

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (12/14/2022)

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

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *Senk motioned, Tsai seconded, 12/1 minutes approved by unanimous consent.*
 - *McNie motioned, Setniker seconded, 12/8 minutes approved by unanimous consent.*

- Chair's Report
 - Sarai Alonso will be invited to speak about watchstanding and the Corps in our first January meeting. Thanks to Haller for putting her in contact with us.

 - Interim Library Dean process is moving forward – there's now two possibilities for the interim after they posted the position. Provost is thinking about how to include the Senate Exec in the interview process.
 - Isakson – is it a foregone conclusion that we will have a Library Dean? I thought that there was a possibility that the structure would change to a Library Chair who would be under an academic Dean.
 - McNie said they're looking for an interim for now. No change in structure yet.
 - Discussion. We should be involved and check with stakeholders (faculty and staff librarians) on their thoughts. Senk said a friend of hers saw an ad for a permanent Library Dean position here and might be interested. McNie will check with Provost, but it wasn't her understanding that the permanent position was being advertised yet.

- Letter to the Chancellor's Office Regarding the Interim President
 - Important point to emphasize: *We are not military*. This seems to be the perception in the wider CSU system. We should emphasize the Art & Sci report and that we're looking to change and move forward. We need an agent of change in the President's position.
 - Discussion of whether to discuss this letter with the broader Senate and/or faculty. Isakson thought getting a couple questions out to all faculty this week might be a good idea. Marocchino seemed interested in writing a draft according to Senk. Consensus that a draft from her could be a good idea. Senk drafted a message to give Kathryn some parameters – for instance, one page max please.
 - Discussion of what characteristics we want to see in the interim President. Emphasis that we cannot have interim of the mold of some recent folks. Some mild disagreement regarding whether the President needed significant maritime experience [to be clear, even those who thought the President didn't need to be maritime knew that the Captain needed to be good in this instance and the President needed to know the limits of their knowledge], but there was consensus that the CO needs to be educated regarding the profound differences between the military, the Coast Guard, and the commercial shipping industry.
 - Senk said that the letter (or its idea) should be mentioned in the General Senate. We should say, for instance, that we want to convey that we're not a military academy and that although the Senate doesn't have a lot of power in the process of finding an interim,

but we need to state our position. The particulars can be worked out later, but the Senate should know that this is being put together and their input will be requested.

- Some discussion of whether to recommend specific candidates that are internal and/or know us well. No consensus here.
 - McNie stated that she's uncomfortable stating a bunch of things we *don't* want. Brief discussion of this, some disagreement in terms of explicitly saying we don't want a person with solely military background.
- The LA Times Article.
 - Is there a role for the Senate in responding to this article?
 - Tsai – do we want to acknowledge and support the people who spoke up and put their names to their words in the article?
 - Discussion ensued. Yip and McNie spoke to wanting a communication from Senate along the same lines as the President's message but also incorporating Tsai's suggestion. Haller mentioned she had encouraged AS folks to pen a similar communication.
 - Yip noted that we should call out the President for refusing to comment for the article. This is unacceptable to punt on this stuff. Senk suggested framing it as a question, like why is it that you "couldn't" comment but the Chico's President somehow could on that campus' issues. We need to understand the rationale behind this lack of comment.
 - Additionally, there is the perception that Title IX investigations are not handled as expediently as impacted parties would like.
 - McNie, can you (Senk) pen something along these lines to the President from Senate?
 - Tsai – as faculty, what are we doing next? We can send a message, but we can't even get a faculty member to volunteer for CommUNITY Day. It seems like we [Senate Exec and Senate] are mostly on our own here.
 - Isakson – maybe we should start with what we look like if we're super successful. Enrollment way up, new training ship, licensed programs maxed out, new and vibrant programs. How do we get there, what steps, etc.
 - Yip – I think that there needs to be meaningful change in the Student Affairs office to address: The lack of meaningful response to the recent social media posts stuff and Erika Nelson's concerns. And the ignorance regarding watchstanding issues. The empty diversity center with no budget.
 - More discussion - trying to wrangle a way forward when the faculty who want to do something are maxed out, and some faculty typically refuse calls for service.
 - Yip noted that students he has spoken to also dismissed the President's statement out of hand. They didn't seem to take it seriously.
 - Fairbanks, noting his inexpertise, actually thought the latest statement from administration struck a better tone than any prior, but if students aren't taking it seriously, that shows a deficit of trust. And that's sad.
 - Further discussion. In terms of what should go in the Senate's letter, we need to include acknowledgement and commendation of the people who spoke up in the article and perhaps a call for more bystander training. We [Senate Exec] are currently having some difficulty coming up with specific actionable items to include in the letter.
 - Haller the former point would be good, the second sounds like the same training as every year. Moving forward – where is this zero tolerance policy they refer to? Where is the action on these words? Standing behind the students is important, and in Haller's experience, students generally think faculty are the only ones doing this.

- Discussion of our AY Plan for Senate Exec
 - What's working? What's not? McNie noted that it feels like we've been spending half the semester putting out fires, though policies to improve matters are in development.
 - What's not working:
 - The dinner with the President was not ideal in terms of meaningful work done,
 - We need to figure out how to move our projects forward while handling the 'fires' that spring up,
 - Going around and around with the watchstanding program and its administrators.
 - Ship safety retrospective not done.
 - Corps leadership selection process is problematic.
 - What's working:
 - Student/Faculty communication (many thanks to Victoria Haller on this)
 - Provost Schroeder as a liaison to administration
 - New Captain and Chief Engineer are doing really well and these hires were a transparent process with appropriate stakeholders
 - Haller thinks that the watchstanding issues are symptomatic of the Corps' inequities. Haller thinks Sarai Alonso has some experience and expertise with the issues inherent with the selection of Corps officers, their responsibilities, etc.
 - Further discussion to finish the meeting. McNie will be making a statement on the LA Times article in the General Senate meeting.
 - We'll draft the interim President letter and then distribute to General Senate for review as soon as possible.
- Meeting Adjourned