

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (9/22/2022)

Attendees: Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Christine Isakson, Victoria Haller (Student Rep), Frank Yip, Wil Tsai, and Keir Moorhead

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *Minutes from 9/8/2022 and 9/13/2022 were reviewed and approved with edits for clarity and concision.*
- Chair/Vice-Chair Updates
 - Senk reported that she had asked her department to meet soon (because they're affected by the ICAS plan for AB 928 compliance the most), and then offer feedback to the GE Committee. She asked GE members to ask their constituencies as well.
- Discussion of ARC Policy
 - Senk spoke to Nordenholz about the ARC membership number change. She explained the rationale. He seems ok with the idea.
 - There's not a lot of momentum for by-laws writing in the standing Senate committees. Should we simply bring by-laws to Senate ourselves?
 - Tsai noted that ARC is waiting for us to supply an MTLM member, so there's that, and any changes we make won't take effect until next year (next cycle). The Provost is up for review, so she can perhaps give some further feedback on the process.
 - Regarding the proposal to separate the survey from the policy - Tsai objected, saying that then we're in a situation where if a couple people leave, we might lose the survey instrument and that institutional knowledge if the survey was separate from the policy. Also, do we know that the archive of the reviews is well implemented in the President's Office/HR? Hard to say without requesting a look.
 - There was some discussion of the survey itself. It was noted that the President did not like the survey instrument (or aspects of it), but he has not been specific on its deficiencies.
 - Tsai noted that we do need to adjust the reflection letter step in the review, and perhaps we send a new policy with that and a slightly tweaked survey instrument back to the President and see what happens.
 - Regarding the proposal to separate the survey from the policy - even if we didn't allow the administration to veto the survey questions upon subsequent revisions, they could still impede the progress of the reviews if they didn't like the questions. Leaving it in the policy might avoid this possible conflict.
 - Further discussion of this: Current administration objections to the reviews partly stem from the faculty saying some unkind things in their reviews that administrators view as personal attacks and others might view as harsh, but legitimate criticism. Could we filter the comments in some way? Answer: Currently, ARC only filters personally identifiable information. The ARC *definitely doesn't want* to filter responses further as it threatens their role as an impartial arbiter.
 - We could note to administration that faculty must tolerate harsh or inappropriate language in their reviews all the time. Additionally, if there's specific language in the

survey questions that is objectionable, the administration needs to identify that if we're going to move forward with adjustments.

- Regarding survey questions that could be problematic - Tsai called out the survey question, "Describe aspects of the administrator's job performance that are exceptional." The word exceptional is perhaps too lofty. Senk also noted the question about whether the administrator is meeting job expectations.
 - Tsai suggested that to move forward on this, perhaps we involve the Provost, and we want to emphasize the goal of the reviews, which is a formative review, not summative or punitive.
 - Senk is summing up so that she can put this across to administration. Some discussion: Pecota was the only administrator who declined an invitation to attend the meeting with Senate Exec. We're thinking about adjusting the 'closing the loop' portion of the policy, which is a reflective statement and is essentially released to the whole campus. Senk notes she could see the discomfort in the release to the campus part, though the reflective statement has value. Perhaps Senate Exec would be the only ones to receive it? And the administrator's direct supervisor?
 - ARC Membership – no time to revise the policy before the current cycle, so we need an MTLM rep to replace Steve Browne. This prompted a short discussion of elections that need to be run.
- Cozen O'Connor Visit Updates
 - Yip made it to the evening open faculty meeting with Cozen O'Connor. He noted that they were very clear who they represent (Chancellor's Office) in this process. Cozen O'Connor gave a pretty candid description of their take on our Title IX procedures as well as the CSU's at large.
 - Haller said that the visit was discussed within Associated Students (AS), so students are aware of the student meeting today with Cozen O'Connor. The venue has shifted to the lower campus from the Inclusion Center, which is good.
 - Tsai noted that the report from Cozen O'Connor would go to the President, but there's no plan for further distribution. Perhaps we can make the point to the President that it would help legitimize the investigation to release the report more widely. Yip said that Senate and AS were planning resolutions to request that the report be released.
 - Corps of Cadet Learning Outcomes Update
 - Follow up! No updates on this currently. Perhaps David Taliaferro will have some information. He is apparently back on campus.
 - Academic Internship Policy Updates
 - *Are we comfortable saying that our endorsement of the policy is contingent on the suggested edits? No objections.* Senk will send along the message with the latest version with Isakson's edits incorporated.
 - Next Steps on AB 928 and Feedback to the ASCSU
 - Culture & Communications is talking about this next week and will offer feedback to the GE committee.
 - Dewey noted that the oral communication requirement in ICAS says that it must be completely focused on the theory and practice of oral communication, not just learning

