Senate Executive Committee Meeting (9/1/2022)

<u>Attendees</u>: Bets McNie (Chair), Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Christine Isakson, Victoria Haller (Student Rep), Frank Yip, Wil Tsai, Keir Moorhead, and Provost Lori Schroeder

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *Minutes from 11/22/2021, 2/10/2022, and 4/14/2022 were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent with minimal edits for concision.*
- Updates on AB 928-Related Proposals
 - Tsai is presenting.
 - He summarized the draft ICAS plan and noted that these changes are controversial on some CSU campuses. For instance(s): Colin Dewey wrote his own strenuous objections. Chico State's Senate also objected strongly.
 - ASCSU has passed some resolutions on this subject, but not anything indicating their approval of the ICAS plan as yet.
 - Dewey has proposed a resolution to speak to our (Cal Maritime's) issues with these revisions to the GE requirements.
 - Tsai said that we should probably be focusing on convincing ASCSU to oppose the ICAS proposal.
 - Tsai shared the draft resolution and noted the potential heavy impact on the foreign language programs across the CSUs as well as other issues.
 - It also resolves to call for improved processes for info-sharing between ASCSU and the campuses on this subject.
 - There is some question on how urgent the passage of this resolution is. ASCSU is accepting feedback until December. What is definite is that a decision by the three systems (CCC, CSU, and UC) is due by May or the administration of those systems will make the decisions themselves.
 - Tsai suggests that our GE Committee be the originators of this resolution.
 - Yip noted that our "Global Awareness" institutional learning outcome certainly needs a foreign language program.
 - Some discussion of whether our GE committee can take this up on short noticed. And there's a difficult question as to what cuts we would choose to make instead. There's no easy answer, but the thought is that we could make choices that would fit our campus better.
 - Other institutions are answering how to adjust their GE programs in different ways. Tsai suggested that Senk add him to the GE Committee agenda so he can share the context and information on this issue. Senk agreed.
- Policy on STCW and Coast Guard Licensing from Mike Kazek.
 - \circ General consensus is that we'll defer to our licensed members. They will confer and render an endorsement decision by tomorrow (9/2).
- Recapitulation of Discussion with President Cropper
 - Focused mostly on resolution responses, particularly to those passed last academic year.

- Discussed a process roughly: (1) President talks to Cabinet once resolution is passed (Cabinet would essentially write a draft response and/or provide info), (2) This would go to Senate Exec for a discussion, and (3) a response would be published.
- Haller asked whether this process might also work with the student government, because they are also interested in the President responding to their resolutions. Bets said that it was possible. Karyn Cornell (President's Chief of Staff) seemed like she would helpful in formalizing the process.
- Yip wanted to know whether there is a timeline associated with this process. We would like responses there are reasonably timely.
- Provost Schroeder said that she's pushed on this issue, originally with Brig (previous Chief of Staff), but now we've got a new process (and a new chief of staff), and we're working out the details. She noted that the timeline would also depend on the complexity of the required response.
- Moorhead asked whether there should be some maximum time for an initial response, though the response could be 'this is complex, so we're working on it and here's when you should expect it'. Yip emphasized that firm timelines are key for this process to work properly.
- McNie said they discussed 3 resolutions with the President. She said there would be a summary of the discussion she would send out to us. Budget resolution was first, but she'd like to delay this discussion until the summary gets out to all of us. Thinks the conversation will be more productive if that's the case. All present agreed.
- Academic Standing Policy Katie Hansen
 - The University Advisors (Katie Hansen and Krystal Loera) are working on updating this policy. Previous policy did not permit automation within PeopleSoft, and this is a problem for accuracy and time consumption.
 - Academic standing policy had some oddities. Example: a student leaves for 5 years, comes back, has a bad semester, and we would reference that record from 5 years ago for determining academic standing.
 - Also noted that academic probation did not allow a D, even if other courses got them above the 2.0 required GPA.
 - The items above are the major changes. Other parts are mostly cleaning up language.
 - General appreciation was expressed for their work on this policy.
 - Yip asked about how the process is working now, how accurate it was, and how cumbersome. Hansen said that she and Krystal Loera have to do this manually now very cumbersome and they're looking forward to automating the information gathering. Yip noted that he really appreciated their work on this. Prior to them, students would occasionally fall between the cracks.
 - Hansen noted that probation students would also be strongly recommended to stay between 12-15 credits.
 - Isakson moved to endorse the policy. All endorsed the policy. No objections.
- Discussion on Senate Executive Committee Priorities for AY 22-23
 - McNie shared her notes from our meeting last week.
 - *First item: evaluating the three-school model.* We need to develop a plan for how this will be approached. Provost Schroeder was happy to see this on the agenda and wants to work with us on this.

