

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (11/3/2022)

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

Absent: Wil Tsai and Christine Isakson (attending ASCSU plenary)

Note: The meeting began with Fairbanks, McNie, Schroeder, and Haller in attendance. We did not have a quorum and Zoom authentication issues prevented Senk and Yip from joining. We reconvened at 11:30am with Senk, Fairbanks, McNie, Schroeder, and Yip.

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *Minutes from 10/18/2022 were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent after minor edits for grammar and clarity.*
- Provost's Report
 - Provost Schroeder said there are tentative dates for the Art&Sci report discussions - 11/30 4-5pm, 12/1 11-noon, 12/5 noon-1, and 12/6 11-noon. The tentative format will involve multiple discussion tables with a facilitator at each table. There will be some guiding questions, and a recordkeeper designated by each table.
 - Library Dean Michele van Hoeck is leaving, how are we going to handle her departure as an institution? Provost Schroeder said that it is a practice in the CSU to occasionally borrow people from within the CSU, and there's a person who has been identified who has related expertise that might fit the position. They're planning to bring that person to the campus to meet the library staff and faculty, make sure they're a good fit, etc.
 - Question for us today – how do we handle this selection while respecting shared governance processes? Provost Schroeder noted that we don't want the perception that Dean van Hoeck is selecting her successor. McNie – yes, I would hope that the librarians and staff's opinions would be respected regarding this interim appointment. Provost Schroeder agreed that is important, and she pledges to work with the library faculty/staff on this appointment. *General consensus that as long as this consultation happens, we should move forward in selecting an interim Library Dean.*
 - Provost Schroeder is also working to replace Mike Kazek (Director of Licensing). There will be some information forthcoming on this process.
- Senate Chair's Report
 - McNie has, thus far, received zero nominations for a replacement of Keir Moorhead on Senate Exec.
 - Senk said that Ariel Setniker is possibly interested. She was concerned about overrepresentation of Sciences and Mathematics but given that we have received no other indications of interest in this open position, this is perhaps a secondary concern.
 - We will also reach out to others so that we (hopefully) have a slate of candidates.
 - Women in Maritime Leadership representative from faculty? Maggie Ward, previous rep, won't be doing it this year.
 - We are scheduled to meet a member of the Board of Trustees in-person on 11/9 – Yip can make it, Fairbanks can't, and Senk can't. McNie will reach out to Tsai and Isakson.

- Policies! We need to write them. Fairbanks volunteered to write the budget oversight policy.
 - Senk noted that Senate can revise the by-laws by simple majority and given that administration has been making improvements on their communication and processes, perhaps we can get rid of some of these oversight committees? We've had issues staffing them, which seems to indicate that faculty don't see a pressing need for them.
 - Fairbanks noted that the University-wide Budget Advisory Committee still has issues, in his opinion. It doesn't meet very often and seems to have limited agency. Retaining the Senate Budget Oversight Committee might be a good idea.
 - Update on the new Cruise Committee. There are 3 faculty reps on it. McNie's take is that it's quite different than in previous years and that's encouraging. Perhaps we should not prioritize the by-laws for the Cruise committee (the Senate one) while we see how well the University committee functions this year.
 - Senk noted that we might consider shifting the Senate Cruise committee to an 'as needed' or ad hoc committee since people want this committee (and the other new Senate standing committees) but aren't willing to staff them year to year. Senk suggested that she could update the Senate on this idea in the November meeting.
 - There was further discussion of this idea. Result: general consensus that these committees should meet essentially as needed, perhaps being 'activated' with a simple majority vote of the General Senate. This will require some adjustments of the by-laws, so consultation with the General Senate will begin.
- Sabbatical Policy
 - Senk will re-distribute the policy to Senators and announce its second reading at the November meeting. Fairbanks noted that there has been quite a gap since the first reading, so we should distribute it well in advance.
- Appendix J Reviews
 - McNie introduced the subject. There's apparently a sentiment that there's an ambiguity in the criteria within Appendix J that has implications in RTP.
 - Provost Schroeder observed that the work on Appendix J should proceed before any adjustments of departmental Appendix K's.
 - Provost Schroeder says that when you look at Appendix J, some of the language that defines professional development and research also appears verbatim within the service category. This doesn't seem like a best practice even if this was done intentionally to give faculty flexibility.
 - It was noted that Senk's previous employer has some documentation that lays this out quite nicely and cites appropriate literature to support its definitions of research, etc.
 - How do we proceed? Fairbanks noted that anything RTP-related tends to be quite controversial and agreed it needs revision, but that we should be prepared for, um, feedback.
 - Further discussion: what is the specific problem(s) we're trying to solve? One item: Cross-listing various activities as service and/or research as needed. The criteria should be clearer, which will help candidates, and the three pillars (teaching, scholarship, service) all need to be supported for RTP candidates to be successful.
 - Fairbanks noted that Appendix J may have been written broadly to encompass other Unit 3 faculty employees like librarians, counselors, some coaches, etc. We want to keep

them in mind when revising. McNie noted that the Library already has an Appendix K, though theirs might need some clarity given her experience on their departmental RTP committee.

- Further discussion: Senk noted that at Hartford, there was flexibility to an extent (e.g. talks from researchers being service to University), you just couldn't double count it. Yip – research should be novel, fundamentally. Question: what about writing a textbook? Answer: if only you use it, not novel. If others use it, novel to them, so qualifies as research. Research need not necessarily be peer-reviewed but vetted or accepted by other professionals in the field (editorial boards, professional orgs, etc.).
- Question: should we propose this in Senate? Suggestion: start with the Senate RTP Committee as subject matter experts, and then go from there.

- Meeting Adjourned