

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (10/6/2022)

Attendees: Elizabeth McNie (Chair), Sarah Senk (Vice Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Christine Isakson, Victoria Haller (Student Rep), Frank Yip, Wil Tsai, and Provost Lori Schroeder

Absent: Keir Moorhead

- Minutes Review and Approval
 - *Minutes from 9/29/2022 were reviewed. Tabled until language is added to AB 928 section.*
 - Haller elaborated on Cruise LOs – she does not recall receiving a syllabus for Cruise 1.

- Provost Report
 - Strategic plan for enrollment will be presented after the Art&Sci Report. It seems like a good thing to discuss in proximity to that Report.
 - There will be an hour-long presentation + an hour of Q&A for the Art&Sci Report. She would like the faculty from the steering committee participate, and the Provost is currently working to line that up.
 - Natalie Herring will present on the strategic plan for enrollment. This will also be public and presented on two occasions.
 - Scheduling these presentations was discussed, which brought up the Senate meeting. There was some confusion here. The consensus at this time seems to be to keep Senate date (because AB 928 feedback is due on the 24th) and keep Senators accountable for attending another Title IX training at another time.
 - *Returned to this when McNie got here at noon. Conclusion was the same: regular Senate meeting time. Another time for Title IX. Mandate it for Senators due to its importance.*
 - Provost Schroeder – there's going to be a new policy for the Cruise Coordination Committee. This is being put together by Deans Browne and Pinisetty. Safety issues (and as well as other things) will be regularly reviewed.

- School and Dean Restructuring Planning
 - The plan to plan committee will come up with a list of peer institutions with whom we can compare. Senators will be tasked with doing a little research figuring out institutions we should use as reference points. This would be due prior to the November General Senate meeting.
 - We will solicit faculty input and have Senators gather this input. Decision sometime in the spring. We're thinking of using the January faculty work day to discuss all of this and work toward consensus.
 - Provost Schroeder – another item to consider is the departure of our Library Dean. I'll be working to identify an interim.
 - Isakson – given the size of the library, should we even have a Dean?
 - Provost Schroeder discussed with Michele Van Hoeck (Library Dean) that very issue and got the history of the position: it used to be a Director, but faculty advocated for a Dean for RTP purposes, etc.
 - Some discussion of whether a Library Department Chair would be appropriate. Tsai noted that there's more staff and facilities to manage over in the library compared to the

- Schools. Provost Schroeder acknowledged that there is a lot of library-specific knowledge required, though other Deans do manage staff and some facilities.
- Senk wondered whether a Dean's salary is equivalent to a Director/Chair + any other support positions that would be necessary to replace the Dean, in which case perhaps a Dean would be best.
 - No conclusion on the best way forward at this time.
- Report from Scheduling Consultant and Scheduling Software Resolution Discussion
 - There was discussion of the conclusions of the consultant's report, and specifically about the current scheduling software (ScheduleWhiz) and whether the consultant recommended its replacement. It seems that they did not, but made suggestions about improving efficiency of processes. Yip noted the manual entry of data back and forth between ScheduleWhiz and PeopleSoft is a real pain point. That time is important and expensive.
 - Provost Schroeder noted that Natalie Herring has said on more than one occasion that we have a bit of a Frankenstein's monster in terms of our software.
 - More discussion of this. The general consensus is that we should look closely at the Academic Scheduling Task Force's recommendation and whether the software they recommended is justifiable given the efficiency gains vs. the price.
 - Tsai mentioned that we're missing some policies governing CS numbering, class cancellation policy, and various items recommended by the consultant's report and that these are important as well. We should consider how to approach writing these policies.
 - AB 928: GE Committee Report and Recommendation to Senate
 - Senk is reporting about a "very interesting" GE committee meeting with many guests. She took copious notes.
 - ASCSU Chair Steffel stated in the meeting that AB 928 only dictates a common pathway for transfer students. It makes no direction regarding CSU GE. There was also no change to UC GE courses. She said that there's only going to be significant impacts at community colleges.
 - The GE Committee discussed all this, and they noted that transfer students do become our students, and having them be on a separate pathway seems unsustainable.
 - The GE Committee is thus still concerned about this, and that humanities should not be cut. The GE Committee's unanimous opinion is that lifelong learning should be cut along with oral communication instead.
 - Post-meeting, they did manage to track down where Tsai (and many others) got the impression that the changes applied to CSU GE. There was a presentation hosted by the ASCSU in which a Chancellor's Office representative explicitly stated this.
 - Isakson looked into this and got an official take through ASCSU. In short, *the presentation was incorrect* and has been removed from the CO's website.
 - There were a few different plausible conspiracy theories shared regarding the motivations of the AB 928 authors, the Chancellor's Office, CSU campus administrations, etc. Always good to see.
 - Isakson said that whatever goes forward [in terms of our campus' response] we should be very clear that this change is for the transfer pathway *only*.
 - Some discussion of what our response to ASCSU should look like. Isakson and Tsai clarified that we *must* take a yea or nay position when we are asked to vote on the

resolution at the ASCSU that will (or will not) give Cal-GETC ASCSU's approval. We *can* offer feedback in our campus response, but the ASCSU approval vote has only 'approve' or 'not approve' as options. Isakson also noted that if the ICAS recommendation fails, then the law gives the administrators the ability to craft the transfer pathway without faculty input.

- ASCSU Chair Steffel specifically said that she recommends approving the ICAS plan to prevent the above.
 - Some discussion of the path forward for our resolution in the upcoming General Senate meeting. The plan, given the ASCSU deadline for response, would be to waive the first reading. This requires distribution of the resolution well prior to the Senate meeting.
 - Yip asked whether ASCSU would be passing a resolution that opposes this curriculum-by-legislative-edict stuff. Isakson noted that our former Chancellor took a hand in pushing this change.
 - Discussion of the feedback mechanism for previous ASCSU calls for campus feedback on AB 928 and its resulting plans. Colin Dewey has previously noted that Maritime's Dropbox folder never had any feedback in it. Apparently Dinesh Pinisetty (previous Senate Chair) was responsible for placing our campus feedback there. ASCSU Chair Steffel said other campuses did have feedback. Feedback *was* given from our campus, but it is unclear at this time whose fault it is that it never made it to the ASCSU.
- Administrator Review Committee (ARC) Update
 - Candidate elections will end at the end of week. We should have the three candidates confirmed then.
 - Current format: ARC Chair reads the whole report out at the beginning of the meeting. Proposal: let's do that differently. Trust the report will be reviewed before the meeting. Discussion will replace the reading of the report, and it can be appropriately formative. The current version, where the report is reviewed in detail with the reviewed administrator present, is incredibly uncomfortable.
 - Yip noted that now that we're back to close-to-normal can we agree to read a secure hard copy prior to the meeting? There could be a concern with the security of the report if it's shared digitally before the meeting.
 - McNie will put together language to adjust the policy along these lines in addition to the items we discussed in previous meetings.
 - Some discussion of the ARC process. Provost noted that at her other institutions, there isn't an in-person meeting between faculty and the reviewed administrator. Maybe close the loop by meeting with the supervisor?
 - More discussion on the format of these meetings will be required.
 - Open Floor
 - Ali Moradmamand won the at-large position election. There are now two open lecturer at-large positions.
 - Meeting Adjourned