

Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
June 25, 2020

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Matt Fairbanks, Elizabeth McNie, Wil Tsai, Frank Yip, Interim Provost Michael Mahoney, Graham Benton [all via Zoom]

Absent: Steven Browne, Christine Isakson, Cynthia Trevisan

I. Benton Presents on Budget Situation

- Benton starts by saying he doesn't know how much the Provost has shared with the committee. Senk writes in chat, "literally nothing concrete."
- Benton wants to review numbers, says they're all taken from the web, ran by Andrew Som and Franz Lozano last night to confirm accuracy.
- Benton shares screen and presents overview of possible budget repercussions, notes there is nothing definitive in here, just his own calculations based on information on the budget webpage. Says that if we need clarification he will relay to Admin and Finance. Benton confirms the point of the presentation is strictly informative; there is nothing Senate needs to approve.
- Benton says he is chairing Health and Safety committee so understand tensions between health and safety and these impacts. States that the committee is working according to three guiding principles: #1 is health and safety, #2 trying as hard as we can to keep with our institutional mission, #3 things change every day. We have to be flexible with how we proceed with understanding that plans we have often get changed at last minute.
- Benton reports that in all meetings he has been in, one of the principles is administration and faculty are trying to keep campus as whole as we possibly can. There's going to be hardships coming up in future. A lot of decisions being made are being made with people in mind.
- Benton reviews Cost of attendance (from financial aid website)
- Benton reviews Campus Mandatory Fees. Explains that CSU policy means we can't change tuition since that is standardized across campuses, but we *can* change student fees.
- 6.2M revenue from 877 students
- Enterprise services can't mingle money with the general fund. We can't take money generated from dining/housing and put it into instruction. That's illegal. Has to be completely separate money. Other potential revenue making streams in Enterprise Services but what they charge for housing and dining (12K must be spent on housing and dining – that's the cost of their food and housing including staff, maintenance, etc.), ES has additional revenue, eg. If someone wants to rent anchor center, etc.
- 400 F2F student covid scenario = net loss of 4.5 million dollars for Enterprise Services. This doesn't impact instructional budgets at all. This is all housing and dining. But these numbers have repercussions, 1) there will be contractions/layoffs (already have been in dining people, namely through Cedexco, but if we have just half of students we only need half of res staff, janitors, dining staff), and 2) way these buildings operate is no different from scenario if you're renting a place to pay a mortgage. We still have notes on these buildings, we pay mortgage based on students' fees. If we don't have the income, we have difficulty paying off loan on buildings.
- Benton presents information regarding General Fund: 1) State Appropriation (Adjusted Allocation State Appropriation) and 2) Tuition Fee. Reports that the State/CSU gave us

37M + 10.7M generated in tuition and fees. Costs Cal Maritime approximately 40K to educate each student (we're talking FTE, not headcount). Reason is because our students carry more units than average. Most institutions are underneath that. Other campuses are given much more by CO, but per student we're by far the most expensive school in the system. We don't have economy of scale, we have highest tenure density, unique majors.

- How many students do we have? Enrollment decline started Fall 2016 (max 1107), down to 1050 in 2017, 1017 in 2018, 911 in 2019. Every student we lose is loss of \$ per student we get from CO, not just fees and tuition.
- Yip: That's a critical point, do we have any attribution for that cause?
- Benton says there are a number of different factors, it's not as simple to say we're not bringing enough students in. We lose half our IBL students between freshman and junior year, so we need to find a solution that may be different than saying we can't get enough FET students in the front door. We need multi-pronged approach. For IBL the question is why are our business sophomores leaving, for FET it's why can't we get them to come here. MT is stable (they have nowhere else to go and it's impacted.) We've looked at it with enrollment specialists. Before world fell apart, we had a plan we were going to implement.
- Pinisetty adds that ME, MET also impacted. We have centers where we can't fit more than 6 students in a class. We can't increase because we have constraints because licensed students.
- Benton confirms Pinisetty is right, it's not just how many we bring in the door. It's how many we keep. Even if we bring in a lot, if we shed half our class as soon as they become sophomores you have half of what you thought, less and less sections to plan for.
  
