

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (10/13/2022)

Attendees: Elizabeth McNie (Chair), Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Christine Isakson, Victoria Haller (Student Rep), Frank Yip, William Tsai, Keir Moorhead, and Provost Lori Schroeder

- Minutes Review and Approval
  - *Minutes from 9/29/2022 and 10/6/2022 were reviewed and approved after some edits for accuracy and concision. Keir Moorhead abstained from the 10/6 meeting minutes approval, because he was unfortunately not present.*
  
- Provost's Report
  - Today is the first presentation by Art&Sci. Anything we [Senate Exec] can do to make sure attendance is good would be appreciated.
  - Natalie Herring will roll out dates for strategic planning concerning enrollment very soon, and these will be followed by campus discussions.
  - Michele van Hoeck (Library Dean) noted that there's a rumor circulating that the tutoring budget has been cut. The reverse is true.
  - Richard Ortega (VP of Advancement) wants us to weigh in on the endowed chair policy. If we've considered it, we should give it our blessing as soon as possible. McNie noted that this was accidentally left off the list for today's meeting.
  - Eric Hoppe [University Grants Specialist] is retiring. Don't panic, Academic Affairs is moving to replace him. Eric will complete his work on campus around the end of October. The grant writer is coming on board around then. The search for Eric Hoppe's replacement will get going as soon as possible. A faculty hiring committee member will be asked for.
  - Yip – the rumor on tutoring seems to have its origins in that tutors have had their hours cut. Tsai said that his information was that one tutor was maxed out in terms of hours and wanted to expand their hours more. Erika Sanchez Nelson [Coordinator for Student Academic Support] apparently said that other tutors were underutilized, and thus their hours should come up rather than the single tutor's hours being further expanded.
  - There was a brief discussion on what the limit on student working hours were for campus jobs. Interested parties were referred to Erika Nelson for further information.
  
- AB 928: GE Committee Report and Recommendation to Senate
  - Discussion here is how to handle this in the upcoming General Senate. Senators should be advised that the intent is to waive a first reading so our feedback to the ASCSU can be on time.
  - Senk – can we frame the feedback as a memo to Isakson and Tsai, or does it need to be in the form of a resolution? McNie – I don't think we're restricted in the form of the feedback to our ASCSU Senators.
  - Senk shared the draft document that has been reviewed by the General Education Committee and some in Senate Exec.
  - Senk will draft a resolution and will share the document with all Senators as soon as possible so they have time for review prior to our General Senate meeting.

- Planning for the General Senate Meeting and Gender Equity Committee Resolution
  - McNie shared the draft resolution for dissolving the Gender Equity ad hoc committee, commending Julie Simons for her leadership, and detailing where the future work in this area will be happening.
  - Tsai offered some feedback that McNie will implement. Fairbanks [accidentally] reiterated the request for more specificity in where this work would continue on campus - DEI Council, etc.
  
- Academic Integrity Committee Grade Appeal Procedures
  - McNie shared some slides on this subject. There's a need to revise the campus' student originated request for change in grade procedures.
  - EO 1037: Assignment of Grade and Grade Appeals Policy was briefly reviewed.
  - Some language in the current policy was highlighted as being problematic in its subjective nature (among other concerns). For example, one of the current bases for requesting a change in grade is "Instructor unfairness", another is "Instructor bad faith".
  - Provost Schroeder added that she was struck by the language in the current grade process policy. She noted that DHR (Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation) issues are at the very least awkward and possibly incurs legal liability for faculty on the AIC who are rendering these decisions.
  - Yip had some questions about what the proposed changes would entail. Who would handle the DHR? Answer: Ideally the Title IX/DHR coordinator. Yip thought that AIC members, if properly trained, would handle the issue better than HR. Provost Schroeder noted that potentially opens faculty up to liability if a student were to sue. She would suggest that the AIC members would 'bird dog' the investigation, make sure that it's timely and thorough, procedures followed, etc. But the investigation itself and its judgement on whether the accusation was DHR would be the purview of the DHR officer(s).
  - Isakson – I understand the positions here, but it seems to pose a problem if there's single person on campus handling these. Perhaps a third-party external investigator would be best?
  - Tsai – we do already have recruitment problems for committee work. If this responsibility is the AIC's, we may have increased problems staffing it. Additionally, faculty are used to taking on some administrative functions when certain positions are unfilled, but as these people come in, we should defer to their expertise.
  - McNie – two questions before us: (1) Do we want to let DHR issues be handled by an appropriate administrator? (2) Who fills that role?
  - Provost Schroeder – what we're uncovering here is an issue of how we handle DHR issues across the campus. Who to report to? Who handles the investigation? We're working to streamline this and make it clear who you're meant to be speaking to as a student who has experienced bias. She expressed doubt whether we wanted the AIC to be the point 'person'.
  - Further discussion – Yip argued that the AIC and faculty in general are better-suited to determine bias in terms of how it relates to grades and academic concerns. There was general agreement that the current form and language in the policy needs to be revised. Yip noted that the AIC's role could be limited to determining bias as it relates to the grade specifically.

