Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair), Ali Moradmand, Colin Dewey, Christine Isakson, Frank Yip, Mike Holden, Tony Lewis, Tamara Burback, Matt Fairbanks, Steve Browne, and some guests from faculty and administration.

### **1. Call to Order and Minutes Approval**

- Chair called the meeting to order.
- Minutes approval for 3/25 minutes. There were some minor edits requested of the Secretary, who adjusted the minutes accordingly.
- *Senator Dewey moved to approve with proposed amendments. Hanson seconded. No objections.*

### **2. Senate Chair Updates**

- Update on course classification system: Dean Neto is presenting to various groups on this subject. Chairs/Deans have been informed. Senate Executive Committee is next. Curriculum Committee will follow. Dean Neto agreed to present to the General Senate at a later date.
- All Senators have been categorized into two year staggered cycles. Chair Pinisetty thanked Senator Trevisan for her long record of service. Congratulations to Senator Setniker for her at-large election win. Congratulations to Senator Tsai for being elected the new ASCSU Senator. Senate Executive Committee elections are upcoming.
- Senator Dewey – question on the course classification issue. Where will the reforms, corrections, etc. be initiated? Senate? Administration? Chairs and Departments?
- Chair Pinisetty – once the presentations happen, the University will need clear definitions on what constitutes, for example, a writing class. Right now, it's a little bit of a mess. Curriculum Committee (CC) will be the lead in making these definitions.
- Senator Dewey – there's a lot of budget and pedagogical concerns on these issues, so glad to hear that it's being resolved, though pities the CC for having to adjudicate these things.

### **3. Incorporation of Service Learning**

- JoEllen Myslik (Cal Maritime Coordinator of Community Engagement) and Anurag Pande presenting.
- Professor Anurag is a faculty at Cal Poly - SLO.

- Professor Anurag thanked the Chair for inviting him. We have a community of colleagues from a lot of CSU campuses that work on service learning. Wants to present on the benefits of service learning to students and community.
- Professor Anurag is a professor of civil engineering and faculty liaison to JoEllen's equivalent at Cal Poly. The following notes summarize his presentation.
- Service learning was defined. Beneficial as an active learning strategy and strengthens the ties between the University at its surrounding community. Service learning integrates building these relationships into coursework - a "Learn By Doing" experience.
- Allows evaluation by students of their impact on local and global communities.
- Observing that impact helps with improved retention (there's some research literature on this, *Gallini and Moely, 2003*).
- Benefits for faculty: connections with local organizations for professional development, sometimes stipends via CSU funding, and publication opportunities in service learning conference proceedings, etc.
- How to do service learning, and where do we start as faculty? It starts with courses and causes that you're passionate about (gave an example for his own interest in traffic and transportation and a program he started with his kids' school assessing traffic safety). Leverage existing relationships in the community, either personal ones or through JoEllen Myslik. Work with those community partners to design the project (academics sometimes don't consider this). Be sure to have meaningful reflection exercises. Without this, learning objectives for students are more difficult to assess and achieve.
- This is a lot of work, but we don't need to do all the work at the same time. Referred to an "implementation spectrum": start small, and then grow when able. Chancellor's Office has a program to identify courses that have a service component, and courses can have a little or be fully integrated. Growing the relationship with the community partner usually makes incorporating more service learning into your course easier, they can be involved in designing the projects, assessing the projects, etc. You don't need a fully-fleshed out, perfect service learning course from the get go. Can start small and stay, or start small and grow. Either is fine and valuable.
- Bringing community engagement into the classroom can move us forward to becoming a more integral part of our community.
- @PolyProfPande is his Twitter. [apande@calpoly.edu](mailto:apande@calpoly.edu) is his email. Encourages us to contact him if we have questions or ask the questions now.
- Vice Chair McNie – talked with JoEllen about this earlier in the year. The start can be easy, small. A single assignment or project. What held her back in the past was thinking the course needed to be completely reinvented.
- JoEllen Myslik – noted that she is available to help faculty on ideas or make connections to community partners. There's some risk management paperwork involved, but she's happy to help us along with that.
- Conclusion: Chair thanked the presenters and said he would forward any questions to the presenters that we might have (if we missed Anurag's contact info).

