

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 8, 2020, 11 AM

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Cynthia Trevisan, Frank Yip, Lori Schroeder (Provost)

I. Guests Linda Bouwer and Bob Arp

- Bouwer presents on centennial campaign (“Leading the Way”): a 40-million-dollar campaign launched on July 1, 2019. It’s an 8-year campaign.
- Campaign is led by volunteer team. Ten people on steering committee. Tom Edwards from ELDP has signed on as honorary chair.
- Campaign has four investment opportunities including: faculty support (endowed professorships, undergrad research, oceanography program), cadet success (ELDP, scholarships, international experience), facilities (machine/welding shops, simulation program), and campus life (includes sustainable energy, athletics scholarships)
- Progress to date: 25% of goal (10 M) raised already
- Bouwer says faculty can help by presenting work at campus functions, highlighting our own work (and student accomplishments), provide opportunities for prospective donors to present to classes, meet with prospective donors, share feedback on interactions with industry leaders
- Arp adds that in 2018 campus priorities were identified in focus groups and had to make decisions based on what donors would support (eg. many people asked to repave parking lots but it’s hard to get donors excited about something like that).
- Chair asks about endowed professorships and how the funding will work. Arp says Cal Maritime is looking at a model in which money does not cover salary and benefits; it becomes enhancements for buying release time for scholarly activity, hiring research assistants, etc. It becomes a retention tool to some degree and helps with recruiting. We don’t want to get into the model where it goes to salaries. The intention is to add prestige to the holder of the title and to allow them to do more scholarly activities.
- Chair asks how goals are managed. Arp says Cal Maritime administration hired a consultant to measure what they think our capacity for a campaign is.
- Chair asks if when we get a donation do we account for the maintenance of those donations. Arp a good example is the gift to bolster the equipment in the machine lab, which also came at a cost to the institution because there wasn’t enough power in the building. Chair clarifies saying that he’s referring to the boats. Arp says the model on the boats is that we charter them out, and the quicker we can do that the less our holding costs are. Boat we’re optimistic we’ll have soon has holding costs of anywhere from 30,000 to 35,000 a month. We’ll have to invest a million and a half but if we net ten million out of it, it’s worth it. We do surveys before we accept a gift and that determines whether we get into it or not.
- McNie asks if the money raised goes into the Cal Maritime foundation or into the Corporation. Arp says this is solely foundation. This has nothing to do with the Corporation whatsoever.
- Chair asks Arp to explain the different between the Foundation and the Corporation. Arp says he’s not a member of the Corporation. It’s set up as tax-exempt. We’re the last of the CSUs to come up with this formal instrument, which dining and housing and the

bookstore sit under. The foundation is on the philanthropic end, the corporation is on the housing/dining end. Arp says when Mark Goodrich sent out the announcement they didn't put enough information on the "why" it was set up. Arp is talking about Franz about adding some supplementary information. Bouwer adds what gave the impression that the two overlapped.

- Provost adds in chat: "There was a sense that there were numerous board members in common. That's what I recall from last week's commentary."
- Bouwer adds that Franz has an administrative role at the school and it makes sense he would be part of both boards.
- Arp adds that they would love to have a faculty member or emeritus member as part of the campaign.
- McNie suggests offering ideas and examples of how faculty get involved in capital campaigns. What does that look like? What is the level of involvement? Arp uses as an example as faculty are in touch with alums and they're changing jobs, letting the Foundation know.

II. ARC Review

- Chair gives context: Senate drafts policy in 2018 when Tom Nordenholz was chair. The idea was to review administrators every three years. Pinisetty says it's a collaborative process where Senate Exec solicits feedback from faculty, we as a committee will not look at raw data; there is an ARC committee with 5 members who receive the raw data and prepare a report. If necessary, the supervisor of the person being reviewed, the supervisor also gets the data (so Provost gets the data for the Deans, President gets the data for the Captain). Senate Exec gets the review produced by the ARC in a closed-door meeting (with no minutes for confidentiality). If concerns are raised, we come up with a plan with the administrator to address any concerns that are raised. Last year's process didn't complete because Sue Opp left in January. It's unclear if the committee completed the review of the other candidate – the library dean. This semester we are supposed to evaluate AVP Graham Benton but the committee is behind on the schedule. Tom Nordenholz is the current chair.
- Provost asks if review questions/instruments are shared with those being reviewed far in advance of those questions being circulated. Chair answers that the survey questions are part of the policy, so they're available to everyone.
- Sam Pecota was appointed as captain in 2018. Trevisan points out that he should have three years on the job before being reviewed, so he is in cycle for next year, along with the three School deans.
- Fairbanks says despite being off the timeline we definitely want to keep the process going and should review Graham this year.
- Yip adds that next year there are already so many next year. Would it be acceptable to ask one of those scheduled next year to volunteer for review this year to keep the review work more balanced (so we're not reviewing 4 people the following year and 1 this year).
- Pinisetty asks if committee is in favor of moving forward, even though the Committee is out of sync with the timeline. Committee agrees we should proceed on a modified timeline to avoid backing up candidates next year.

