

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (10/28/2021)

Attendees: Christine Isakson, Bets McNie (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Wil Tsai, Margot Hanson, Frank Yip, Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair, slightly scuffed today)

- Minutes
  - After a brief discussion on small corrections and adjustments, Yip motions to approve, Tsai seconds, **10/18 minutes approved as amended by acclamation.**
  - Similarly, **10/19 minutes approved as amended by acclamation.**
  
- Karen Yoder, Athletic Director Presenting a Proposed Cheering Section for Athletic Events
  - “The Watch” is going to be the name of the people in the section.
  - There have been changes to the logo to be more inclusive of female cadets.
  - Student groups have voted to approve these.
  - “The Brig” is the location name for a cheering section.
  - The Compass student groups will be presenting this to campus (including to Senate Exec), but Yoder wanted to present to us in advance of this.
  - Tsai notes that “The Brig” typically has a negative connotation rather than a positive one. What did the students like about it? Yoder – the Council of Cadet Athletes (CCA) voted for it and discussed it.
  - Isakson – I like the idea overall. Also think that The Watch is a clever name. Are they aware of what a Brig is? Answer - Yes.
  - The students also looked at Crow’s Nest, Quarterdeck, and Davy Jones’ Locker. All were deemed a little clunky or too long.
  - McNie – I also like this idea, but the name may tacitly encourage negative behavior.
  - Tsai – so we question the connotation, but respect the students’ thoughts and planning on it.
  - Provost Schroeder – in the VPs meeting, there was concern that it’s insensitive to those people who may have experienced prison or the like.
  - Yip agreed with McNie’s take on the potential behavior.
  - Yoder noted that she does not necessarily endorse it [the name] and cited some incidents from a recent home soccer opener that make her worry.
  - Isakson noted her experience speaking with a shipmate who related their own experience with jail and how being on a ship is nothing like it.
  - Tsai – so, we would like to push back, but we should frame it as a discussion with the student bodies.
  - Other ideas: The Hull or The Bridge?
  - Hanson noted that students could become a bit disillusioned if overruled, particularly if they were led to believe that they had decision-making authority in this matter.
  - Yoder – I think the students think they have the authority on this issue, but I think they do need to discuss this and hear the feedback. I wanted to give you notice before their presentation.
  - Yoder – I’m also excited about The Watch and that the students are excited about this. She’d like to support this sort of student spirit.
  - Yoder departed, and we thanked her for her presentation and bringing the issue to our attention.

- Pinisetty entered the meeting at this point. Apologized for his tardiness, and explained that he fell down the stairs coming from Lot E on the hill, somehow escaping serious injury.
- This prompted a brief discussion of how hazardous those stairs are, particularly after the first rain of the season, and the parking situation on lower campus. Lot B is apparently closed due to instability in some of the nearby eucalyptus trees after the recent storm.
- AIC Policy, Professor Taiyo Inoue Presenting
  - Timeline: Summer 2020 was the first draft, went to Senate in October 2020, approved by Senate in February 2021, in late July 2021 there was a meeting with Inoue, Pinisetty, and the Provost. There were concerns about the purview of the AIC policy, and some disagreement on the subject of faculty academic malfeasance and whether it was an HR or academic matter.
  - Inoue changed the policy in response to these concerns from the President and administration. Pinisetty was there and could give his opinion (so there was some faculty input), but the process made Inoue uncomfortable because now the policy was different from what the Senate approved.
  - September of this year, more commentary, handwritten by President on the draft. Some of the items were minutiae. Changing “students” to “cadets” for instance. It was also requested that Deans be in the loop of notification.
  - One substantive change on the restorative justice portion of the policy as well. Inoue (and by vote, the Senate) wanted to design it to limit recipients of information so that there were no leaks of confidentiality. The President wanted to add more recipients (Student Conduct office and the Provost).
  - Inoue noted that he feels like he is acting unilaterally, and unsure of whether the Senate would support the changes.
  - Inoue explained his thinking on the students vs. cadets issue. When it comes to academic matters, it seems that they are students, not cadets.
  - Inoue summed up, saying that the nature of these requested changes, small and large, is why he is here to get our input.
  - There was a discussion of the issue of whether faculty academic malfeasance should be heard by the AIC. Faculty making decisions about faculty was the issue. Inoue noted that faculty often make decisions about other faculty, RTP for instance. Yip noted his support of this position, and gave the example of plagiarism as something that academics would be best suited to judge when students or faculty are the culprits.
  - McNie – I’m confused about addressing faculty misconduct in the AIC. Not certain this is appropriate.
  - Inoue explained that in the original policy, there was a provision on this, and the Senate discussed and approved it.
  - Yip – and this is the concern: because that provision was changed, is the AIC policy substantively different that the one approved by the Senate?
  - Isakson – There’s a distinction between resolutions and policies. President must sign the policy for it to have force. Seems like the policy should have to go back to the Senate if substantive changes are requested.
  - Inoue – yes, and that process can really stretch out. He’s concerned about the timeliness of these things. Suggestion: the same time period during which the Senate is debating a

policy should also be the same time period in which the administration are reviewing the same draft. So, when it is approved by the Senate, there will already be knowledge and perhaps tacit approval of the Senate-approved policy.