#### **4. IBL Chair Response to Response – Follow Up Letter**

- Vice Chair McNie presenting.
- Noted this particular item has been pushed down the agenda for the last couple meetings for various reasons. Apologies.

- Reviewed the timeline. We wrote the original resolution on the IBL Chair decision. President responded. And we've written a response letter which includes some of the feedback Senators sent to its first draft.
- One piece of feedback was that the letter did not adequately address the President's lack of response to the resolution's points on overriding the department vote and explaining his decision.
- *Response to this feedback:* the letter was adjusted to make explicit the request for his reasons for overriding the department vote.
- The second piece of feedback on the letter was the suggestion that there was an earlier letter to the President in which the Senate Executive Committee claimed the President's actions were retaliation, and that the President was successful in "quelling the concerns about retaliation that once existed among Senate Exec members."
- *Response to this feedback:* the letter was not adjusted to include material about retaliation. The rationale was that this was dealt with in the 5/14 General Senate meeting. Senators cast considerable doubt on the President's stated reasons for denying Dr. Lewis' appointment as IBL department chair, but that's different than concrete evidence that the move was retaliatory.
- Third piece of feedback: the letter should address concerns over feeling safe sharing information in the Faculty Senate.
- *Response to this feedback:* We are interested in addressing these concerns, but they are not relevant to the subject of the letter.
- Vice Chair McNie solicited feedback on this second draft of the letter from those present. *No feedback.* McNie said the letter would be sent to the President as soon as possible.

## 5. Standing Committee Updates

- Curriculum Committee (CC) is up first. Amy Parsons, Chair, is presenting.
- Noted the program redesigns (MT, ME, IBL) that have made their way through the CC this year.
- Future goals: bylaw/procedure revision, new CCR forms, clarify role of CC in academic equity issues. Noted the course classification issue will feed into this last point significantly.
- Faculty Development Committee up next. Mike Holden, Chair, presenting.
- Thanked Dean Michele Van Hoeck for her efforts. Noted that she anticipates potential issues with funds being swept, etc, and is a valuable facilitator.
- Slow year for the committee due to very limited conference travel.
- Two RSCA projects were recommended for funding this year. There will be revisions to the application for clarity, etc, but these revisions are not yet complete.
- Faculty Development funds were in departments through 2/15.
- Academy-Wide funding applications are now closed for AY 20-21.
- Membership of the Committee: Department chairs, Margot Hanson for the Library, Mike Holden and Jon Fischer are the at-large members.
- Evan Chang-Siu – the Faculty Maritime Grant strikes him as something that might be better run by this Committee since it took 4 months for the Foundation to get back to him to then deny his application for a clerical reason.
- Senator Holden noted that they can't take over fund administration, but the Foundation could grant the committee that authority if they wished. The current funding opportunities are through the Provost, who requests recommendations from the committee.
- Senator Hanson also noted that students can apply to that fund and agreed the process is inefficient.

- Chair Pinisetti noted that Evan's application was also denied due to VPAT issues, or at least, that was cited as a reason.
- Chair Pinisetti noted the IRA deadline is tomorrow.
- Senator Hanson – for PMAG (President's Mission Achievement Grant), Dean van Hoeck has been trying (with President's Office) to get the process clearer and more efficient.
- Chang-Siu – right now, the VPAT process is really long, 3-6 months. Talk to Tom Nordenholz about the problems getting one 3D printer if you'd like another example. It is crazy how inefficient it is for anything with a screen or software. Notes the importance of the goal of VPAT, but views IT personnel as less an enabler and more of a block to projects like his.
- Chair Pinisetti – noted Senate Exec's meeting with Julianne Tolson (CIO) on the VPAT issue and that we will continue to work to make the process better.
  
