

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (1/27/2022)

Attendees: Bets McNie (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Christine Isakson, Wil Tsai, Leah Wyzykowski (Student Rep), Frank Yip, and Keir Moorhead

- Minutes
  - McNie moved to approve, Moorhead seconded. *1/18/2022 minutes approved by acclamation.*
  - McNie move to approve, Isakson seconded. *12/9/2021 minutes approved by acclamation.*
  - We are getting closer to being current with minutes review and approval. Another set will be prepared by the Secretary for our next meeting.
  
- Review of Draft Letter to the Provost on Appointed Faculty Positions
  - Tsai said he accepted the edits he had received on the draft letter.
  - Question was posed: do we need a resolution on this subject? After a short discussion, it was agreed that Senate should be informed this step was taken, but we can move ahead.
  - Pinisetty will take it from here and distribute via the Senate Exec email.
  
- ARC Policy Discussion
  - McNie has looked over the survey instrument and thinks that there are some adjustments that need to be made (some word choices lead to more than one interpretation of the question, the language in some questions could be a little more focused on encouraging a formative assessment, etc.), but there is not extensive work to be done in her opinion.
  - The goal is to have this complete by end-of-semester.
  - Tsai noted that there is a question with language in some questions. Specifically, the use of “excel” is maybe too superlative for individuals who are performing well but not necessarily excelling.
  
- Department Chairs’ Review Discussion
  - Pinisetty is working on the survey instrument for these reviews. He will have a draft by the second week of February. He will consult with McNie before sharing more widely for comment.
  
- Marine Transportation Appendix K Discussion
  - This was circulated in the fall semester. No comments except from Provost Schroeder. Steve Browne [MT Department Chair] responded to those.
  - Pinisetty highlighted a paragraph, which Provost also brought attention to, which seemed out of place for an Appendix K even though he agreed with it. Quoted here: “Maritime vocational lecturers with significant teaching experience in the department when these guidelines become effective shall not be excluded from consideration for a maritime vocational instructor position solely on the basis of their license grade.”

- Pinisetty and the Provost thought it was more of a hiring policy issue.
  - McNie wasn't sure, but agreed it seemed out of place. Pinisetty will consult with Browne on the issue. Sentiment was that we should try to not delay approval of the Appendix, so we will move quickly.
  - There was a short discussion. Isakson wondered whether the paragraph could make sense if merged with the list above it in the Appendix.
  - Pinisetty was under the impression that all new hires were professors - no more MVIs. Former Provost Opp had essentially eliminated the category.
  - McNie noted that some in her department did not agree with that decision by Provost Opp and that the MVI category should be preserved.
  - Pinisetty said he would talk with Provost Schroeder about that.
  - There was more discussion of the applicability of the paragraph in question, which talks about allowing MVIs to apply/transition to MVIs. Some thought that the lecturer policy might speak to this better.
- Title IX Discussion with Kathleen McMahon and Jody Shipper
    - Pinisetty thanked them for joining us.
    - McMahon [VP of Cadet Affairs] outlined the current status, which is that Grand River Solutions [a consultancy in which Jody Shipper is a lead] has been brought to be interim Title IX staff and to help improve/reform the office at Cal Maritime.
    - McMahon noted that Shipper is no longer the Title IX (TIX) investigator for campus, but will be engaged on the consulting to improve our TIX office.
    - Shipper introduced herself. She stated that she's not looking to find fault with the individuals who previously ran TIX, but wants to focus on institutional reforms and practices: what is working, what isn't, and why.
    - She's seen 3 things: (1) misunderstanding the function and purpose of TIX (some thinking it's only for victims or only for women for example). (2) because of this misunderstanding, some don't understand what information needs to be recorded by TIX. She noted an example of faculty reporting but also investigating on their own. Also the notion that things need to be 'vetted' prior to speaking with TIX. This has to do with communication, training, and trust that things will be handled properly. (3) important to make clear what to expect when something is reported. What are your rights? What do you deserve or should you have when dealing with TIX? Again, training and communication.
    - Shipper continuing – there's a space between an incident and an investigation that we're not filling. People think that there's a decision of reporting or no, and that's it. However, there's a lot of support and services between those two poles. Need to think creatively and be working with other parts of the University to make these accommodations. There can be training, there can be monitoring to make sure an incident doesn't happen again – in the classroom, in the living situations, etc.
    - Shipper concluded and asked us for questions.
    - McNie complimented Jody's presentation and said that she'd had the opportunity to see another of Shipper's presentations in another context and that was great. McNie said that speaking more about the TIX training would be helpful to this audience.