- Benton reports that Marc McGee sent numbers this morning. Targets 317, deposits 284. Not a bad number. Not what we wanted, but not horrible. If you look at 2018 we wanted 319 we got 293. Last year we wanted 319 we got 275. It's not as great as it was 2 years ago. We're doing okay if it's a normal year. Benton is worried that even if people put in a deposit, which usually means they have skin in the game, but might not choose to come here based on how safe they feel, what campus environment we can provide, and what they can expect when they get here.
- Benton notes that we also waived a lot of deposits this year. So there's no money on the table if some of those 284 choose to leave. Even if they *did* put a deposit down, if they felt CMA wasn't doing what they want us to do in this environment, that's a lot less to lose than whole tuition. So McGee does not know how many of these are coming. We're getting calls every day asking what "are you doing, are you going online, are you going alt modality because I need to make my mind, and we don't have an answer because the working groups are working on it. As soon as we figure it out we have to tell the incoming class and they have to make a decision."
- Tsai asks if there is a reason why Fall 2020 target even with a new major is lower than past 2 years?
- Benton reports that there is: administration had a target of 50 incoming IBL students, a target they realized was unrealistic. "We've got to do something different."
- Benton continues with presentation, describing a slide detailing drop in enrollment predicted due to COVID pandemic: "here's where it hurts – if we lose students who decide not to enroll in Cal Maritime, potential loss of revenue is 1.2M for just 30 students. This will impact academic affairs budgets, departmental budgets, this is where we'll feel the pinch."
- Benton reports that McGee forwarded text from someone, just anecdotal, but this is the kind of thing he is getting, a student who was going to go to Monterey Bay but asks if he can go to Cal Maritime instead because he "doesn't want to go to an online college." Benton also

adds, “I don’t know how many we have the other way, who won’t show up if forced to come back.”

- Yip says, “I’m unfamiliar with what admissions does. What’s the answer he’s been giving them? I’m deciding between two schools, what’s he been saying? How has he been differentiating the programs at Cal Maritime from programs at another CSU? What’s his sales pitch?”
- Benton says “I’m sure it’s the pitch he gives all the time: we’re a small school, co-curricular leadership stuff.”
- Benton: if we make decisions by major [to maintain face-to-face classes of licensed majors only], does this mean we’re losing more IBL/GSMA? We don’t know how many students we might shed. That would impact number of sections, number of faculty we need to teach, no one wants to talk about contractions but in CBA contractions happen at department level, so if a dept becomes so small that we don’t need all the instructors we have. Benton adds as an example that Humboldt is down, they can shrink and survive. But if we shrink there may be a point of no return. If we go to 500 students, 300 students, we may not survive.
- Senk asks, “but is that on the table? 600 something students need face-to-face instruction and, according to proposed plan, will be on campus. How would we go down to 300?”
- Benton explains the problem is the lasting impact of low-enrolled year: number of classes get cut as cohort moves through. Budget implications will be worse for following year. We’ve got 660 in license tracks pretty committed, coming back, but that 30K we’re getting from the CSU per student we won’t get in the following year because the CSU budget is based on state budget, majority of that is sales tax and property tax. We can absorb one bad year. If it becomes 2 or 3 years we’re in a bit more trouble.
- Benton adds that there were 5 class action lawsuits brought against CSU, two more are going to be filed, suing campuses to return money that has already been spent, student fees from Spring 2020. We’ve done some of that already. We returned dining and housing. One is suing for instruction/tuition, asking for refund. Benton reiterates that the purpose of this presentation is to inform. Not trying to make any pitch, just notifying us. In a number of situations, it’s damned if we do, damned if we don’t.
- Senk asks, “I guess my question is the same question I’ve been asking for two months: without a risk assessment, without an account of what *can* be done safely, what is this information *for*? It sure is motivating to bring people back, but if we *can’t* due to safety concerns, what do we *do* with this information?”
- Benton notes that Pinisetty has brought up the fact that we have no fixed variables.
- Senk says, “We’re at an impasse, then, because we don’t know what *can* be done safely yet. Faculty are frustrated, faculty are being asked to propose things like hy-flex and hybrid and high-BS classes before we actually know what the maximum safe classroom capacity is or whether any of these models can actually be implemented this fall, how many students will actually be on campus or have access to campus, etc.”
- Benton notes, “you’re preaching to the choir.”
- McNie adds: “what are the decision making requirements that whoever is making this decision is going to need? What are the factors going into it? We could spin our wheels all day about risk vs safety, so what is the decision-maker looking for? How can we facilitate a decision? What info could this group provide that could be helpful?”

