

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 14, 2020

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Christine Isakson, Elizabeth McNie, Wil Tsai, Cynthia Trevisan, Mike Mahoney (Provost)

I. Fall 2020: what we know

- Chancellor White has announced most CSU classes will be online, licensed programs will still be F2F. Need to finalize dealing with finishing Spring 2020 before planning Fall 2020.
- Moorhead reports as faculty rep on LRPG committee. Four primary options, disagreements on nomenclature. Main goal: getting seniors out. Secondary goal: everyone else to finish spring prior to start of fall. Committee is suggesting two broken-out time periods. One with seniors doing a two-week session prior to everyone else. Two F2F groupings, one as early as possible, the other butting up against beginning of semester to minimize cost of travel. Victory lappers: 2 week dockside steaming option to get sea time in. For deck dept, 2 weeks of sea time moves the needle. For engineers it doesn't. On engineering side two weeks would allow completion of STCW, but students would have to return / those engineering victory lappers would have to work with career services to get sea time, and then they'd be complete. F2F will be in last 3 weeks prior to fall semester. Goal is to avoid "keeping everyone on hot standby" by just selecting a date.
- Browne asks: commercial cruise cadets will hopefully be at sea this summer, so have you discussed how F2F training for sophomores will be handled?
- Moorhead says it would have to be addressed in subsequent semesters. If they weren't going on commercial cruise, they would still come back to finish spring classes to try to mitigate difficulty of making up all these classes during the fall semester.
- Fairbanks asks what's the population? Moorhead says they don't know exactly. Cruise 250 is Moorhead's class so he sent out a B survey, 75% of people who answered said they'd go if they could get one, 25% said they wouldn't go this summer at all. Total of 28 responses.
- Pinisetty reports Career services is working with these students through June to get them billets.
- Tsai emphasizes everything is preliminary, hasn't even been formally recommended to cabinet. This is not a done deal, so please don't publicize. But Tsai asks Fairbanks to liaise with CFA to start working on plans for faculty compensation. Fairbanks says Steve Runyon has been directly meeting with Admin, but CFA hasn't really gotten past the question of "what happens if a faculty member refuses to return because of health concerns?" For faculty who are needed, what does their compensation look like? That conversation hasn't started but should happen rapidly once there's more certainty regarding how much time and when people will be working.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Fairbanks will communicate to CFA the importance of "pre-staging" to see what information would be needed and when.
- Browne notes in chat. "FYI: The Governor's May budget revise came out today. It cuts \$398 million reduction of ongoing general funds for the CSU. This puts us back to the same level of funding as 2018-2019."

- Senk asks what info we can take back to faculty. When will we know about enrollment declines, etc. / tax receipts?
- Provost doesn't know.
- Trevisan notes campus extended admissions to June 1.
- Senk asks when we'll know.
- Trevisan says admissions would have numbers of students who put down a down payment. Notes that in 2008 furloughs union put the question "should we lay off lecturers or would everyone take a pay cut" and union voted on taking furloughs, and in essence we had to not work 3 days a month. But 2008 was different because we didn't have a crash in enrollment.
- Pinisetty anticipates won't know until July when our numbers will stabilize. Once we see stability in numbers we can plan accordingly.

II. IBL Department Chair Decision

- Committee shares draft letter regarding the IBL Department Chair appointment.
- Provost asks why senate is involved.
- Senk explains that the new senate bylaws entitle us to request information from the administration. In this case, one of our constituents – Nipoli Kamdar – asked for our help in soliciting an explanation for an unprecedented decision on our campus.
- Yip notes that in addition to Dr. Kamdar, faculty at large have expressed concern since the announcement was made.
- Browne adds that he can confirm Kamdar wasn't the only faculty member who was concerned. "Lots of folks are concerned about this."
- Provost notes this is not uncommon in the CSU. Says "I was Dean and Dept chair."
- Senk adds that part of the problem is that we don't have a good policy about appointment and review, notes that Gary Reichard wrote his opinions and this situation indicates this should be number one agenda item for the fall.
- Browne asks what the circumstances were that let to him being appointed as both dean and department?
- Provost does not recall. Says "It was in the 90s."
- Browne asks "Was it like this, where the department achieved consensus but the president didn't like the candidate?"
- Provost says "they had a very different policy. As I recall I was already chair, and no one wanted to do the chair job."
- Committee notes different circumstances. Committee notes that we need explanation for the sake of faculty morale.
- Provost adds, "If you're asking for an explanation, you're opening IBL up for scrutiny. If the President is requested to give a reason, it probably has something to do with dysfunction in the department, and do you want that to get out and be part of this discussion? I think it's better to try to fix it locally rather than have a global discussion, which might go external as well."
- Yip: shouldn't this info be shared with the department itself alone? If there's dysfunction, you should tell them.
- Provost says we can do this in person, "don't go sending letters all over the place"
- Senk clarifies that the problem is that we have *no* information. Notes we're not sending letters "all over the place." It's within our purview as Senate to request information. Letter is to the President, not CC'd to anyone.