- Discussion of how to proceed: General support of a Senate subcommittee to work with the Provost. We'll communicate the formation of the subcommittee to the Senate, ask for volunteers, note that it's a subcommittee to set out the parameters of the process, not to decide what to do with the Schools. Provost Schroeder requested some consideration of diversity (in Schools and experience and background) in the members of the subcommittee.
- \circ Tsai said that it would be good to present the subcommittee to General Senate on the 15th.
- Yip volunteered to be on the subcommittee and be the liaison with Senate Exec and noted the urgency to start this process.
- *TSGB ship safety and organizational issues*. Moorhead suggested we pump the brakes a bit so that the new Captain can be involved in these discussions. Isakson noted that the Captain will have a lot to do and won't have the historical knowledge on these issues. We want to be sure keep focus on and get movement on these issues.
- Yip asked whether we have records available from this past summer's TSGB cruise that document safety concerns and/or improvements.
- McNie should we start with a letter requesting a 'post-mortem' of the ship situation from the President?
- Tsai asked who would do this post-mortem? Suggested that it should be a third party, maritime-focused.
- Provost Schroeder noted that it might be more efficient to simply ask Karyn Cornell or the President to attend our meeting and ask them these questions about ship operations and safety.
- Isakson wondered whether they would have a good idea of how to proceed, who to call to do this sort of audit, etc.
- McNie suggested that perhaps Dean Steve Browne would also be a good person to have in this possible meeting/discussion.
- Moorhead said that before calling for new audit, we should look at the existing, recent audits by ISM. We need to look at these before we can decide what to ask or advocate for.
- Some discussion of where these audits are and how to access them. Moorhead said that MARAD certainly has them, and Craig Dawson, Franz Lozano (VP Finance and Admin), and the Chief Engineer should have access to them. He has volunteered to speak with them to obtain the audit information as a starting point.
- Organization of Marine Programs and Captain of the Training Ship is the next area of focus.
- Moorhead noted that the Cruise Oversight Committee (Senate) and Cruise Committee (University) will be co-existing. We need to work out the roles of these. Perhaps whatto-do (pedagogy, organization of coursework, etc.) goes to the Senate committee, and the how-to-do-it goes to the University one.
- Provost said that the Cruise Committee will continue but will be overseen from Academic Affairs (AA). Deans of the license programs will co-chair. She thinks Moorhead's description of its role is apt and noted that faculty will still serve on the Committee. Membership should be similar to what it was in the past. She's thinking the Committee will be a timeline-focused Committee, making sure things progress apace and addressing impeding issues as they arise.
- McNie said we should meet to sort out this division of labor or different missions of the two Committees so we can articulate it in the Senate Committee's by-laws.

- Moorhead noted that Captain Pecota's Cruise Committee was about 20 people when it previously was about 8 people. The new form is quite unwieldy. Provost Schroeder agreed that the size seemed impractical. She would be reviewing the membership.
- *JEDI Committee*. We've got multiple efforts on campus on these issues. We need to sort out our strengths and our foci. Julie Simons has agreed to participate in meeting with these overlapping committees to help with this organizational process.
- Provost-Appointed Positions Policy.
 - First question: should these positions count as service for RTP? There was some discussion of this. The positions are compensated, but they also are important in a wellfunctioning University. Eventually, it was agreed that the RTP policy and relevant committees should answer this question.
- Introduction of New Student Representative
 - Victoria Haller also goes by Vicky. She's a senior. She was Chief of Staff of on the ASCMA board last year. She has connections there but isn't serving this year.
 - We're very pleased to have her on the Committee this year.
- Meeting Adjourned