

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 18, 2020

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steve Browne, Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Elizabeth McNie, Cynthia Trevisan, Wil Tsai, Frank Yip

- I. McNie Reports on Health and Safety Committee meeting earlier today.
 - McNie reports just got out of Health and Safety meeting. Moved our meeting today from 4 PM to 12:30 because they wanted response by the Cabinet meeting at 4:00.
 - McNie reports Health and Safety Committee decided to approve the calendar with a few stipulations, primarily being whether we can get the tests in time and complete the Health and Safety plan in time. Idea is we want that stuff done 2 weeks before the seniors would come back on June 17. So deadline is around June 1 to come up with a plan. Talking about needing to meet more frequently, but as far as plan was concerned, they thought it was well organized.
 - Senk asks who is on the committee and asks a clarifying question: didn't the provost say a couple of weeks ago that the health and safety will be purview of medical staff? Isaakson responds to say that was her understanding, too.
 - Dinesh says they are *consulting*; the plans that the Health and Safety Committee will develop will be presented to them to get their approval.
 - McNie reports that campus is committed to meeting OSHA standards as a minimum.

- II. Spring/Summer F2F Plan Discussion.
 - Moorhead shares draft document detailing three options: Option 1 (F2F Graduating Seniors only return first, followed by a 2-week dockside steaming in early July, followed by the return of remaining cadets); Option 2a (no dockside steaming); Option 2B (2-week dockside steaming followed by all cadets)
 - Browne asks if they looked to see if senior classes can fit into that timeframe (June 17-July 3 for "Phase 1")
 - Tsai says Kazek pulled the days from the schedule, turns out to be about eleven days total, so yes, it's doable within that timeframe. Tsai anticipates some students may need to attend both sessions.
 - Browne asks if Phase 1 is cancelled, we'll be adding 100 seniors to Phase 2. Can we handle 100 extra students in the same time period.
 - Tsai says the schedule was actually built in the reverse direction. We're extracting the seniors out of that original schedule. If they pop back in, we're still back to the original plan.
 - Browne asks shouldn't second F2F period be shorter, if you removed all the seniors?
 - Tsai: in principle it could, but the challenge/question is really do we have enough time to go back and refit all the pieces. We don't have time to rework the whole schedule. We aren't changing anything in second F2F; we want to minimize number of changes that would occur.
 - Browne notes in Kazek's earlier plan the seniors were front-loaded, so could be possible that if we end up delaying the start of that second F2F if we remove all the front-loaded classes.

- Pinisetty adds if you count the days, Phase 2 is about 24 days. Classes that sophomores and juniors need to take have at least 3 weeks of instruction. So we'll still have those 3.5 week classes. Brown asks, "so no matter how many seniors there are we will still need 24 days?" Pinisetty confirms yes.
- Moorhead notes we wanted to build predictable failure modes into this. In perfect scenario we get seniors only, two-week dockside steaming, and then the remaining cadets. If earlier phases fail, we don't have to change any of the dates later on.
- Trevisan asks if senior are mixed with other cohorts in these classes. And what does that mean for faculty? Do they teach twice? One for the seniors? And one for the next. Moorhead confirms yes, a faculty member might have to teach the class twice. Tsai notes this is all contingent on HR negotiating with faculty regarding the increased workload. We also need to figure out what to do if a faculty member does not feel it's safe to return.
- Browne: could we have option 2c: MT "victory-lappers" have no benefit coming back early because they still have to do DL 420.
- Committee discusses different scenarios. Brown, McNie, and Isaakson say they approve the plan. Isaakson adds her approval is contingent on Health and Safety approval.
- Pinisetty asks Moorhead if the Captain has been consulted. Moorhead replies yes.
- Moorhead adds that to do Dockside Steaming we have to activate the ship, have to crew up the ship and do drills first. Requires some choreography on everyone's part. Two weeks will not graduate everybody (eg. one student still needs 65 hours of sea time). But even if we do the dockside steaming and don't count it as sea time, we could still do STCW competencies and at least meet the STCW stuff and the academic requirements of CRU 350. Even if we don't activate, for the engineers it still makes sense for us to do it.
- Trevisan asks to clarify why we aren't just planning to delay until late summer. Tsai notes doing one session hurts seniors who have to delay. And delaying everyone to late summer creates logistical hardships, students will experience cost if they have to go back and forth.
- Browne asks what happens if we just do shipboard medical early on. Do we know how many MT students only need Shipboard Medical (ETO 217). Tsai says there are 27 enrolled, 3 need a victory lap.
- Pinisetty notes it's an advantage to reduce the number of students on campus at any given time.
- Tsai: can I ask, when we write our green light, can we say 1) it's contingent on Health and Safety, and 2) it's contingent on a working labor agreement between HR and CFA. That has to be ironed out. Yip agrees that's a potential pitfall. Tsai adds same with dockside steaming. Fairbanks adds CFA is meeting weekly, and he asked last Thursday about where the status was in terms of negotiating pay. Sounds like things aren't moving very quickly. Sounded like they were starting by negotiating for protections in writing for faculty who choose not to return for Health and Safety concerns. Sounded like they didn't want to put anything in writing but gave assurances. CFA is still pursuing something in writing. Nothing has been formally agreed upon in terms of compensation.
- Pinisetty says the department chairs need to know ASAP if faculty are not returning, because chairs need to find a replacement.