III. Professional Leave Committee Update

- Chair notes that we need a replacement for the Sabbatical Leave Committee because one member of the committee submitted an application and must be recused from the committee.

IV. Spring Calendar Update [Fairbanks]

- Fairbanks presents proposed schedule modifications:
- Last instructional day would be April 19. There would be a dead day, and then finals from the 21st to the 24th. Saturdays have been used for finals regularly, so that's not an issue. Idea now is to keep the dead day, but student feedback shows that Engineers in particular *really* want a dead day. Most likely scenario is that everyone starts on the 11th (online and FtF) and final exams would still be four days, but the last day might get pushed to the Monday following last week in April. Not ideal, but we've had that little "Sunday island" in the middle of finals before. We're butting up against cruise quarantine time with that Monday final, but it's a way to fit all of the instructional days into the schedule.
- Chair asks about Graduation. Three out of the four options presented so far involves a face-to-face element. Overlaps with quarantine. Fairbanks is aware that Administration would prefer an in-person commencement. LRPG has reservations given the effect on quarantine time. How will this work? One possibility is to have two separate graduations: one for people not going on cruise and one for those going; that way the people going on cruise could start their quarantine without pushing back cruise.

V. Issues with a Faculty Complaint

- Chair says that a faculty member sent an email to Senate Chair, Provost, and Deans saying that he has heard from cadets some complaints about 1) other faculty members posting lectures on Brightspace and "disappearing," 2) other faculty not sticking with the class time allotted to that particular class, and 3) assigning too much work. He named a few faculty members but didn't name which faculty member fell into which category.
- Chair notes that it's a problem to jump to conclusions, and Pinisetty has told that faculty member that accusations cannot be made without collecting complete information.
- Trevisan says these accusations are unsubstantiated and reckless. In the Department of Science and Math they were made against people who have an established track record of teaching excellence. They are vulnerable since two are untenured and one is a lecturer. Trevisan reports that she replied to the accuser saying that we teach Cadets to speak directly to faculty members, so why would he notify the Provost about baseless claims without reaching out to those instructors. His email was signed "respectfully and collegially," though there was nothing respectful or cordial about his email; he didn't even bother to touch base to see whether the accusations were even accurate before submitting this information to Deans and Provost.
- Pinisetty notes there are a number of things that complicate the issues. For instance, some faculty set exams for a 24-hour period and recommend that they take them during

scheduled class time. But it's up to the student to manage their time to take the exam and finish before the deadline.

- Isakson: the other issue is that we have someone teaching Face-to-Face classes critiquing asynchronous teaching. Asynchronous classes operate differently. It could be a timed exam and it is up to students to study and finish the exam in the time allotted and make it to their next class on time. Faculty who took the classes about online teaching know that they were encouraged to post asynchronous lectures and allow students to watch in their own time.
- Yip believes an admonishment from this body is in order. This is highly unprofessional – before reaching out the faculty member and/or the chair before going straight to the top, there's a way to do these things. Yip adds that there is an undercurrent here that face-to-face classes are a priority right now and that online classes should take a backseat.
- McNie says she is particularly concerned for those folks who are untenured, and it may be worth having a discussion on campus about what collegiality means. Clearly that's been missed here. Multiple opportunities were missed to talk to individuals. Something isn't getting across about what collegiality is.
- Provost wants to underscore that the first thing one has to do is tell students to speak to the faculty member. Provost assures everyone on the committee that this email will not affect RTP decisions.
- Trevisan thanks Provost. Says she asked L&S Dean to reach out to the faculty members who were unfairly accused, and the Dean said it was the Chair's job. Trevisan reports that these faculty members have been great distress, especially because their jobs are provisional.
- Pinisetty adds that it is a violation of the CBA and the RTP policy to consider anything not included in the WPAF.
- Yip adds it's a serious thing to have an established professor mention something like this to people who are going to be reviewing you. And to the larger point, there has to be something about collegiality, and a statement about how all the classes in your curriculum are important. We need to counteract a pervasive attitude that only major classes are important and others are like "fluff."
- Pinisetty notes that the email doesn't explicitly say that. The bigger concern is collegiality.
- Yip: my point is that the reason that others feel empowered to do things like send an email like that is because they believe their classes are more important than General Education courses in science and math, etc.
- Senk adds that the accusation about "too much work" is an interesting one, and that an unspoken issue here might also be student's struggling to manage their time when learning in a blended environment. Senk reports that some of her own students have missed synchronous classes or failed to watch asynchronous materials, and when asked they blame their major classes or say it's because they were studying for an exam in another class that was scheduled later that day. That is not the instructor's fault; it's on the student, but we need to remember here that we are dealing with extraordinary circumstances. It's hard to focus when the state is on fire and there's a pandemic *and* you're taking online classes for the first time. So maybe another thing we can do here is ask the University Advisors to create some workshops about time management to help students succeed in this environment. It's easy to blame a professor for assigning "too much work," but the root cause here is that students are unable to complete the work in

a timely fashion due to these extenuating circumstances, and they need help learning how to manage.

- McNie adds in chat: “good point: many faculty took courses on how to teach online but students didn’t get any lessons on how to learn online.”

Meeting adjourned.