

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (11/10/2022)

Attendees: Elizabeth McNie (Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Frank Yip, Wil Tsai, Christine Isakson, Ariel Setniker, and Provost Lori Schroeder

Absent: Sarah Senk. She is traveling for a presentation.

- Minutes Review and Approval
  - *Minutes from 11/3/2022 were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent. Tsai and Isakson abstained.*
- Provost's Report
  - Provost Schroeder mentioned that the possibility of an interim Library Dean from another CSU is looking a little trickier than initially thought. Updates will be forthcoming.
- ARC Policy Review
  - McNie said that the amendments to the policy are rather small (presence of the administrator in the meeting, and the removal of the reflection statement by the administrator), and thus she's hoping for a first reading waiver in the Senate meeting.
  - Tsai said he thought we were doing more (modifying evaluation questions, etc.), so with these smaller changes, it seems reasonable as long as we give Senators plenty of opportunity to review the changes.
  - Isakson noted that waiving the first reading does make it hard for the broader faculty to have input into the proposed changes. The ASCSU has tried to shift away from first reading waivers because of this.
  - McNie said she would send out the revised policy on Monday (today is a pseudo Friday, so it might go unnoticed).
- McNie's Conversation with Max Jones (AS President)
  - The conversation with Max Jones was concerning the Art&Sci consultants' report.
  - Jones' impression was very positive. He's a license-ME major. His constituency likes the idea of the Corps within the broader University. He's also excited about the prospect of new majors.
  - Isakson – has he gone out and spoken to the broader student body? She noted that there are, for example, very few women in engineering students (and none in engineering faculty).
  - McNie said that Max Jones has primarily spoken with AS folks and others who attended the Art&Sci presentations.
  - In a related matter, Yip noted his appreciation of the Provost's attendance of a recent AS meeting to talk about the Art&Sci presentations.
- Proposal: Release Time for the GE Committee Chair
  - Colin Dewey stated that the General Education Committee work is not all getting done, partly because of lack of expertise in the GE program such that most of the work falls on the Chair.

- It should be that the Chair is supervising and the members of the Committee should be doing a significant portion of this work.
- The Chair should have the time to stay abreast of issues like AB 928 and other larger, structural issues with the GE program.
- He noted that the GE program is meant to be a University-wide issue of importance and it is sometimes not afforded that status.
- His proposal is that each School should have a stake, perhaps 1 WTU, so that the GE Chair would at least have a single course release.
- Dewey outlined some of the work that still has yet to be done – reviewing current course offerings, making sure they are compliant with appropriate learning outcomes, etc.
- Isakson – I'm not opposed to this release time proposal. Is it necessary for Schools to give up a WTU? Or can we simply add this to the S&M and C&C budgets?
- Dewey – that's another idea, though I've been a Chair for many years and still have no idea how these budgets are constructed.
- Provost Schroeder noted the Deans are meant to be conveying how these budgets are arrived at, and requests of this type can certainly be made. Now, since the School structure is up in the air, we may want to consider funding this through the Provost's Office. That would signify its importance. She noted that if we follow the Art&Sci report recommendations, we will definitely need a strong GE program and Committee to support the University.
- Isakson is wondering about the timeliness of adding it to School budgets vs. the Provost's Office budget. Maybe short term from the Provost's Office.
- Dewey indicated his support for it coming from Provost's Office. Makes it simpler and less susceptible to changes in individual School priorities. Additionally, he has made brought up the issue of release time for the GE Chair with the Dean of Letters and Sciences.
- Yip noted the importance of the GE program (example – engineers need to know how to communicate!), but how should we proceed? A resolution? The Provost seems amenable to the request, but should we as a Senate be weighing in with our support of a strong GE program and the release time proposal?
- Tsai related his experience in IWAC where they rewrote their by-laws to outline the specific duties of the Chair and members. This would bring responsibilities to the GE committee members that they would have to take on. He also noted that politically, there may headwinds due to the voting members on the GE Committee only being from GE subject area expertise.
- Colin noted that all departments have at least one non-voting member on the committee, but they are currently not expected to be involved with assessment.
- McNie – so perhaps we start with a 'position description' of the Chair to help justify this release.
- Provost Schroeder said she would be interested in whether other CSUs have similar arrangements for their GE Committee Chairs.
- No one present knows what other campuses do in this area. Provost Schroeder will ask other Provosts. Tsai proposed polling ASCSU folks. Dewey is on some of the CSU-wide email lists that discuss these issues, so he'll reach out as well.
- Further discussion: It was noted that we need the perspective that GE is part of the University and all degrees and is an integral part of everyone's degrees. Provost Schroeder noted that FYE might fit well within the GE program. Most other campuses

she has been at include it within that program. Dewey agreed with the idea, though currently the FYE program is not part of the GE program.