outcomes. This changes, fundamentally, what A1 is in the current GE pattern. Only one course here at Cal Maritime currently satisfies this requirement.

- C&C department language will head to GE Committee in their October meeting. Other GE Committee members are polling their constituents for feedback as well.
- Regarding the just-passed AB 928 resolution distribution: McNie needs to be the sender (probably). Tsai hasn't seen it at the ASCSU. Senk is contacting McNie on this item.

- Art & Sci Consultants' Presentation Scheduling
 - It was agreed that Monday is best for some schedules and also in terms of appearances. Friday news is often interpreted as an attempt to bury things. More faculty should be on campus on Monday as well.
 - Haller asked for clarification on what the presentations will involve. Senk, Yip, and Tsai gave an outline – data on why students come here, why they don't, why they leave, and many other subjects related to Cal Maritime's current and future enrollment.

- Senate Elections
 - Senk is setting up a Microsoft Form to handle the ARC School of MTLM representative and consulted Tsai on some technical details.

- Open Floor
 - Yip noted that the enrollment issue is hurting us now. Sciences & Mathematics is struggling to have work for all tenured/tenure-track faculty this spring. The situation is critical. He would like some acknowledgement of this and also some statement from the administration on how it would be handled now and in the future.
 - Senk – should I ask about this before next meeting or should we talk about this the next time we're all together? Yip – I think next meeting is fine.
 - Isakson thought that we could invite the new Captain to Senate Exec or General Senate or both, perhaps after Day on the Bay.
 - Some discussion: It was agreed that the Captain is very, very, very busy, so no hurry on the invite. Definitely after Day on the Bay.
 - Moorhead said that there was a call for faculty participation on the Day on the Bay. The 'pay' was a free ticket for a friend or family. Everyone responded with an affirmative no. Isakson – I think Steve Browne may have said yes, but otherwise no.
 - Moorhead – I'm waiting for a report from Kazek, but it looks like we might not have enough spots for the number of students who need to go on cruise. Apparently, there are two cohorts of seniors who have a need. Moorhead also noted that they're short on classroom space and lab equipment for proper instruction. Continuing, Moorhead said he's had to rebuild the cruise program every year for the last 6 years (two cruise to one cruise to no cruise to two cruises but one overloaded and one underloaded and one only 40 days). Not sure what to do about this, but it's a big problem. Not sustainable.
 - Haller shared that there was a meeting in which students were informed that there are about 50 students needing the 'victory lap' cruise when in a typical year there are about 10. There's some uncertainty as to whether the students would be able to get their licenses on time.
 - How do we address this? Is it a Senate or CFA or both kind of issue? Moorhead wasn't sure, but we may have problems staffing the ship, particularly if MARAD doesn't pick up the bill for external mariners. He noted that they were short-staffed this past summer in

terms of the academic program. It will be the same situation or a worse situation this summer in his estimation.

- Moorhead says he's going to bring this up in the Deans & Chairs meeting. Waiting on Kazek's report - maybe a week. The solution to short staffing is money, but the administration says there is none, and then we just do the same thing again.
- Yip – we need to start planning for CommUNITY Day now! Tsai – who's job is it? Cadet Affairs and Academic Affairs both have a claim, and it's unclear who is leading.

- Meeting Adjourned