

Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2020
2 PM – 4 PM

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Elizabeth McNie, Cynthia Trevisan, Wil Tsai, Frank Yip [all via remote connection]

Absent: Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Steve Browne

I. AB 1460 (Ethnic Studies Resolution)

- Pinisetty reports that AB 1460 has passed, reports from ASCSU Senate Chairs meetings
- Senk reminds committee that GE Committee recommended and campus survey that indicated the only feasible way of adopting a requirement would be to have it overlap with GE. suggests surveying departments, particularly those that teach Area C and Area D classes and identifying which *existing* courses might already meet the learning outcomes.

II. Litigation

- Chair reports on class action lawsuit against the CSU regarding tuition from Spring 2020 after the switch to online modalities. We should expect emails from Chief Information Officer, but we should not delete any emails or any records, should save everything that demonstrates how extensively we were in contact with students while we were teaching remotely.
- Julianne reported to Pinisetty that all of the Zoom logs are saved, that Cal Maritime faculty have done an amazing job, there are so many Zoom sessions faculty have conducted with students, so our campus may not have an issue because we have evidence to demonstrate that we provided quality online teaching.
- Fairbanks was under the impression that the IT department was just going to archive everything anyway, so reports that he's not entirely certain what we're supposed to be doing anything.
- Pinisetty reports that our campus already refunded students for housing and dining.

III. Fall 2020 Planning Discussion

- McNie reports she has been coordinating with Lachlan Davis (Corps Commander), and they would like to bring together faculty, staff, and students for an "ideas summit" to come up with ideas about how to make online education more enriching, how to make campus life more enriching given that we'll be pivoting a lot of things to virtual modalities.
- Our enrollment has already been dropping, one of the ways of brining numbers up is to enrich these experiences this fall. Ideas Summit would be co-hosted by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the Triad, and this is a rush, but the reason for having it on June 30 is that it's at the end of Phase 1 and before Phase 2, it's a time when no one is scheduled for class.
- McNie has been kicking around idea that maybe we call all of the incoming students and assure them about the effectiveness of online teaching and talk to them directly about what they can expect from the experience.

- Senk adds “[redacted expletive] YEAH,” notes that this is a brilliant idea to engage students during the COVID crisis, but it’s also a way to empower students, to get them to feel like they have agency and that they can shape how the institution works.
- McNie says idea is to give them some agency in the problem solving
- Isakson emphasizes that when we get all of these ideas we’ll need to follow through and *that* piece will really help the campus culture
- Yip says he is very supportive, asks how many people would be involved in the summit.
- McNie says she is considering a “world café” model over Zoom, but thinks we can get 30-50 people.
- Pinisetty supports it, notes we are also doing the work of admissions here. Admissions is also talking to students, maybe we can coordinate with them and see if they can advertise this program.
- Tsai notes this overlaps perfectly with something he’d proposed [shares Google Doc with draft]: “creating faculty ‘touchpoints’ outside of the classroom.” One issue is that we keep talking about “Cadet Experience” but we don’t know what that experience will be. What is it? What defines that experience? What is it that they’re going to do outside of class that will be enriching and engaging. In terms of enrollment, the problem is *not* our classes being offered virtually; it’s a lack of an enriching cadet experience, even pre-COVID. Rather than pushing more face-to-face classes, we should be engaging students in innovative ways.
- Trevisan asks about “pushing face to face classes”
- Tsai reports this refers to the Interim Provost’s insistence that we need to offer bring the majority of classes back to face-to-face modalities.
- McNie notes this is in sync with her plan, that these are “two paths to the same destination.”
- Pinisetty reports he spoke to Marc McGee and asked how Admissions is planning on “selling” the Fall 2020 programs; McGee said he is not, that he does not want to make false promises, wants to be very careful. Pinisetty believes that things should start from Student Affairs, they should try to see what kinds of experiences they can provide to students virtually. What sort of experience do they want the cadets to have? Pinisetty reports asking McGee: current numbers show we are short 30 students from targets, but as Senk asked Mahoney in a previous meeting, is that because we’re moving online or because it’s part of the normal decline in enrollment that we’ve seen in the past few years? McGee said that he believes cadets who are on the list of deposits will *withdraw* deposits if we are primarily online.
- Isakson notes we are *not* going fully online.
- Yip asks: it’s not entirely clear to me what’s explained to them in normal circumstances for why they should attend. It would be helpful to know that. The classes will still be small sized. A zoom with 20 people is different than a Zoom with 200. We can help him, but he’s got to tell them *something*.
- McNie notes this is “ridiculous” because we are doing a mix of face-to-face and online. The only question is what ratio.
- Pinisetty clarifies that McGee is talking only about IBL and GSMA students.
- Tsai is worried about what’s been communicated there. We had students who didn’t even know they’d be allowed back in the forms during that conversation last week. The institution has got to do a better job of communication. These are students who are currently enrolled.
- Pinisetty suggests we should coordinate with Kristin Tener directly.
- Fairbanks notes McGee is in a weird position because if it’s paying attention to what LRPG is putting together and Cabinet is saying, he’s hearing two different things about what’s likely to happen with IBL and GSMA classes. I get the dissonance.

