

## Senate Exec Meeting (4/1/2021)

Attendees: Dinesh Pinisetty, Elizabeth McNie, Matt Fairbanks, Cynthia Trevisan, Frank Yip, Christine Isakson, Lori Schroeder (Provost)

- Open Floor
  - I showed the Sharepoint folder for meeting minutes. Draft minutes through 3/18 are on there currently.
  - Yip requested Isakson make a page with full General Senate membership (a list). Isakson said she would add it to her list.
- Topics for Discussion with the President
  - The various administrative hires (and lack of hiring in certain positions like A/V).
  - It was noted that these questions were asked of the President last time he visited, but the answers were somewhat unsatisfactory.
- New Employee Onboarding Process
  - McNie – Barbara Reece is now in charge of employee onboarding. Quite immersive. New faculty will also meet with Dinesh and her (Chair and Vice Chair) to be informed about Senate, etc. Dinesh and Bets are putting together some slides and what not. The onboarding will include some Cal Maritime history and current character. New employees will have an opportunity to meet with various groups (admin, athletics, students, faculty, etc.) Process will be quite extensive, taking place over about two weeks.
  - McNie mentioned they do this once a quarter (or maybe only once semester?).
  - Yip says this sounds quite time intensive.
- Funding for Scholarly Activities
  - Pinisetty - \$100,000 to each School for research and creative activities. Also, there will be something in the way of start-up funds for new hires.
  - Yip – these resolutions seem to be moving things, people. Well done.
  - Trevisan – who will decide how the money is apportioned? Discretion of the Dean? Applications?
  - Pinisetty – I asked this of the Provost and President. Said that it should not be by the Deans' discretion. Faculty group (with Dean input) should be reviewing applications. Should be clear expectations and criteria. The Provost reportedly agreed with this sentiment.
  - Pinisetty – suggested having research support faculty positions (like Alex Parker's previous position under Sue Opp), one per School, who would help run things and write policy. The Provost reportedly seemed amenable to this idea.
  - Isakson related an instance of the Dean taking over money (\$25,000) from the intermodal association that Bob Neumann (IBL lecturer) got and deciding where it should go. Partly into this new inventory program for non-licensed student standing watch, which seems weird given that it was specifically for IBL folks, not all non-licensed programs. Also very strange that the Dean has control over the funds instead of the applicant.
  - Isakson added that the recent IRA application for the external exam funds is odd, because this use seems to be more aligned with the grant's mission, not IRA (despite technically falling within the purview).
  - [Provost joined the meeting at this point.]

- Pinisetty noted that our opinion is that the funds should be distributed by a faculty-run committee.
- Provost said that faculty input should be included, but that because the money may be used for a lot of different things, we need to carefully consider who gets input.
- Funds cannot be used to buy-out time according to the President.
- Provost – we do need transparency on what these funds can/can't do. Agrees that it should not be entirely up to the Deans' discretion.
- Trevisan – what is the rationale for not using the funds for buy-outs? Time is often the most important thing for starting/maintaining research programs.
- Provost – we're not quite like other CSUs, not an R1, so we want to make sure faculty remain classroom teachers. We also don't have the funds to do buy-outs in a big way. The funds could be used to hire, say, a grant consultant so that faculty could get a grant, which would then fund their buy-outs.
- Isakson – a related issue: we should have a well-defined rate for buy-outs so that professors who are bringing in money can have a consistent number to work with.
- Some discussion on whether the new Scholarly Activities Task Force was tasked with figuring out a model for this.
- Yip – noted that there are different policies on different CSU campuses. And the operational posture here seems to be that no funds can be used for buy-out.
- Provost – again, we're not quite like other places, usually buy-outs are more of an R1 thing. Wants there to be equity between faculty who are in different fields of research, some with larger federal grants, some with small (or zero) grants because of choice of specialty. I think we all share the goal of research productivity and supporting these activities. [general agreement]
- Isakson - it will be important to have well-defined borders on these funds so that faculty know when they have an idea whether they should apply and can be competitive. Buying proprietary data, travel, conferences, etc, etc.
- Provost – yes, it will be invaluable to get the faculty voice on this. Admits that she's still figuring out which bucket of money can be used for what and some are not clearly defined in terms of their scope. Isakson noted she is also learning this, and there was general agreement that not all buckets of funding are well-defined on campus.
- Provost – we're looking for consistency across Schools, but the nature of research varies across the University. How can that be handled? McNie – we want to make sure the structure encompasses the kind of research that MT and licensed folks do.
- Provost – what about pursuing another degree? Pinisetty– that doesn't strike me as research/scholarly-activities.
- The Provost noted that there are professional development funds in HR, which most faculty don't know about.
- Pinisetty – these funds seem to be more appropriate for Academic Affairs to handle rather than HR.
- Provost – if there's a faculty member applying for these new scholarly activity funds, it makes sense to have a layer of input between the faculty and the Dean. The Chair would make sense.
- Some concern expressed that the Dean would control the funds, but the Provost clarified that the Deans would be making sure the use of funds would be appropriate for the program, not in terms of whether they like the research project. And the Provost would field appeals of the Deans' decisions.

- Which faculty should be consulted to set up these ground rules for this new funding? Pinisetty said he will look for people.
  - Yip – Perhaps School-wide meetings on the subject?
- Deans' Responsibilities Document
  - Pinisetty noted that he had received a little feedback on the Dean responsibilities document. He'll forward what he received to the Provost.
  - Yip and Isakson said they also would be sending some feedback through Pinisetty.
  - Provost noted her surprise that there was no existing internal document on this subject.
  - Yip noted our appreciation for putting this document together with input from Faculty Senate.
- ARC Meetings
  - Pinisetty announced the meeting that we will be having about the ARC process with Professor Nordenholz, Dean van Houck, and Associate Provost Benton.
  - We will not see the complete review (only for ARC and supervisor), but we will see the final summary letter.
  - There will be a different meeting for the Captain, because the President is the Captain's direct supervisor.
- Meeting Adjourned