

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 20, 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. Updates from the Food Advisory Committee (Guests Eric Cooper and Michael Strange)
 - Committee has three subgroups (comms, operations, finance)
 - Comms group surveyed 26% of cadet and parent population
 - Committee members (cadets) are calling all cadets who responded no to new dining concept on survey
 - Operations group is doing stuff like rebranding
 - Finance group reviewed inventory items from Sodexo and price; group also tasked with recommending meal plan pricing. Looking into new rate structure for the spring. Priscilla Muha is on committee to make sure there are no implications for financial aid packages.
 - Plan is to roll out new dining center concept in December
 - Strange: concept does *not* include staples. You won't be able to buy flour. You will be able to buy things that can be reheated or created through minimal need of equipment.
 - Cooper says national average is \$27 per day. Working to get it cheaper than it is now. But we're going to a all-you-can-eat model to a purchase and individual meal model.

- II. Scholarship Resolution
 - Pinisetty reviews suggested changes from prior meeting.
 - **Action items: Send latest draft of the resolution to all Senators when we adjourn.**

- III. Diversity of Board of Directors
 - McNie reports that it came to the attention of the Gender Equity committee that the composition of the Cal Maritime Corporation is entirely male. Committee feels that both boards of Corporation and Foundation need some attention to gender equity issues. Letter praises Foundation board for making significant strides in past 6 months in terms of diversity/equity, but lack of any women on committee indicates that there are some real blind spots on campus. Committee voted to pass letter onto Senate Exec in hopes that we will endorse and send to the President and the Corporation and Foundation Boards. Letter requests that they add women to the Board of Directors, that they develop plans for how to improve diversity and equity on the Board, and that they share information about the process by which members were selected (with specific attention to the Faculty Director position, which was never run by Senate Exec).
 - Chair praises all of the work the committee is doing. Asks what the action plan is moving forward.
 - McNie suggests Senate Executive committee "adopt" this letter and send to President and respective boards and cabinet. Not sure if that includes approval by the rest of the Senate or not.
 - Yip suggests in the interest of timeliness we send as Senate Executive Committee rather than drafting a resolution from the Senate.
 - Fairbanks says it would be nice to introduce the letter to the Senate and offer feedback.

- Committee discusses two goals: 1) pointing out the problem with the process (which is done) and nothing how the process should have taken into account the faculty voice, and 2) making sure that considering women on the board is *not* an afterthought. (McNie adds that there are talented, qualified women on campus who could have been considered for that Board and weren't. Yip notes that the lack of women on that Board was noted immediately, and it's concerning that it wasn't noticed by the people constituting the Board.)
- **Action items: Pinisetty will send letter to Executive Committee members for feedback to polish it up, and on Sunday will send to all Senators for feedback.**

IV. Academic Review Committee Update

- Chair reports that we will need to set up a meeting to review the feedback gathered last year about the Library Dean
- Chair notes that when we discuss ARC work we should refer to positions, not names.
- Chair suggests inviting committee chair, Tom Nordenholz, to an Executive Committee meeting where we will review the feedback. In accordance with the policy we will not record minutes to maintain confidentiality. Provost is the supervisor, who will also be in attendance.
- Chair follows up regarding review cycle for this academic year. Since we only have the AVP undergoing review this year, but four scheduled for next year, the Chair invited an individual to volunteer to be reviewed early. The Captain, Engineering Dean, and MTLM Dean all volunteered. We will be evaluating the Captain and the AVP this year and the three school deans the following year.
- McNie will send out call for service to fill the ARC vacancy caused by Tony Lewis's resignation from the committee.
- **Action items: Chair will confirm Nordenholz and Library Dean are available at our next scheduled Executive Committee meeting.**

V. LRPG Reorganization

- Executive Committee asks Provost for clarification about Long Range Planning Group restructuring that happened last week.
- Provost explains that instead of Don and Lina heading up LRPG we will have three pillars: academic affairs, health and safety, student life and athletics. Michele van Hoeck will head up Academic Affairs, Danielle Pelczarski will lead Health and Safety, and Kristen Tener will lead Student Life and Athletics. Those three chairs will be responsible for bringing in voices of constituents.
- Chair asks where faculty voices will be included now.
- Provost would like to hear our thoughts about how to formalize the way faculty input is given
- Isakson: I also don't understand how something was completely disbanded, and there's no continuity (with the exception of Health and Safety, which still has Danielle)
- Provost says that Michele in her leadership role will be expected to maintain continuity by coordinating with former members of LRPG.
- Senk adds that there is again a disconnect between intent and impact. It sounds like the intent was to create a more effective organizational structure (and obviously we support that) but the *impact* has been that people assuming that the administration has not been pleased with faculty input so far; common narrative is that administration is replacing those committee members in an attempt to get new people who *will* tell them what they want to

hear. Senk suggests that the way to correct that misconception is to formalize a mechanism for faculty input and to keep a very clear and public-facing record of when and how faculty input is applied and rejected. That last part is important: if faculty input is ignored, there needs to be a justification so that people can understand the rationale. Putting in a minimal amount of work to justify these decisions will improve morale.

- Yip adds that what hindered early planning efforts was lack of operational knowledge (eg. setup of classrooms), and that knowledge is so necessary if these committees are going to work effectively.
- Fairbanks adds that without a preamble explaining the decision, people jumped to conclusions that the work was unsatisfactory; when you're doing a good job, you don't get reorganized. Fairbanks explains that from his point of view as a member of one of the committees, he only found out on Friday morning when he got a last-minute calendar invitation and was told the committees were disbanded, but there was no "why." In the absence of the why, people will draw their own conclusions about why that's happening. And that's unfortunate if the intention is good.
- Provost notes she doesn't disagree with anything that's been said and it's good to hear it because it will help her voice these concerns to Cabinet.
- McNie agrees with Senk and Yip and Fairbanks and asks Provost to emphasize to Cabinet the importance of communicating the "why:" "if something wasn't working, tell us, communicate it to us. The impression is that 'people up high' didn't like what was being done," so they disbanded the committees."
- Pinisetty: again, "going back to Sarah's point, the intention may be good, but the process was bad. This is where my frustration comes from. We keep repeating the same mistakes."
- Yip is concerned about the loss of institutional knowledge. It feels capricious and premature to remove these people from their tasks without refocusing them on the tasks that will be done.
- Provost will take this information back to Cabinet. Notes that it was not clear in Friday's meeting whether the new plan was "fully baked" and will emphasize the need for clearer communication and justifications for decisions up front.

VI. Student Evaluations

- Chair asks Provost for input about how faculty evaluations will be conducted.
- Pinisetty reports that Pat Harper shared some questions, and we can ask Veronica Boe to share what questions they have in place for our online graduate program.
- Fairbanks: we need to be mindful that we will have to get comments from faculty, from departments.
- Pinisetty says based on his understanding the budget will be coming from IT. But we need to make sure we have enough in the budget to cover the on-campus evaluation and the online process.
- Yip notes this has to happen. Those of us in RTP reviewer roles right now need valuable data.
- **Action Items: Senk and Trevisan will reach out to ASCSU List to see if other campuses are willing to share their course evaluation questions.**

Meeting adjourned.