- Haller noted that the student handbook should contain this information – who to report to, who handles it, etc. She expanded on this, noting that it’s unclear who edits the handbook and what the process is for editing it. It seems like it gets changed when people aren’t looking, and it also gets changed on the website without notice.
  - McNie – if we had someone in DHR on campus (trained and hired for that purpose), would that allay some of your concerns? Yip – yes, they could handle determination of bias and the AIC could then render the decision on the grade change.
  - McNie – this will be a further discussion with the General Senate when we start these revisions.
  - Tsai asked where (administratively) we go from here since this is an Academic Affairs (not Senate) policy. Provost Schroeder noted that there’s a reason she came here first as it affects faculty directly. Some discussion – agreement that current AIC members should be consulted early in this revision process. Provost Schroeder asked whether this would be a situation where she should reach out to the University General Counsel for legal advice. There was agreement that this was a good idea.
  - McNie – ok, we’ll reach out to Counsel, the AIC members, and we’ll return to this issue very soon.
- Professional Leave Committee
    - Senk summarized the current, unfortunate, situation: There’s no PLC Chair, the IBL member stepped down recently without giving a reason, the former Chair resigned and is now GSMA Chair so can’t serve on the PLC.
    - The old PLC policy actually says there should be one member from each department. MT have turned down their opportunity to have a representative. IBL has two people conflicted out (applying for sabbatical this cycle), Nipoli Kamdar (IBL Chair, so can’t serve on the PLC), and the person who stepped down as possible candidates. Raises the question of what we do when the only eligible department member refuses to serve. Exec recommendation is to allow the department to decide: either convince the one eligible member who stepped down to step up, or forego a representative.
    - Senk shared the policy draft that we’re working with [it went through a first reading last year] to try to form a PLC policy.
    - Some discussion of the part of the sabbatical application rubric that considers a candidate’s prior record and whether that’s appropriate in all cases. There were some concerns expressed about possible bias and also the ability of the PLC to properly assess the quality of prior work. Senk asserted that this was meant to address whether the application was related to a candidate’s prior work and their record in previous sabbaticals, not (for example) how prestigious the candidate’s prior work was.
    - Senk has added suggestions to the rubric for rating sabbatical. This ‘prior record’ item appears there as one item among approximately a half dozen, all equally weighted.
    - Discussion of the size of the Committee: Should it remain one per department? Or one per School? One per department seems excessive and creates problems when small departments have no eligible members who can serve. Committee should be similar in size to RTP Committee.
    - If we’re doing the latter, how do we select these folks? Elections? Appointment by Senate Executive? We can present options at general senate meeting.
    - McNie – does this need to be ready for the next General Senate? Answer: No, the cycle is already started for this year. McNie - ok, so send feedback to Senk and myself, and

we'll keep this moving. Senk suggests inviting feedback now, presenting the policy at the November senate meeting, and aiming for approval by January or February.

- After the above, there was a brief discussion of committee representation and service inequity amongst faculty. Relatively few faculty end up doing a very large proportion of service, and there doesn't seem to be a good mechanism for compelling service, even though it's contractually meant to be a portion of any full-time tenure-track/tenured faculty's workload.
- Senate Standing Committee Policies
  - We need them! Committees were instructed to have these completed by the end of 2021. Some simply did not do it. This discussion was deferred to the upcoming General Senate meeting.
- Future Schools Structure Discussion for the General Senate Meeting
  - McNie gave us an update. The task force has a list of sister universities and list of questions that we will ask of them about their structure. The thought is that each Senator will be assigned a university to interrogate.
  - Provost Schroeder – one thing to add. I hope we're all listening to the Art&Sci presentation today and thinking about how that might affect our conclusions in the School structure question. [Nodding heads were observed.]
- ARC Update and Proposed Policy Adjustments
  - McNie reviewed her proposed changes to the ARC policy. This is mostly concerning the meetings – how many and who should be in them.
  - Fairbanks expressed support for the supervisor being there, but not the reviewed administrator. That format, in his experience, has always been very uncomfortable and doesn't seem conducive to formative feedback.
  - Tsai asked whether we should have separate meetings for reviewing the data and then discussing with Senate Exec, the ARC Chair, and the administrator's supervisor? McNie said she's a little reluctant to have two entire Senate Exec meetings occupied by this. Perhaps review prior to the supervisor joining the meeting, and it can be all one meeting.
  - There was general acceptance of this idea.
  - Discussion of the questions and survey itself: Should we simply share the criteria by which administrators will be evaluated prior to each cycle? Tsai said that we should more specific and include the questions themselves as well.
  - There was a suggestion to separate the survey from the policy itself so that it can be updated without re-approving the policy for each revision. This suggestion was received positively.
- Academic Calendar for AY 2023-2024
  - McNie will share some information on this by email in the near future.
- Open Floor
  - Moorhead said we should start discussing how to deal with the number of students on the Golden Bear this summer. There's lots of rumors circulating. Students are getting stressed out.
  - Provost Schroeder and Dinesh Pinisetty (Dean of Engineering) are working on this issue.

- Isakson – did Mike Kazek get the numbers of students who need cruise? Answer: yes. Isakson – and we're not planning a second cruise because of dry-dock? Moorhead – the dock space hasn't yet been reserved, but if the dry-dock extends into the school year, it will wreak havoc with courses in the fall.
  - Some discussion of whether the academic calendar could be adjusted to try to plan around this eventuality. This sounds very difficult to plan around. The calendar is not finalized, but planning has been in progress.
  - We should invite the new Captain to visit a future meeting! General consensus immediately achieved.
- 
- Meeting Adjourned