- Shipper noted that big blocks of training often aren't great. Short bursts of interactive, engaging trainings lead to better results. For example, a student comes to you, what should you do? Sample scripts, making sure to use supportive and not chilling language.
- Shipper also spoke to faculty feeling reluctant to be a "mandated reporter" and wanting to hold the student's information in trust, which is understandable. Using the language "required referral" is more positive and a small shift in language that helps.
- McNie wanted to echo the importance for in-person and interactive training rather than computer-based training.
- Isakson thanked Shipper for her work and noted its importance. Who can be held accountable if folks don't have clear ideas about expectations for TIX? In our organizational hierarchy, who holds who accountable?
- Shipper – in theory, the TIX coordinator is the person required to comply with TIX requirements. Responsible for the response and also the following process. In terms of compliance with TIX, it's the coordinator. Now, there are other pieces. For training, for faculty, the Provost is ostensibly the person responsible, but there are others and it's for the organization to define those responsibilities and accountability. She pointed out that the law doesn't require trainings be effective. It's more an art than a science in terms of this. If a person does all of their specific tasks, then they're doing what they're required to do, but there's clearly more, but it's for the organization to define and enforce.
- Tsai – how do we assess the effectiveness of the TIX program? Shipper noted that there's always a climate survey as an option, but indicated that the problems here at Cal Maritime are relatively clear. Once the new structure and people are put in place and given some time, *then* evaluation through climate surveys and audits would be appropriate. She noted that you actually want to see the TIX reporting numbers going *up*, which is counterintuitive. She also said that no one has the secret sauce for *measuring* the effectiveness of the office.
- Yip thanked Shipper for her time and appreciated what Shipper said in that we don't need another survey and we need to act on the information we already have. Wondered whether she's been able to diagnose the deficiencies and what proposals were made for reform. Shipper responded that she's got a lot of anecdotal data. She noted an example [redacted, though it was quite general in nature]. That sort of feedback is difficult to turn into something actionable. She said that various formal obligations *were* done in our TIX office, but those efforts haven't connected with students appropriately.
- Shipper noted that there weren't many *formal* problems (i.e. letter of the law issues), but there are a lot of less well-defined things like students not feeling like they were being taken seriously, TIX not connecting with intended audiences, etc.
- Pinisetty noted the lack of trust in the TIX office and this issue being recognized by McMahon and Schroeder even prior to Shipper being here. Pinisetty brought up the possibility of TIX faculty deputies and wanted to know what Shipper thought of that plan, and also what we all can do.
- Shipper said that she's encouraged by the level of faculty engagement with these issues. She often gets resistance to the idea of new and different training, for example.
- Shipper enumerated some of her recommendations and observations: transparency of the TIX process is very important, noted our unique campus environment in terms of gender ratios, the Yikyak on campus can be *vile*.
- Shipper finished by pointing out that saying, "let's be nice to each other", is not an effective strategy. This needs a whole community effort and it takes time.

- Notes on transition: Kim Anderson is coming in to replace Shipper as interim TIX coordinator. Shipper talked about carefully handing off all the active investigations and conversations to be sure everyone is comfortable.
  - McMahon – Kim is functioning from Wisconsin, but Shipper has found that every single student has wanted to speak virtually. She said that if that changes, there is the option to bring Kim (or perhaps Shipper) in for trainings, etc.
  - McMahon noted that we might be with Grand River a little longer than we hoped, but the TIX coordinator search may take a little while. We want the right person.
  - McMahon and Shipper departed.
  - McNie said she and Captain Tamara Burback spoke with Shipper with the Gender Equity committee and that McNie has a summary that she will share with the group for reference.
- Committee Recruitment
    - Pinisetty - let's start with the JEDI committee. McNie – no volunteers as yet.
    - Student Evaluation Task Force? McNie – that's done, staffed. Pinisetty was uncertain and thought this task force was on McNie's Senate meeting slide for recruitment. McNie will check to be sure, but thinks we're ok on this task force.
    - We need to find replacement on the General Education Committee for area B2. Yip – that's from our department, and I think we're nominating Ariel Setniker.
    - Director of Academic Technology search committee – Sam Pearson and Ariel Setniker have it covered.
    - Commandant search committee - two somewhat reluctant volunteers thus far. McNie will be reaching out, perhaps to Alex Parker, on this.
    - Budget Oversight Committee – currently zero volunteers for this standing committee.
    - International Experience Oversight Committee – Julie Chisholm has volunteered. We have reached out to see whether she would be willing to write a policy for the committee.
  - McNie – we've got more committees this year than last, but the same pool of faculty for service.
  - McNie and Moorhead are handling the Cruise Oversight Committee.
  - The Research task force is meeting and has volunteers.
  - Fairbanks volunteered to start Budget Oversight Committee policy, because it needs to move forward, and he's on the University Budget Advisory Committee.
  - Tsai asked about the commandant search committee process. He wanted to be sure faculty (and students) have input. It was noted by Senate Exec members that the weight given to our input in the past appeared to be approximately zero.
  - Yip – anecdotal data suggests that positive COVID cases are staying flat. He was wondering about extending the remote deadline. This interest should be communicated to the Provost.
  - Isakson noted that she's meeting with a statewide person on finance and budget data. She will report back what info she learns to Fairbanks for Budget Oversight purposes.

- There was some discussion about what can be done about faculty who flat out refuse to do service. Pinisetty noted that he asked a similar question 1.5 years ago and didn't get feedback from CSU Senate Chairs. He encouraged our ASCSU Senators to inquire about this in their meetings.
  - More discussion of this issue and how it seems to be more acute at the full professor level.
  - Pinisetty will also ask Runyon [CFA Chapter President] about it. He noted that, among other things, it's about protecting junior faculty so they can develop appropriately. He wonders with the increase in research requirements for RTP, how junior faculty are expected to balance things appropriately. McNie and Pinisetty noted their experiences at other institutions that do a lot to shield junior faculty time.
  - More discussion on this topic and whether to change the Senate policy to put some boundaries on service, etc. Tsai noted that this issue is something that would have to be handled internally (i.e. within the faculty), because handing off to Deans or something of the sort would be met with severe resistance.
- 
- Meeting Adjourned