

Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 10, 2020

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Cynthia Trevisan, Frank Yip, Lori Schroeder (Provost)

Absent: Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair)

I. Urgent Matter: RTP Review of Asynchronous Teaching

- Pinisetty reports AVP Benton confirmed at least two candidates undergoing annual review are teaching entirely asynchronously and will have no synchronous class meetings for RTP reviewers to observe. We urgently need to create a supplementary form regarding the evaluation of asynchronous teaching since the existing forms will not apply.
- Pinisetty explains that our options are to either make a decision as a Senate Executive Committee or to call an emergency meeting of the senate. However, emergency meetings must be called seven days in advance and the ET Department is starting reviews next week, so Pinisetty is concerned that a meeting.

Senk notes procedural matter: "The Senate and its Standing Committees on matters that call for immediate action or attention may act for the Senate on such business of the Senate as may be necessary between meetings if: (a) If we act alone (as an Executive Committee without calling an emergency meeting of the whole Senate) we must report this action to the Senate as a specific agenda item at its next meeting. (b) Action taken by the Executive Committee during a period when the Senate cannot be convened (a) shall require a majority vote of the members of the Committee; (b) shall be reported to the Senate at its next meeting).

Should the Executive Committee exercise the power to act for the Senate on this matter, which calls for immediate attention (implementing a new form for asynchronous teaching evaluation)? Vote is unanimous in favor.

Trevisan notes that she does not have the entirety of her course available to students. We may want to allow candidates the option to show that to reviewers.

Isakson responds that the course being evaluated; we want to make the evaluation comparable to a regular classroom visit. If we can show how much they need to show reviewers.

The committee expresses appreciation to Fairbanks for thoroughness of the draft resolution

Committee discusses how we should designate the difference between Senate resolutions

and Executive Committee resolution. Yip suggests calling this Executive Committee

Resolution 1a to distinguish clearly from regular Senate resolutions. Pinisetty and Senk

agrees to implement suggested changes.

IV. Scheduling

Provost has said she wants clarity around scheduling process, buy-in from Chairs, Deans, and Faculty. Decision-making happens. There needs to be a process. Provost has concerns about the short term, this next set of scheduling. Provost reports she spoke to Dinesh about this earlier in the week and they both agreed there needed to be some proactive decision making about course enrollments. Chairs should know that Provost asked Deans to share budget information that came to them from CLC this week so that they understand the pressures motivating some of the recent decisions about cutting sections.

V. Lecturer Contracts

Isakson brings to the attention of the committee that a lecturer in IBL reported he received his contract yesterday and learned for the first time that his workload was cut by 40% had even started.

Isakson reports that to her knowledge the lecturer had a meeting with the Dean recently and was not notified about the reduction until he received the contract.

Trevisan reports that she received an email last night from one of her lecturers notifying her that she did not receive her contract yet. Trevisan adds that there may be ambiguity in the case of the IBL lecturer, who has historically done advising.

Fairbanks asks if the lecturer has contacted Demetra to make sure the contract is correct. Fairbanks reports that there have been numerous errors during the summer, and that if Demetra was working in a hurry it could be an error. Fairbanks also notes that as Faculty Rights chair, Isakson should refer the lecturer to him, especially if there are ripple effects (eg. if a lecturer formerly given reassigned time for advising is no longer advising, that will increase the workload for other IBL faculty). Isakson reports that CFA President is aware. Provost reports that she has a meeting scheduled with Don Maier this afternoon and will seek more information.

VI. Curriculum Committee Vote on the MT Curriculum Overhaul

Yip reports that the MT department did not engage with the S&M department appropriately during the curriculum review process.

Midd [J] YgDfcj cghUf \YUXgi dI gmb[hUthe Science and Math Department will be sending a letter expressing concerns about the proposal and asking Provost to pause the process and send the proposal back for further deliberations.

Trevisan notes that members of the Curriculum Committee did not appear to understand the nature of the changes to the curriculum. There are clear indicators that the people who voted on the proposal had not given a careful reading about the impact on students. The fact that the Maritime Academies was problematic.

Isakson adds in terms of process and mutual respect and consideration: if you think about the process of the curriculum review, it's not just about the curriculum, it's about the process. U`cZ`h`c`g`Y`W`a` a` Y`b`h`g`"`M`c`i` f`Y`U`g`_`Y`X`h`c` d`f`Y`g`Y`b`h`m`c`i` f`c`[]W`U`g`h`c`k` \`m`m`c`i` `X`X`c`f`X`X`b`c`h`h`a`k`e`