- General Education (GE) Committee next. Senator Dewey presenting.
- Shared the draft policy. Many revisions to improve it. GE committee met, approved it for submission to the General Senate for approval and feedback.
- Membership was a point of significant discussion. The idea now is that there will one member per GE area. As far as non-voting representatives or people attending - anyone can attend and speak their mind. Formally, the non-voting reps are: Registrar's office, Provost/AVP, representatives from departments not represented by any subject area experts, and a student representative.
- Senator Hanson – noted importance of having subject matter experts but also not wanting a committee that is too large and unwieldy for scheduling. Thanked the GE committee members for their work.
- Senator Tsai asked about Sarah Senk's report about assessment and whether some of that language made it into the document.
- Senator Hanson – Yes, in Section 1e in a way.
- Senator Dewey noted that the GE report that Sarah put together has a lot of good stuff in it, but most are issues that will need to be addressed in future efforts.
- Chair Pinisetti asked about the routing of paperwork for CCRs and GE committee business and whether Senate would be asked to weigh in. Senator Dewey wondered about the point of having a committee if the whole Senate needed to vote on all these things.
- Chang-Siu noted that moving to DocuSign or something might make the process digital, easy, and traceable so things move efficiently.
- Senator Isakson noted that the Registrar may be getting software for curriculum that might help with that process.
- Chair Pinisetti asked Senator Dewey to send the policy to him so that it can go out to all Senators for feedback prior to the second reading.

## **6. Retreat Resolution**

- Chair Pinisetti introduced it, noted that Senator Yip wrote it up almost entirely on his own in a short timeframe.
- Senator Yip presenting. Noted Senate Exec's participation in the CLC retreat on Monday and Tuesday (4/19 – 4/20). Shared his screen with the resolution text.
- Gave some background on the budgeting process in the Monday meeting. Noted that the items being discussed a sort of wish-list, budgets not yet certain, but that there is a lack of contextual

information about the budget requests. Previous requests look like some current requests. We don't know whether the previous requests were funded, fully, partially, or not at all. What impact did it have? Etc.

- His view was that budgeting process should have all possible context so that informed decisions can be made about the current proposals.
- Senator Yip said the process hasn't really changed over the past few years that he has knowledge of.
- Noted the ranking process was odd, given that some things all seemed to be far away from the priority of others and yet had to be ranked sequentially 1 – 10.
- Senator Yip said that basically we're trying to close the loop. What happened before, what was its result, how much did it cost, was it effective, and thus how do we view your current budget requests. We want assessment of these budget expenditures.
- He also explained the slightly unrelated Resolved about assessment of the Retreat itself, which doesn't seem to happen, which is distinct from anything he has experienced elsewhere.
- Noted that the distribution list includes people who would need to supply the information and would need to implement the changes.
- Senator Yip concluded his presentation and asked for feedback.
- Chair Pinisetty - Assessment is key for the budget. Did we achieve our goals? How does this inform our future goals and decisions?
- Senator Dewey put a similar comment in chat and then elaborated. Noted an email to Chairs that essentially asked: what do you want to build [infrastructure-wise]? Would be far more useful to have context, how much money is available, what the goals should be of the building, etc.
- Senator Lewis: Thinks Senator Yip's work is great. Wondered whether the new positions in the Foundation was assessed in this way.
- Chair Pinisetty noted that Senate Exec asked the question and was informed that the positions were not new.
- Senator Fairbanks noted that one was a replacement and recalled the other being termed 'budget neutral'.
- Senator Lewis wonders whether our faculty leaders can push this issue to administration successfully.
- Senator Isakson asked what tools are at our disposal. Policy is a tool, but what else?
- Senator Lewis – we do have other tools.
- Vice Chair McNie – what other tools? I'm skeptical on forming another committee. What are your ideas for action?
- Senator Lewis – we have a voice. Noted Cal Poly's example of reaching out to the media.
- And he noted that we have the option of votes of no confidence. Not sure on the history of these here, but it's a tool. Said that he feels very strongly about this issue.

## 7. Adjournment [~12:22 pm]