

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (9/29/2022)

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

Note: some attendees arrived after the Academic Awards ceremony (~11:30am).

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *Minutes from 9/22/2022 were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent with edits for clarity and concision.*

- Updates on Upcoming Elections and on Honorary Degrees
 - Academic Affairs developed a policy for directors, we vetted it, but it isn't signed by the President yet. However, Graham and Lori will follow the spirit of it.
 - We need to run an election for the IE Director position. The candidates are currently Khalid Bachkar and Julie Chisholm.
 - Ryan Wade has been nominated as GSMA chair.
 - We are still waiting for Frank Yip's confirmation as interim Department Chair for Sciences and Mathematics.
 - We need to run an election for the MTLM ARC position.
 - We need to run elections for the other open Senate positions.

 - An honorary degree was not handed out last year. There's an impression that we're not getting good candidates for these degrees, perhaps because we're not soliciting nominations appropriately. How do we fix this?
 - Idea: disseminate the qualifications for these degrees, maybe on our website.
 - Idea: maybe have this as a standing agenda item during a fall semester General Senate meeting so that Senators know to poll their constituents and bring nominations to the meeting.
 - Senk – we should think big with these nominations. Example - James Cameron is filming Avatar 2 underwater! [Secretary unsure if Senk's tongue was firmly in cheek regarding James Cameron.]
 - Isakson – can we also have information available about past recipients of honorary degrees granted by Cal Maritime. That would be a valuable reference.
 - McNie – how do we involve students? Perhaps contact the Compass as a start.

- Monthly Meeting with the President - Review
 - McNie and Senk presenting. They met with the President yesterday. The Provost was not present, but Karyn Cornell (Chief of Staff) was.
 - The notes are in the Senate Exec SharePoint courtesy of Senk.
 - Senk related that the President seems amenable to many of our proposals. For example, the idea of the Inclusion Center moving to Mayo from PEAC for a more central campus location.
 - Resolution responses were delayed due to Cornell taking her Comprehensives this weekend. She was very apologetic. Responses should come soon once these are complete.

- One concern – the President’s current take on the Art&Sci report is that it will take a lot of time to process, but Art&Sci seems to be saying that we need to move quickly and make profound changes. If the process drags out, it could be problematic.
 - Isakson – I really appreciate that you’re doing these reports out to Senate Exec. It’s important information to have.
 - There was a discussion with the President about the Captain’s hiring. President emphasized that the cruise’s mission is primarily academic (the reason for the two Deans leading the Captain’s hiring committee).
 - They also discussed the service load on faculty and the inequity in those loads due to faculty who don’t really do service.
 - McNie and Senk also asserted that if faculty were going to be involved in assessments of budget and other university functions, there should be a faculty position with release time that directs this.
 - Consolidation of University committees was also discussed, and the idea of reducing the overall number and size of the committees was received well.
 - They discussed the idea of a resolution to protect new faculty in their first few years from service so they can concentrate on teaching and research. Perhaps no service or something adjacent to that.
 - Cropper noted that the committees are created with good intent, but he’s got some administrators on 10-12 committees, and it needs to be addressed.
 - Cropper was invited to attend a Senate Exec meeting but is not available through November. He proposed a working lunch or dinner. Those present expressed approval of this idea. McNie will reach out to the President’s Office.
- DEI/JEDI/Gender Equity Committee Update
 - McNie introduced Julie Simons, and she asked Julie to share her thoughts about a way forward on these committees.
 - Simons stated that the Gender Equity Committee is no longer active. It was large and unwieldy for scheduling, and some positions on it were not well-utilized.
 - Often the question was asked whether the Gender Equity folks were working with the DEI Council on various issues. In Simon’s experience, the DEI Council’s work has ebbed and flowed during her time here, but overall it has not been very functional. King Xiong [most recent DEI Council chair] related that one reason for this is simply that they had no budget. The DEI Council *should* be a line item in the budget.
 - Simons said from a Senate perspective, we should have at least 2, preferably 3 faculty on the DEI Council, and those people ideally would also constitute at least a part of the JEDI Committee. She thinks JEDI should exist, because Senate would control its activities and mission. Her opinion is that the DEI Council will likely continue to be dysfunctional without a major course correction, and she’s not very hopeful of that with the current administration.
 - McNie met with VP McMahon and others about the work of the DEI Council. They were open to changing the structure and having co-chairs, one of whom would be faculty. They’re willing to write in that structure to the Council’s by-laws. McNie also said that she was told there *is* a budget for DEI, though McNie asserted that the budget should be increased, that administration was receptive to that, and that the President wanted the DEI Council to have recurring events (which would of course require a budget).

