

Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 10, 2020

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Cynthia Trevisan, Frank Yip, Lori Schroeder (Provost)

Absent: Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair)

I. Urgent Matter: RTP Review of Asynchronous Teaching

- Pinisetty reports AVP Benton confirmed at least two candidates undergoing annual review are teaching entirely asynchronously and will have no synchronous class meetings for RTP reviewers to observe. We urgently need to create a supplementary form regarding the evaluation of asynchronous teaching since the existing forms will not apply.
- Pinisetty explains that our options are to either make a decision as a Senate Executive Committee or to call an emergency meeting of the senate. However, emergency meetings must be called seven days in advance and the ET Department is starting reviews next week, so Pinisetty is concerned that we don't really have time to call a general meeting.
- Senk notes procedural matter: our new bylaws authorize the Executive Committee to "act for the Senate and its Standing Committees on matters that call for immediate action or attention" and "transact such business of the Senate as may be necessary between meetings." If we act alone (as an Executive Committee without calling an emergency meeting of the whole Senate) we must report this action to the Senate as a specific agenda item at its next meeting. The bylaws also specify that "any action taken by the Executive Committee during a period when the Senate cannot be convened (a) shall require a majority vote of the members of the Committee; (b) shall be reported to the Senate at its next meeting).
- **Executive Committee conducts vote:** Should the Executive Committee exercise the power to act for the Senate on this matter, which calls for immediate attention (implementing a new form for asynchronous teaching evaluation)? Vote is unanimous in favor.
- Fairbanks presents "Peer Evaluation Form for Asynchronous Courses" form he drafted earlier in the week, based on another college's form shared with Executive Committee member Isakson by Kitty Luce.
- Trevisan praises Fairbanks's draft form, notes that not everybody took the online pedagogy training course and might not know exactly what to look for and how to compare to a face-to-face class, so this form is very useful. Committee agrees form is excellent. Provost also approves, noting that "I like that it focuses on the *formative*."
- Trevisan adds that it is important to avoid confusion so that we don't give these to RTP committees assessing synchronous teaching. We need to be clear that this form is for asynchronous modalities only.
- Pinisetty shares screen and presents an accompanying resolution Fairbanks drafted #likeaboss
- Yip asks if there is a reason the reviewer's role in the LMS shall be set to student. Fairbanks notes privacy issues regarding grades, and also notion that when someone observes a class, they should experience it in the role of a student.

- Trevisan notes that she does not have the entirety of her course available to students. We may want to allow candidates the option to show that to reviewers.
- Isakson responds that we don't want someone evaluated to worry about the entire course being evaluated; we want to make the evaluation comparable to a regular classroom visit. If we invite them to show the whole course, there's a gray area for candidates who may wonder how much they need to show reviewers.
- Fairbanks notes that's why he tried to define "complete lesson" specifically.
- Committee expresses appreciation to Fairbanks for thoroughness of the draft resolution
- Committee discusses how we should designate the difference between Senate resolutions and Executive Committee resolution. Yip suggests calling this Executive Committee Resolution 1a to distinguish clearly from regular Senate resolutions. Pinisetty and Senk suggest 1e (for "executive committee"). Fairbanks implements suggested changes.
- **Executive Committee conducts vote to approve the revised resolution and teaching evaluation form. Vote is unanimous in favor.**

- **Action items: Pinisetty will email to Chairs, Graham, etc. and Senk will email Senators sharing the document, explaining intent and reason for the Executive Committee resolution (clarifying that since some departments are beginning their review next week and there isn't time to even call an emergency meeting of the Senate, which could not be called sooner than 7 days from now).**