- McNie will reach out to Sarah Senk (GE Chair) to start the process of a job responsibilities document. Should there be a resolution affirming the importance of the GE program? And who will write it?
- Tsai volunteered to write a draft. Fairbanks volunteered to help. It is penciled in for a first reading in December's General Senate meeting. Senk will also likely have some input here.
  
- GWAR (the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement, not the band)
  - Dewey presenting again. We need a campus-wide upper level writing strategy where 3 unit upper division courses meet the requirements of GWAR. We don't have a policy that says what criteria must be met to be GWAR-compliant. We need some detail, and it shouldn't be a C&C-only thing. It should be understood by and acted upon by all departments.
  - He's got a draft memo based on one from CSU Channel Islands. They've defined the upper division course qualifications for GWAR. He's not trying to outsource work to the Curriculum Committee or another body, but again, it can't just be C&C's domain.
  - Dewey noted the example of Oceanography having a course that is well-described, but it hasn't run yet because they haven't yet exceeded 3 OCN students who needed to take it.
  - He noted that the memo is specific about *who* can teach these writing courses so that subject matter experts are teaching these things.
  - Dewey noted we have almost nothing about these courses and GWAR on the campus website. What's there still references GWE, and it's housed in the Registrar's website, which also doesn't make much sense.
  - McNie – should we have a task force with department reps to put this together? Should we [Senate Exec] draft something and then circulate it for comment?
  - Dewey prefers the latter, because there are some specific things that must be in there. It's not really a brainstorming exercise followed by writing something up, which is perhaps more appropriate for task forces.
  - McNie – perhaps a presentation with some slides in December's meeting? Dewey agreed and thinks we (the Senate with all our Committees) can get this done without an extra task force.
  - Dewey noted that CSU-wide it was decreed that there will be no GWAR exam and its requirements will be part of an upper division writing course. Not a lot of other language in the documentation of this. Here at Cal Maritime, we've traditionally done GWAR exams, and then advanced writing was a remedial thing after you failed the exam twice. That structure is now gone, so we need a policy on these mandated GWAR courses.
  - McNie will add Dewey to the agenda for the December General Senate meeting.
  
- Athletics Department Budget and Personnel
  - Yip is sharing a budget spreadsheet showing the Athletics department budget over the last few years.
  - He noted that salaries have gone up 60% along with various other smaller increases. He's concerned about these increases as it seems to be a sort of 'doing less with more' thing. For instance, decreased PEAC hours compared to AY 19-20 despite budget increasing since then.