- McNie noted that Aparna Sinha is already on the DEI Council. She would advocate for 4-5 faculty on the Council. The faculty co-chair would be elected by the faculty. She wants JEDI and DEI to work collaboratively – it would be unfortunate if their work conflicted or duplicated efforts. She views it as a chance to “build back better”. [Secretary resists impulse for emoji in the minutes.]
 - Yip – I have personal experience with the dysfunction of this Council. We need a mission and the power to do substantive work. We need that in the charter. His experience is that it devolved to ‘Taco Tuesday’ type events, which is not what the DEI Council should be doing.
 - McNie noted that the charter is new of 9/2021. Administration seemed receptive to changes.
 - Simons said that the number of faculty on DEI Council is important. Too many is a lot of work and also next to impossible to schedule.
 - Some discussion of this. Agreement that the DEI Council is and was quite large, which made it unwieldy and that likely led to its problems.
 - *Action Items: review and possible revise charter and think about adjusting the number of individuals on the DEI Council to be more nimble.*
 - Tsai – perhaps another action item. *We need to finish the JEDI Committee by-laws.* Simons’ proposal is that the membership serve on JEDI and the DEI Council. Not sure if we need to restart the process of approving the Committee in Senate.
 - Yip – isn’t it a huge structural failure that King Xiong was the chair of the DEI Council and he didn’t even know there was a budget? McNie – that is certainly a good question, but there is a budget, and the President seemed supportive of expanding that.
- Title IX Trainings
 - There’s a Title IX (TIX) training scheduled for during the General Senate meeting. We’re being asked to turn over that time for that important training. McNie noted that she’s very protective of General Senate meeting time, but the TIX trainings are also very important. What do we think about this?
 - Provost Schroeder noted that the TIX trainings will be offered at other times. She realizes that commandeering meeting time is not ideal. However, we really need to have some accountability, i.e. Senators should commit to attending another TIX training if the General Senate meeting goes ahead.
 - Idea: permitting absence for Senators and keeping attending Senators accountable for attending another time slot for TIX?
 - *No firm conclusion on how to handle this at this time.*
 - Provost Report
 - Art&Sci presentation will have to be the 14th (Friday) of October. President Cropper is available that day only, and the Art&Sci folks thought it was imperative that he attend.
 - There will be two different time slots in the day for the presentations.
 - There will be discussion sessions for the campus to digest what they’ve heard.
 - Provost Schroeder said that she’s going to try get the faculty from the Art&Sci steering committee to be on the panel with the consultants.
 - Some discussion of the venue for the meetings. Currently the Compass room is the venue. Some discussion of PowerPoint font size best practices.

- Task Force on Cruise updates: they looked at the recommendations coming out of the problematic 2021 cruise. Those point to a much different role for the Cruise Committee in the future. Assessment, academic program, etc. That's not currently in the Cruise Committee's charter, so there will need to be a campus-wide rethinking of what the Cruise Committee does. The new Captain will of course figure prominently. Provost Schroeder characterized it as a 'reset' of the Cruise Committee as an entity.
 - She noted the (currently inactive) Cruise Committee on Senate, and she wanted to apprise us of this upcoming change so that we can have these upcoming changes in mind.
 - McNie – perhaps the Senate Cruise committee could function as a subcommittee of the University one?
 - Moorhead – I think there's still a need for the Senate one. Perhaps it's a good thing that we haven't written the Senate Cruise committee by-laws. They can be developed in parallel with the University one now. As far as the Senate Committee vs. the University Committee roles, he outlined his thought that Senate would handle more of the 'why?' and the University Committee more of the 'how?' regarding Cruise.
 - Provost Schroeder noted that if the academic program is entirely Senate-driven, then the Deans of the license-granting Schools seem to be left out when they shouldn't be.
 - Some discussion of the roles of these Committees. Particularly with regards to assessment of the cruise. Proposal that the Senate committee runs the assessment. McNie gave some context, noting that assessment was essentially non-existent in even the recent past. The Senate Cruise Committee was created/proposed partly because of that problem.
 - Isakson noted that it's important for the standards for evaluation and assessment be available and disseminated prior to cruise as well. This would help with instruction.
 - Provost Schroeder - Do we have learning outcomes for cruise? Answer – no, not really. It was agreed that would be a place to start. [Moorhead later corrected this, saying that there are course specific learning outcomes for cruise coursework.]
 - Provost – so, you're saying that the Senate Cruise Committee should still remain, but its focus would be primarily assessment? Discussion of this: Additional role would be evaluation of ship conditions, staff, etc. The Provost noted that faculty sitting in judgement of staff is not something that would work. Continued discussion: Perhaps not evaluating staff, but a mechanism for feedback on ship conditions, etc. These sorts of things could be assessed as "conditions for learning". It wouldn't be blaming people, but the environment and structure surrounding the cruise's academic program.
 - Haller noted that there is a lengthy syllabus for commercial cruise, so there's existing learning outcomes for that at least. Perhaps a place to start for training cruise learning outcomes.
- AB 928 Planning Update
 - Isakson is presenting. She noted Beth Steffel's email clarifying that transfers currently have multiple methods of meeting lower division GE requirements and the AB 928 focuses only on transfer pathways. Currently, no changes to the CSU's GE pattern (which applies to those who start in the CSU) are being proposed. However, there's an expectation (and confusion) on many CSU campuses that there will eventually be changes to the CSU's GE pattern and that those changes will mirror the proposed changes to the common transfer pathway.

- Discussion took place between Senk, Isakson, and Tsai regarding the intent and interpretation of AB 928. This included the fact that currently in EO 1100, upper division transfer students can get credit for CSU GE through IGETC (CSU). Therefore, it should be the case that Cal-GETC would be an alternate path to meet GE, allowing the current CSU GE pattern, defined in EO 1100 to remain. However, it was noted that this does mean that although all students are earning the same degrees, transfer students will have less GE coursework than those who started in the CSU. However, this is similar to current practice with transfer students.
- Perhaps we should have a meeting including ASCSU Chair Beth Steffel and Colin Dewey. We're currently proposing a weird, two-class system - some people with speech, humanities, and Area E...and some with just one of those.
- Isakson – I just wanted to clarify that it's not assumed that this pathway will be applied to the CSU pathway at all campuses.
- People are confused here. Apparently not everyone coming to Cal Maritime takes the same set of courses for admittance.
- Isakson will invite Chair Steffel to the General Education Committee meeting on Tuesday to provide clarification, which will help inform the committee's feedback.
- Open Floor
 - Waiting on numbers of students needing cruise from Mike Kazek. Apparently this is meant to happen by tomorrow. This is needed to start planning for summer cruise. The situation currently looks quite daunting.
- Meeting Adjourned