

## Senate Executive Committee Meeting (10/18/2022)

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 10/13/2022 were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent.*
- Provost's Report
  - She wanted to say that there *are* going to be next steps after the Art&Sci presentation. More information will be forthcoming. There are a few questions to resolve before sharing of the slides from the consultants. We want it to be done such that their context and meaning is clear.
  - Natalie Herring's presentation on enrollment will have a discussion component, and they're interested in capturing the results of those discussions.
  - Haller received an email about the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) meetings, but she doesn't know if the student body really understands that their input is valued and welcomed. Provost did admit that the initial email wasn't clear on this, and her office will be following up to clarify the process. She offered to attend an AS meeting. Haller thought that would be great. She would put the Provost in touch with the appropriate students to get on the agenda.
  - McNie suggested that the alumni association be looped into the conversation on the Art&Sci report. They might feel a little blindsided if this isn't done.
  - Regarding DHR issues and the AIC – Provost Schroeder asked the University's General Counsel for their input. Apparently, their initial response was quite strong about faculty being prohibited from judging DHR issues. The Provost suggested including McNie in a meeting with the General Counsel. McNie was open to that. McNie has reached out to the AIC members about their input on the issue as well.
  - Mike Kazek is stepping down from his position as Director of Licensing, effective after the audit from the Coast Guard. He's clearly being mindful of the transition process to have a smooth hand off.
  - Yip asked whether we would have the necessary existing expertise here to replace him, given that Mike is ex-Coast Guard. Provost Schroeder said that Coast Guard experience was certainly useful, but not required for the role.
  - Haller asked about Kazek's transition out and its timing. Provost Schroeder clarified that the audit happens in November, and Kazek's current timeline is resignation at the end of the calendar year. Haller pointed out that sea-time requirements, etc. have been in flux after COVID so there's a lot of stress around these issues already, and students might receive this news poorly. It would best to get a clear communication out as soon as is possible. Provost Schroeder acknowledged that was necessary and also expanded a bit, noting that the cruise situation [more students than available cruise spots on the TSGB] has solutions, but it's a matter of sorting out which one is optimal.
  - Isakson asked a couple clarifying questions here and emphasized that the Director should definitely have STCW expertise.

- Last item from the Provost – notification of the appointment of the International Experience Director is going out very soon.
- Academic Certificates Policy
  - *Endorsed by unanimous consent.*
- AB 928 Update
  - Senk shared the resolution draft with Senate as sort of a collaborative document. Various people have gotten in there to review and comment.
  - McNie said that some material seems to overlap with the resolution we already passed.
  - She first called out the WHEREAS' that talked about Oral Communication and integrating that within our learning outcomes. She noted that implies that there are changes happening here at Cal Maritime, which isn't the case. We got feedback from Beth Steffel that was quite clear on this point as well as from the Vice Chancellor.
  - Fairbanks noted that with our new understanding of this, these WHEREAS's don't seem responsive to the prompt given by the ASCSU, because it still only applies to transfer students, not CSU GE pathway.
  - Editing ensued. Some Whereas clauses have been moved to Rationale, which needs clarifying language that it's referencing what's required of community college (CC) students who are looking to transfer.
  - Senk and Dewey spoke with someone familiar with the situation from the perspective of the CC, who views CSU as wanting to preserve oral communication, yet we're actually advocating dropping it here on our campus.
- Student Evaluations – Aparna Sinha Presenting
  - Sinha, Pinisetty, Shackman, Crawford, and Skoll worked on this.
  - They assessed the current state of affairs with student evaluations. She noted that some language is problematic. Some questions about the professor/instructor contain gendered language, which hurts female instructors on average.
  - They wanted to assess students' learning rather than the likability of the instructor. The latter is more what the current course evaluations do.
  - They aggregated questions used at other institutions, ran them through a qualitative data analysis tool (Deduce), and then had a bunch of categories. They then deliberated to narrow this to six categories. They revised the questions in those categories and checked them for weak or gender-specific qualifiers and associations.
  - If this survey is piloted in parallel with the old survey, we can establish the reliability of the current evaluation. They'd like to do this in the Fall 2022 semester.
  - I asked what 'reliability' meant in this context. Sinha elaborated, saying that it meant consistency in measurement independent of things external to the course and student learning.
  - McNie - so where do we go from here? What can this body do to help?
  - Sinha said step one is releasing the questions to the faculty, then hopefully pilot the questions in some courses this semester and expand next semester.
  - Tsai wondered whether there was someone on the committee from license-side? Answer: Brian Crawford.

