

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (4/6/2023)

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

Absent: Frank Yip

- Resolution on Alternative Watch
  - McNie thanked Setniker for her commentary on the draft resolution.
  - Tsai was talking with Alex Parker, and Parker thinks that one concern from departments might be if the alternate watches required some funding. If no funding was forthcoming, then it would be a sort of unfunded mandate.
  - Some discussion followed. It was noted that we as a University don't want to be conflating field work and trips with alternate watch. Senk said that the resolution is more focused on making clear that departments should have control over watch (or professional development) assignments. The idea being to practice things you're going to be doing in your professional life.
  - The Google doc draft resolution was shared and Senk read it through.
  - Provost Schroeder noted (per our discussion last week) that she and the President thought the faculty already owns watch, so is this resolution addressing the faculty? Who is the audience for this resolution?
  - McNie said that watch doesn't fall under the Curriculum Committee as it currently exists, so the Senate taking this position seems like the next best faculty group to make this decision/assertion.
  - More discussion of this: It was noted that this is a University-wide requirement, so the General Senate weighing in makes sense. Senk said that GE committee members were on board in formulating watch as a University requirement through their committee. The idea came up in their most recent meeting.
  - Tsai tried to distill what we're trying to accomplish with the resolution. Are we asserting faculty control over all watches? Or just three majors? Isakson answered that the intent is all of watch.
  - Tsai noted that departments do need to develop policies and procedures for this stuff. We also need to determine who pays for things, how much staffing the port guard box actually needs, etc, etc.
  - There was more discussion on the scope of this resolution. McNie noted that we could get pushback from license departments because administering watch is additional work, and it seems that we don't want to delay this resolution, which mostly focuses on non-license majors. She also noted that the Commandants are apparently developing a watch program, which seems a bit at odds with this push for asserting faculty purview over watch. The point was made that perhaps the license departments could choose to cede control of watch to the Commandants' Office if they didn't wish to administer it themselves.
  - Suggestion: perhaps we could generally assert faculty purview over watch, and the departments who are motivated to administer their own watches can do so. Others can simply stick with the current system. The language here will need to be carefully constructed.

- We pivoted briefly to an issue Isakson brought to our attention. A student who went on cruise did not get credit for it. This was an IBL looking for IE credit. Perhaps she didn't pay tuition? Steve Browne said he was not aware of this student even being aboard.
- Interim President Appointment Resolution
  - Tsai pointed out that CSU Fullerton is also annoyed with the process of appointing interim Presidents. We could consider writing a joint resolution directed at the CO.
  - There are concerns that the current draft may unintentionally burn some bridges with the incoming President.
  - McNie expressed that perhaps two separate resolutions from Fullerton and us might be more powerful. If we're focusing on the process of the appointment, we don't really need the 'cover' of linking arms with another campus.
  - Senk is making a list of points for revisions to the current draft. We need to make points that we're hopeful about the new President, but the selection process does not set him up for success. The process doesn't demonstrate good shared governance practices and all campus stakeholders feel unheard.
  - Some live editing of the document commenced.
  - The conclusion is that we'll proceed in writing this resolution for introduction in April. We will try to keep this and the other resolution at one page.
  - McNie confirmed that we want to move forward with having the A&S consultants speak with the alumni about the difficult position Cal Maritime is in and their recommendations. Provost agreed that we should move forward with that.
  - Senk and McNie confirmed that Chairs are invited to next week's meeting to discuss watch. Senk noted that there is a Deans and Chairs meeting, but she'll ask if there's flexibility.
- Minutes Review and Approval
  - The minutes from our 3/30/2023 meeting were reviewed. *Tsai motioned, McNie seconded, and the 3/30/2023 minutes were approved by unanimous consent.*
- Meeting Adjourned