

Senate Exec Meeting (9/10/2021)

Attendees: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Frank Yip, Christine Isakson, Bets McNie (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Wil Tsai, Margot Hanson, and Provost Lori Schroeder

- Chair's Announcement
 - Discussion of whether to move the General Senate meeting in deference to an invited speaker in Rizza at the same time on the 16th. We decided to leave the meeting as is, because moving it would cause more problems than it solved.
 - Scholarly Activities Resolution – we need to implement the Resolved's.
 - McNie got some people together last semester to work on the above. Evan Chang-Siu and Alejandro Cifuentes-Lorenzen were the faculty. Chang-Siu left the institution. McNie said that she will do a second round of recruiting and use the 'McNie Charm'TM to convince folks to volunteer.
 - Pinisetty asked the Provost for a response to the Senate meeting/faculty meetings being online (or with an online option) resolution.
 - Provost Schroeder noted that the President wasn't sure whether he was meant to respond and was confused by the resolution's distribution list and the fact that it came from the Senate Secretary instead of the Senate Chair
 - Hanson pointed out that the Secretary was our acting Chair at the time of the resolution passing.
 - The President was also wondering about the provisions of the CBA that dealt with work location and whether the Senate had purview over non-Senate meetings involving faculty.
 - McNie suggested we wordsmith the email such that the ask for a response is clear - what we'd like to hear about and what the timeline for response would be.
- Discussion of Flexibility in Instruction Modality Resolution
 - Tsai noted that the ship has sailed on wholesale changes to modality, but these Resolved's give faculty flexibility to work around circumstances like a family member with COVID.
 - Provost Schroeder – is this a request for blanket approval to work with their Chair for when they can teach online? The first Resolved reads as if she is ceding authority to Chairs to determine modality, which is something she's not willing to do.
 - Pinisetty said he agrees the first Resolved has some clarity issues.
 - McNie – no faculty have been given dispensation based on extenuating circumstances, which suggests that administration is not concerned with this. She feels we need to speak strongly on this, and if the President declines, then we're on the record.
 - Provost Schroeder – students are being asked to be here in-person. And faculty being at higher risk is at least debatable.
 - McNie – data indicates that 18-25 years old are at lower risk, and she reiterated her point that no dispensation through the ADA has been granted.
 - Provost – how do we determined what's extenuating?
 - McNie – that's a discussion.
 - Hanson – the ADA isn't a tool well-adapted for a pandemic and noted the risk of bringing COVID home to unvaccinated.
 - Provost – clinical personnel have indicated to us that the risk is extremely low.

- Hanson – the President/Provost indicated that contingency planning would occur, and she’s not seeing that. Supports the current language. Doesn’t appear that President will support it.
 - Provost – not saying that, but we seem to have disagreement about whether the risk has risen to the point where contingencies are necessary.
 - Hanson – administration seems to believe that faculty will jump en masse to online if given the option, whereas she thinks the faculty would teach what they believe to be pedagogically appropriate.
 - Pinisetty – hopes that Wil will take the lead in presenting this to Senate. And adjust language to bring clarity.
 - Tsai – not sure exactly how to proceed. The ship has sailed on modality (WASC required the adjustments happen prior to start of class). I’ll share with General Senate and ask for feedback to help with wordsmithing.
 - Other attendees agreed that we should leave as is and circulate to General Senate for comment.
 - Some discussion of whether this WASC requirement that Wil mentioned is campus or CSU specific. Wil shared a link for reference:
<https://wascsenior.app.box.com/s/2lrdd2veq1f82cdsdlmed279s4aaky66>
 - Provost reiterated her position that the vaccine rate on campus is so high that the risk is very low, and that we’re not close to the situation that we were in pre-vaccine last year, and it seems like we’re talking like we’re back there somehow.
- RTP Issue
 - Pinisetty described the situation outlined in Graham’s email on RTP committee membership.
 - Fairbanks added that he didn’t see significant potential for bias there. (in allowing people being promoted to serve on an RTP committee for retention)
 - *Senate Exec voted unanimously to support Graham’s solution.*
- Student Vaccination Data from Provost Schroeder
 - 14 students are technically non-compliant. However, they haven’t checked into their residence halls, etc. Student Affairs thinks they’re no-shows.
 - She noted that we’re not allowed to disenroll students yet. Hanson asked why and Provost noted this was an edict from the Chancellor’s Office (CO).
 - CO apparently also said disenrollment because of non-compliance should happen prior to census. Quite the conundrum.
 - Pinisetty said that Student Affairs is saying 3% have exemptions, 1-2% are non-compliant (but not here to the best of Student Affairs’ knowledge), and the rest are vaccinated.
 - Provost Schroeder explained that the one possible outlier among the 14 will get their first shot before coming and would be tested along with the exemption students until they were completely vaccinated.
 - Hanson asked about whether an option along the lines of the compliant/non-compliant designations given at SF State would be an option for us (in terms of information sharing). Provost noted that non-compliant would only apply to those 14 students, which would be equivalent to sharing their vaccine status at a small University like us.

- Meeting adjourned.