II. Qualtrics Update

- Isakson asks in chat, "What's the story with Qualtrics?"
- Provost reports that after the last meeting she wrote Julianne, who replied that there was a breakdown in negotiations between the CSU and Qualtrics regarding how information is stored. At this point we're not sure if it's advisable to strike out on our own.
- Isakson asks what are the requirements? Do we have requirements at the state level that the service has to store data a certain way? Pinisetty says that to his knowledge Qualtrics won't sign off on the documents that we want them to sign regarding FERPA. Isakson asks if we can find another service that will ensure the privacy requirements.
- Provost is wondering what other CSUs are doing around this issue. Frustrations can't be limited to Cal Maritime.
- Pinisetty notes that other CSUs may be using Qualtrics (on their own contracts).
- Provost says she will ask CIO Tolson: roadblock isn't an option here, let me ask for solutions about what we can do
- Senk asks what are we doing about the online course evaluations for this semester. Are we contracting with a separate provider?
- Pinisetty notes that CIO Tolson has to approve that too, and we need to emphasize a deadline, ideally October 1

III. Review of Resolution Commentary

- Senk reports so far three people have commented on the resolutions discussed at the last General meeting.
- Pinisetty will send reminder that feedback is due tomorrow.

IV. Scheduling

- Provost has said she wants clarity around scheduling process, buy-in from Chairs, Deans, *and* Registrar's office so that everyone understands how decision-making happens. There needs to be a process. Provost has concerns about the short term, this next set of scheduling.
- Provost reports she spoke to Dinesh about this earlier in the week and they both agreed there needed to be some proactive decision making about course enrollments. Chairs should know that Provost asked Deans to share budget information that came to them from CLC this week so that they understand the pressures motivating some of the recent decisions about cutting sections.

V. Lecturer Contracts

- Isakson brings to the attention of the committee that a lecturer in IBL reported he received his contract yesterday and learned for the first time that his workload was cut by 40%
- Pinisetty asks how it's possible that the lecturer didn't know this given that the fall semester had even started.
- Isakson reports that to her knowledge the lecturer had a meeting with the Dean recently and was not notified about the reduction until he received the contract.
- Trevisan reports that she received an email last night from one of her lecturers notifying her that she did not receive her contract yet. Trevisan adds that there may be ambiguity in the case of the IBL lecturer, who has historically done advising.
- Fairbanks asks if the lecturer has contacted Demetra to make sure the contract is correct. Fairbanks reports that there have been numerous errors during the summer, and that if Demetra was working in a hurry it could be an error. Fairbanks also notes that as Faculty Rights chair, Isakson should refer the lecturer to him, especially if there are ripple effects (eg. if a lecturer formerly given reassigned time for advising is no longer advising, that will increase the workload for other IBL faculty). Isakson reports that CFA President is aware.
- Provost reports that she has a meeting scheduled with Don Maier this afternoon and will seek more information.

VI. Curriculum Committee Vote on the MT Curriculum Overhaul

- Yip reports that the MT department did not engage with the S&M department appropriately during the curriculum review process.
- Yip gives Provost a "heads up" saying that the Science and Math Department will be sending a letter expressing concerns about the proposal and asking Provost to pause the process and send the proposal back for further deliberations.
- Trevisan notes that members of the Curriculum Committee did not appear to understand the nature of the changes to the curriculum. There are clear indicators that the people who voted on the proposal had not given a careful reading about the impact on students. The fact that the MT department claimed that they didn't need to compare themselves to other Maritime Academies was problematic.
- Isakson adds in terms of process and mutual respect and consideration: if you think about this as a researcher when you get reviewer feedback on your paper, you're asked to address all of those comments. You're asked to present your logic as to why you did or did not take

into account the asked-for changes, and you have to be able to present that in a logical way. And when we're talking about major changes to a curriculum, it's good to require minutes from a meeting that you *did* have with any department that has asked for a rationale.

- Senk suggests we write resolution because we're stalled without a policy about curriculum changes that requiring that we implement the new forms drafted last Spring.
- Provost asks if one problem is that current CCR form contains a box one can check indicating that you had a conversation with impacted departments but doesn't require follow-up. Senk says this is precisely the problem; there is no formal process for the "peer-review"-style procedures Christine is describing. Senk drafted forms, got feedback from Benton and the Registrar last Spring. Pat Harper is currently looking at them. Notes that there was no agreement on how to proceed; Benton suggested just replacing the CCR form, but Senk volunteers to draft a resolution to make this a Senate-driven thing. The resolution will call for an overhaul to the CCR forms and process to standardize the process and make sure that the same questions are asked and answered for each proposal.

Meeting adjourned.