- Pinisetty reports that at Provost's council Interim Provost Mahoney reported to the council that students want to come back, but faculty do not. Pinisetty reports correcting Mahoney, saying that faculty just want clarity, asking that Mahoney *not* make a claim that faculty are not inclined to come back without evidence. And Pinisetty notes that 51% of students want to come back, meaning 49% many not want to, but those aren't being mentioned. Pinisetty uses engineering metaphor: if you don't fix a single variable, you cannot come up with a solution.
- Yip suggests telling McGee to emphasize class size, faculty-to-student ratio.
- Isakson asks if we know what our capacity is. Says we need to sit down and do that math work first. We don't even know how many *can* come back. What is our capacity?
- Pinisetty says that's exactly what he mentioned at council, and he recommended to Admin that they need to approach the problem "from the other way around": first identify housing and classroom capacity and then figure out how many people can safely return rather than asking people to commit to teaching face-to-face without identifying whether there is sufficient space.
- Trevisan reports that what she and Senk are hearing from the other ASCSU representatives, it's unlikely that the Chancellor will approve anything that doesn't have strong justification for being face-to-face.
- Pinisetty reports that chairs did not have clarity whether the Chancellor's policy was an order or "guidelines," as Mahoney reported to Senate Exec. Pinisetty is waiting to hear back from another CSU Senate Chair who will speak to Loren Blanchard. It's clear that other campus problems are different, that in their cases it's the campus Presidents saying they *can't* teach face-to-face.
- Yip notes that as soon as we come to an accord regarding what percentage is face-to-face, we're going to be late to the party dealing with resources because we're spending so much time talking about this. We've been saying this now for *two months*: the critical issue is "what's the maximum number of students we can accommodate?"
- Tsai reports LRPG is just getting housing's plan, that they filed capacity at 435 (because they're not counting the ship's berthing). We still need Health and Safety to assess how many people can fit safely into each classroom.
- McNie: Health and Safety is focused on current situation, but if that's something that needs to be done we'll put in on the agenda and make it done. But we've been so focused on getting Phase 1 launched. Has encouraged the committee to get fall planning launched.
- Fairbanks notes that some classroom spaces are a little more crowded than others for the same number of seats.
- Tsai says we could make a crude estimate of classroom capacity, but it's a chicken/egg problem. But housing is the bigger constraint here. I just want to convey that face-to-face classes is not the issue: if I can stop worrying about Mahoney's pressuring an increase in face-to-face classes, we can focus on the necessary things.
- Pinisetty: this is our campus: starting with the least important thing. This should have been started from health and safety, housing, classrooms. Why convince a faculty member to return face-to-face if we don't have space to house those students, or classroom space to use?
- Pinisetty: in April at CLC meeting I told Michael Martin I needed this information. Martin reported that's a good question, need to get answers from Chancellor's office. Two and a half months: nothing.
- McNie: We have an endowment of 15M. Why don't we take some of that money and cut fees for students. If we disappear as an institution, that 15M doesn't help us at all. Purdue froze its tuition in 2012 and what they saw happen was significant enrollment bump, to the

point were they offset those losses with additional fees. If this is really a crisis, an existential crisis, *do something*, it is time to tap into that.

- Isakson: wondering if there's a way that we can let them know that we can't move forward on anything until we know what capacity is. We need to have that before we send out any surveys, which will create confusion.
- Yip: this is the critical issue, we've been mentioning this for two months
- Pinisetty reports that this morning during a meeting with Lina and Don he stressed the same thing. By creating confusion about whether we'll be F2F online, they are minimizing the amount of time faculty can plan for successful online courses.
- Pinisetty: the other thing they are not considering is that if we bring an unsafe number of people back, we are compromising the potential of the STCW classes; we are jeopardizing all programs by trying to be over-ambitious
- Senk mentions comment she made to Mahoney in Friday's meeting, that the more people we bring back to campus, the higher the likelihood of an outbreak, and if we have an outbreak, the whole operation shuts down: including those classes that *cannot* be taught online, and then we're in a worse situation than we were in Spring 2020, but we don't have the summer of a buffer.
- Yip: what's driving a lot of the student comments is wishful thinking; it's not been effectively communicated to them that they are not returning to a normal semester, they return their movement will be restricted, etc.
- McNie: I think it's time for one of our strongly worded Friday-afternoon letters.
- Wil: we have to submit *something* to the chancellor by the end of this month. We do not have the luxury of time anymore.
- Committee discusses administrative suggestions about hybrid classes, how we don't have the technology to support that mode, the suggestion misunderstands that online classes are fundamentally different pedagogically than in person lectures, would require significant increase in faculty workload to execute (creating materials to engage the students who were online at the time that their classmates are in lecture). And fundamentally the issue is that we have no information to identify our maximum capacity.
- Committee discusses that we should recommend that one or more members of the Senate Executive Committee become part of cabinet because they have been talking in circles for two months, describing an existential crisis that is clearly in part linked to the institution's failure of messaging regarding why a non-licensed major should come to Cal Maritime over another program in the first place.
- **Action items: respective Senate Executive members of COVID planning committees will report our concerns to those committees.**

IV. Phase 1 Reports

- McNie reports things appear to be going well, notes she confronted a campus police officer who wasn't wearing a mask, but did not report it to the president. Describes how we are learning and adjusting, anticipates Phase 2 going smoothly because it's only 20 students, but Phase 3 will be a challenge given difficulties enforcing social distancing measures and proper PPE use.

Meeting adjourned.