- Pinisetty asks if we can just... write this letter now.
- Committee drafts letter:
 - Dear Members of the Long-Range Planning Group,
 - At your request, the Senate Executive Committee met at 12:30 on Monday, May 18, 2020 to discuss the “F2F Return Plan” dated May 16, 2020 (shared with us on Sunday, May 17). We conditionally support the plan so long as 1) the Health and Safety Task Force, in consultation with appropriate health experts, confirms they will be able to implement their safety plan, and 2) the Department of Human Resources reaches an agreement with CFA regarding the necessary faculty compensation.

III. Online Planning

- Tsai reports there should have been a communication regarding which courses will meet F2F, which will be hybrid, and which will be entirely online. Are department chairs doing this? Or individual personnel?
- Pinisetty reports department chairs are doing this. Pinisetty reports that the Engineering Dean forwarded to faculty. Trevisan reports that the L&S Dean has not contacted.
- Tsai says we’re targeting tomorrow afternoon as the time to start centralizing things, to figure out what percentage of students will be online.
- Pinisetty reports LRPG plans to run plan by Cabinet by May 22. Tsai says Chancellor’s Office wants it by May 31.
- Fairbanks asks to confirm that the committee wants this data by tomorrow afternoon? Is this a problem that one School hasn’t been notified yet?
- Yip notes it might be doable given that C&C and S&M have already been planning (after assuming their classes will be online).
- Pinisetty notes he does not want chairs to make the decision; he wants Deans to consult their faculty.
- Pinisetty notes that Lina’s email says May 25. Tsai clarifies that’s the date it should go to Cabinet. Our deadline internally is Friday.

IV. Provost Search Interviews

- Committee agrees for equity purposes we should ask each candidate the same questions, after discussion compiles the following draft questions:
 - o “The Provost represents the academic core of the faculty. Could you elaborate on your philosophy about how to make sure they feel their voices are heard?”
 - o “As you know, the university is working to double in size in the next decade. What do you think would be the most effective ways to grow?”
 - o “As you may know, we recently split into 3 schools, so we’re working with a relatively new structure and are still working to shape the roles for Deans and Department chairs. Can you tell us how you see the different roles? What should the role of Department Chairs be, in your opinion?”
 - o “How would you avoid academic siloing and competition for course responsibility between schools?”

- “Can you tell us a bit about how you would plan as Provost to respond to the current COVID-19 crisis? We’d like to know in particular about any relevant experience managing significant organizational change/uncertainty?”
- Committee agrees to save the following suggested questions for open forum:
 - “How do you make people ‘play nice’ across different entities?” Silos between Academic Affairs / Student Affairs / Corps of Cadets
 - What are your opinions regarding standards for RTP?
 - What have you learned about STCW / Cal Maritime?

Meeting adjourned.