- Tsai noted that in looking over the lab specific questions, he wonders whether they translate well to some license-track labs. Sinha – that’s part of the reason for releasing it to faculty, to get that kind of feedback.
  - McNie suggested presenting it in a meeting/workshop in some Tuesday or Thursday where meetings are lighter. The fourth week of the month maybe? Sinha - yes, that sounds good.
  - Yip – in your survey of how these evaluations are administered at other institutions, are they mostly online? Sinha confirmed this, mostly online. Yip noted that’s a struggle for us - we get low participation rates online and somewhat bifurcated results. In-person surveys get a bigger, more representative sample size.
  - Some discussion of next steps: Email to faculty and gathering feedback. Piloting the surveys this semester. Consultation with Academic Affairs, students, and Senate to start the process of ‘ratifying’ these.
- Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and IWAC
    - Tsai presenting.
    - No one knows who’s in charge of ILOs, and no one knows the process for changing them.
    - A couple of them seem well-nigh un-assessable. Tsai and Senk called out a couple of them (D, G, and I) and noted language that is not specific and/or not aligned with other stated campus learning goals.
    - We need a process and policy that governs this, and we should get this moving as soon as we can. Do we punt this to IWAC? Or go within Senate? Yip and Senk spoke to the idea that IWAC take the lead, because of their expertise. Some old memos on this subject will be forwarded to them as they start the process.
- Captain of the TSGB and Its Chief Engineer are Visiting
    - We all introduced ourselves. Captain Samar Bannister introduced herself, and so did Adam Kleitman, Chief Engineer.
    - They’re gearing for the upcoming cruise. They’ve reviewed the takeaways from previous cruise reports.
    - They want to improve things, communicate well, and they’re already making changes for improving the quality and safety of the cruise. Communication is the pinnacle. Leadership is next. MSDS is next, and Kleitman has been tasked with that.
    - They’re on to meet with the Deans next and want to emphasize that they’re here to work with everyone. They had a good experience on cruise when they were cadets, so they want to pass that on to the current students.
    - Kleitman – we’re new, so we’re trying to standardize everything so there’s a plan for how to handle staterooms, safety issues, etc, etc.
    - November 8<sup>th</sup>, November 10<sup>th</sup> (freshman/juniors) will be meet and greets with the Captain and Chief Engineer. They want to offer some clarity on what the expectations are for cruise, what students can bring, etc. They’re interested in doing similar meet and greets with faculty and staff. They’ll work with McNie for scheduling the faculty meeting.
    - McNie spoke for a bit, appreciating their open communication, and said that we’re here to help.

- Kleitman noted that anything we can do to assist them in closing the communication gap between faculty and ship's staff would be much appreciated.
- Haller asked a clarifying question on the scheduling of the meet and greets with students. Captain Bannister elaborated and noted that David Taliaferro will give the final word and communication on the time/date, but that the dates above are solid as far as Bannister and Kleitman are concerned.
- Tsai – I just wanted to make sure that the junior group (for the meet and greet) includes the victory lap seniors as well. Not an issue if the messages about the meet and greets go out to all students.
- Everyone thanked them from stopping by.
  
- Open Floor
  - McNie – remember to respond to the dinner invite for our working dinner with the President.
  - Yip – last weekend was alumni weekend, and apparently the communication was not clear to faculty or students. It was noted that the communication from the alumni association has been not good.
  
- Meeting Adjourned