- Yip showed an organizational chart for Athletics in which there are 4 new MPP positions, which he suggests may be a big reason for the increase in salary budget.
  - Isakson noted the relatively dilapidated state of classroom tech and yet we see these new positions, the new car in Athletics, etc, etc.
  - Yip shared a visual aid for everyone who hadn't seen the car, which seems inadequate for transporting teams to athletic events, which raises questions regarding its use.
  - McNie – if we raise these questions, we may be told that these are different pots of money. That is an often repeated response to these inquiries. Also, does this help with recruitment? How do we compare to similar institutions? There are lots of questions to answer to contextualize this. Lastly, how does this inquiry relate to the mission/purpose of the Faculty Senate?
  - Yip noted that at least part of this money likely came from the General Fund. He acknowledged the potential power of it as a recruiting tool, but do we retain these students?
  - McNie said perhaps we start by inviting someone (Franz Lozano? Karen Yoder?) to Senate Exec to discuss the issues raised. Tsai seconded and said we should have questions for them in advance so that they aren't blindsided. We're looking for information at this point.
  - After a brief discussion, we proposed the first or second week of December for that meeting. Questions will be collated first by Yip.
- Classroom Technology
    - Tsai presenting. He said Senior Director of Academic Technology Jase Teoh is working on this, which is continuing from previous work done by people in her position. She's worked with a lot of contractors and reached out for information from faculty, etc. It was noted that although there was a call for faculty feedback this semester, participation in this information gathering has been very limited.
    - She's proposing a pretty radical change – all the rooms, all at once. She's concerned about time. If we start it next summer, we need to start acquiring parts and equipment approximately now. She's also concerned about supply chain issues and inflation on the equipment side.
    - Teoh is looking for some more input and perhaps support from faculty and the Faculty Senate.
    - Provost Schroeder shared that the current proposal is in the neighborhood of \$2.2 million. It's a huge ask. She asked Teoh for a second option - a phased project. A sort of Year 1 and Year 2 process. Teoh presented these options to President Cropper, and he indicated his support of the upgrade, though the funding and phase-in plan are still to be determined.
    - In Teoh's view, the classrooms (viewed as a whole) haven't had a serious renovation in almost 20 years.
    - Tsai is drafting a resolution for a first reading in November on this subject.
    - The concern the President expressed was essentially – remember the SmartBoards? [In other words, a big expenditure, put in a lot of classrooms, and now barely used.]
    - We want to make sure that we've got buy-in from faculty. We don't want to be in SmartBoard situation where we buy all this stuff and then no one uses it. Apparently the tech that Teoh is proposing is something that is relatively adaptable – low tech for the

people that want it and better equipped for people who want that – but we don't have specifics in front of us at this meeting.

- Setniker – the resolution would be to support Teoh's solution as is? Tsai – not exactly, but we want to support the need for an overhaul and that faculty feedback will be incorporated (feedback, consultation).
- Dinner with the President
  - McNie's opinion is that the dinner was nice, but a meeting during work hours would have been more productive.
  - She was surprised to hear that he wasn't opposed to the idea of a Corps structure that wasn't necessarily for all students at the University.
  - Yip thought the discussion of making student duties relevant to their education was important.
  - Tsai noted that he's not sure how we're funding all these possible changes in response to the Art&Sci report. He cited the example of Humboldt's reinvention as a Cal Poly. Additionally, who is responsible for leading these charges? Just not sure where to begin.
  - Separately, Tsai wants to know how Kathleen McMahon's visits to other Academies went.
  - Provost Schroeder – which changes are you talking about? Tsai – so we have this Art&Sci report - some of the responsibilities are in CLD and some in AA - who is responsible for leading the various initiatives for change? What does the org chart/decision-making structure look like?
  - Provost Schroeder had some of the same thoughts, and she has noted to people that CSU will need to support our changes in some way. She said that the President says there needs to be campus-wide discussions of the Art&Sci recommendations and that strategic planning groups will shoulder some of it, but it does leave the overall plan a little amorphous right now.
- NC-SARA
  - This has to do with distance education.
  - California has decreasing numbers going in CC's and CSU's. In this situation, we need to look at our competition. CA is not part of NC-SARA, which establishes basic rules for postsecondary distance education. Members are constrained by certain rules within NC-SARA.
  - If we stay a non-member, anyone can come into CA with their distance education programs and pull from CA state education grants and Pell grants to enable students to attend non-CA (and non-CSU) institutions.
  - McNie – is there an action required of us? Or is this informational?
  - Isakson noted that it briefly came up in the President's dinner. It's mostly informational at this point.
  - Yip – is ASCSU working on this issue? Answer: Yes.
  - Tsai – this is potentially a good rallying cry for getting more faculty involvement in lobbying the legislature on these issues.
- Open Floor

- Yip – I know an engineering student who has done 11 watches and has 5 more by the end of the semester. Who is overseeing equity in these watches? Answer: the Commandants? Maybe?
  - Isakson noted that we have previously asked that Taliaferro attend a Senate meeting. Taliaferro is currently on training apparently. Opinion – we can't let everything come to a screeching halt when Taliaferro leaves. We will extend an invite to Moore, deputy Commandant.
- 
- Meeting Adjourned