- Browne suggests IBL is particularly sensitive given recent history of an IBL department consensus being overturned.
- Senk says that we hope that will contextualize the outcry for the Provost, but ultimately it's tangential to current issue. Points to excerpts from draft letter clarifying what we are asking for: "We wholeheartedly support Dr. Kamdar's request for a written explanation to help faculty understand how you came to this decision."
- Provost asks if department has invited president to talk to them.
- Senk says we don't know, and no one is really sure how to proceed. "It *is* within our purview to solicit information."
- Yip adds that "beyond that we still share some concerns about workload, the ability to service the department, that *we* would like some clarity on." Notes requests in draft letter that: "In addition to requesting a brief justification to help our constituents understand the real reasons underpinning your decision, we are requesting a clear and actionable plan for eliminating conflicts of interest that may arise from a Dean occupying the role of department chair."
- Provost says maybe he could provide clarity in the meeting? Provost says rather than send a letter the Department asks the President to meet with them.
- Senk mentions optics and suspicious, stresses the importance of a public-facing explanation beyond the IBL department. Browne adds the announcement came out on April 30 at 5 PM, notes that our constituents have reported they are suspicious of the timing, whether it's warranted or not, and that also leads to angst.
- Provost urges committee not to endorse speculation.
- Senk and Yip reiterate that we think written validation for the explanation is important. Yip notes we have a vested interest in knowing/confirming that there is a justification and promoting shared governance
- Fairbanks notes this is unusual *here*, that in the 9 years he has worked here no dept vote overturned.
- Committee explains to provost issue of speculation about retaliations (documented in our previous meeting).
- Yip notes we (Senate Exec) also have our own concerns, notably [as the letter says] "that IBL faculty feel they have been deprived of a "seat at the table," particularly since they will now lack dedicated representation at Dean and Chairs meetings. Finally, the removal of the Department Chair removes a critical layer of faculty member assessment by essentially eliminating a layer of RTP review. The removal of this critical layer of faculty assessment needs to be addressed."
- Browne proposes sending a simplified version of this letter, saying that we forward Dr. Kamdar's letter with our endorsement and request further explanation, clarifying that what we're supportive of is the request for information.
- Committee notes it is important to add our concerns about Dean+Chair / echo concern about shared governance. Browne quotes AAUP standards (and clarifies "*that's* how we're involved; it's that this is a shared governance issue).
- McNie raises concerns about meeting with the dept directly. Notes that half of them are untenured, may not feel comfortable raising issues / talking directly. "I'd like to see something a little more formal."
- Committee reiterates that this is a broader issue of shared governance. A lot of people want to hear the response. It's been a long time. Committee adds that this is important to consider the optics: Committee notes that the chair announcement

went out to all faculty. That's never happened before. If it wasn't intended as retaliatory, it sure came across as a passive aggressive telling *everyone*.

- **Action Items: Provost will communicate to president that the department is looking for an explanation and will urge president to meet with the IBL department.**
- Committee asks Provost to clarify that there are two main issues we would like to see addressed: 1) the 6:1 vote overturned needs explaining (for shared governance), and 2) logistics / concerns about how a Dean will also do the job of chair / how that will work.
- Provost and Senate Chair say they will talk to President to try to get answers.
- Pinisetty says "If answers aren't given, Senate will send formal letter by Monday."

Meeting adjourned.