- Pinisetty noted that the by-laws were done in this way, but the by-laws now say that the procedure is: pass the policy, then submit for approval (or not).
  - Tsai – so, we should try for the ‘reconciliation’ process [the parallel process described above] in the future. For this document, we should have the Senate re-visit it.
  - Hanson noted that the cadet vs. student terminology issue might have been avoided if we did the parallel process.
  - Yip noted lack of consultation with faculty on the cadet terminology in this policy and elsewhere and noted his distinct displeasure on that point.
  - Tsai pointed out that the ‘student’ term is something more appropriate for CSU-wide issues, and also there’s the issue of students in the grad school here. Do we need a different AIC policy for them?
  - Inoue – I consulted Kathleen Arnold on the graduate school issue. They apparently reference our old policy for their standards.
  - Some discussion of this and whether Senate policies apply to the grad school. Kathleen Arnold (Graduate School Coordinator) would like to speak to us about these issues and wants the graduate school to interface with Senate.
  - Provost Schroeder said that she’s willing to make the case for “student” over “cadet” in this policy to the President. She also said she shares the frustration with the extended timeline for approval, and agreed that the changes are such that it raises the question of whether should go back to the Senate.
  - Pinisetty – we should speak with Senators and administration about having a parallel consultation process on policies to avoid unnecessary delays.
  - Provost Schroeder – on whether the faculty should be under the authority of the AIC, she would hope that Michael Martin (HR AVP) is consulted prior to debate in the Senate on the issue. There might be an issue in terms of the legalities involved and it could be tricky to put it within the Senate’s oversight.
  - Pinisetty – we will speak with CFA officers and Michael Martin to gather information on this issue before we start the conversation.
  - Yip – can we perhaps directly meet with the President to try and hash this out? This [the AIC policy approval process] has dragged on too long.
  - McNie – it might be a better approach to let the Provost discuss the student/cadet issue rather than us.
  - Yip clarified that the he meant the changes to the restorative process and faculty oversight of faculty.
  - There was some discussion of who would be in this meeting with the President. Definitely Inoue as AIC Chair and some to-be-determined subset of the Senate Exec.
  - Isakson – but isn’t this yet another small meeting? Doesn’t it need to go to the Senate first? [general agreement]
  - For the future: we definitely need to hash out a better process for policy adjustments and approvals.
- Videos Made by Professors Strange, Hanson, and Marocchino
    - Pinisetty said he didn’t bring it to the Senate meeting at the time (September) because they were sent to him the night before the General Senate meeting.

- Some discussion of whether they were presented at ASCSU. Answer - No.
  - Some more discussion and confusion surrounding who received the videos, and whether they were appropriate to be discussed now. Marocchino has requested some time to discuss the issue at a future General Senate meeting.
  - Hanson spoke about her reasons for making the video and her despair on whether something would be done by administration on teaching flexibility given the ongoing pandemic and the fact that children cannot yet be vaccinated.
  - Isakson noted that there is a lot of stress among faculty, noted dirty conditions reported by staff members in some venues, and stated that the mask mandate is not being enforced in many venues. Some faculty even defy it. That's the environment we're dealing with.
  - McNie – so, we're in agreement that we'll present the videos in Senate?
  - Hanson – perhaps links to the videos. They were made for a different time. Perhaps Marocchino would like to use hers in her presentation.
- Task Force on Student Evaluations (discussion prompted by Tsai)
    - Task force charge document amendment: Senate will appoint *co-chairs*. The reasoning being that Simons will be on sabbatical in the near future. Want continuity in leadership.
    - Isakson motioned to approve the amendment, Hanson seconded. **Approval by acclamation on moving forward with the task force on student evaluations.**
- Open Floor
    - Some discussion of whether to move forward with recruitment on the exceptional service award committee. [Note: purpose of the program is to alleviate cultural taxation of faculty.]
    - McNie requested clarity on the task force 'ask' before recruiting. Pinisetty said that Runyon would be sending him some rubrics from other campuses, so he'll send those to McNie when they're supplied.
- Meeting Adjourned