- Benton says that's a great question, reports that the President wants to bring back as many students to embrace the co-curricular student life we have on this campus, and to bring back as many students as is safe, and leaving it to different constituent groups to figure out how to do that. So Health and Safety is going to put housing recommendation forward, and that will be shopped around.
- Pinisetty says "it's a chicken/egg dilemma." Housing is asking how many they have to accommodate, Academic Affairs waiting to find out how many Housing can accommodate.
- Senk adds that another issue is classroom capacity, we don't yet know how many classes *can* be taught in person. We've been saying this for two months: we need to know this before we even ask people to teach F2F. Another issue is that Chancellor's policy is very clear: the letter we have been asking to provide to the Chancellor asks for an *explicit attestation* that classes taught F2F *can't* be taught online, and if you are asking all of us to be flexible and consider teaching in person, you're essentially asking faculty to lie, because if you want us to say that, say, a marketing class *can't* be taught online, a writing class *can't* be taught online, but that's a lie. The Provost told us in a previous meeting that Chico and Humboldt were interpreting that policy as "guidelines" rather than a mandate, and I got in touch with their ASCSU reps, one of whom said "that's crazy false." So this is our impasse: faculty feel they are being asked to misrepresent the situation and say that their classes *must* be taught face to face when they *can* be taught online."
- Isakson adds that there are no business classes that can't be taught face to face. It seems like we're being asked to give the Chancellor a list of classes to ask for exemptions for based on an instructor's *willingness* to teach F2F, not whether the class can or can't be taught online. Isakson asks, when are we sending that letter?
- Benton replies that Senk and Isakson raise good questions. Says that "regarding policy, Cal Maritime has always looked for exceptions to a lot of Chancellor's Office policies because we are different. President is looking to expand opportunities for us to bring back students because we aren't other institutions, because we have different type of campus, and for us to have to follow same protocols as SF State where they're in a city, with members of the public using library. I don't know the answer of how deep we can go."
- Senk says, "I've suggested this to others in administration, but if exemptions *are* possible, why are we not starting with looking at available safe classrooms, like Rizza, which is highly ventilated, which I would be comfortable teaching in with the doors open, why aren't we framing the exemption request that way – saying "we *can* safely teach a 25-person class in here" rather than asking people to make up reasons why their classes can't be taught online when they can?"
- Benton replies that it's not clear we *can* have socially distant classrooms
- Moorhead suggests that Step 1 is to figure out how many beds we're going to use.
- Benton adds that it's also unclear what happens if we bring students back and they have only online class.
- Yip reiterates that we need to get admissions marketing Cal Maritime, we need to make the argument about why we're better than online at a community college.
- Tsai asks, "what if we don't communicate a plan by June 30? We'll lose more students in all programs because they don't know what we're doing and they're tired of waiting. Does Marc McGee know how many students who we will lose because we're making them come back. What are the repercussions if they think they're delaying graduation and have to take the semester off. We want a plan that is as close to possible as approvable by the CO."
- Benton says Tsai is right; if we don't tell incoming students what we're doing, they're going to bail.

- Senk says it's also important to note that when we spoke to the President and Provost about this a month ago, they were justifying bringing all students back because they were looking at that IMHE data which at the time suggested that by September we would have no more cases. Now that has gone out the window. Data is very different now, the conditions have changed from when we were first considering bringing people back
- Provost Mahoney says, "I want to correct info someone said. I want to correct info. I never said that." [Senk confirms that in the April 8 Executive Meeting the Provost said projections suggested that there would be "no deaths in the state of California by the end of *May*" and that in the meeting on May 4 the President said predictions were that the "Last expected day of any death in CA is May 15" and that there was a "prediction of resurgence of COVID in October." Senk writes in chat: "I apologize for getting it wrong. Either way my point is the same: the conditions have changed" since we last discussed predictions about when it would be safe to resume classes.]
- Mahoney describes information about campus plans: reports that "Cal Poly plan proposes to have double occupancy, 17 plans submitted so far, almost everyone has been sent back to campus for revisions. Only 5 or 6 have been approved in total. That may have changed in last two days. The plan is currently being edited by L&S Dean Kevin Mandernack. We'll be discussing it and submitting it Friday, Monday at the latest. President has to attest to certain things in the plan, it has to be submitted by the President, it goes to a group of 4 people, one level lower than Executive Vice Chancellor level. So when we submit our plan it'll go to that group, which already has a backlog, they haven't even looked at a handful of plans because they're reviewing all 23 plans. My hope is it will come back by end of the week with revisions, and shortly after July 4 we will no. There is no deadline. I heard someone say there is a deadline, but there is no deadline."
- Tsai types in chat: "Sorry, it was not a deadline for the submission, it was a deadline to communicate to the students about what our plans are for the fall."
- Mahoney continues: "It's been sitting with LRPG for a long time because they have a lot to do. They're also working on Face-to-Face going on now, dockside steaming, F2F for end of summer, LRPG has been doing a lot, so I wouldn't criticize them."
- Senk types in chat: "I would criticize the institutional structure that gave ONE group so much to do."
- McNie types in chat: "I recall calling for a Manhattan-style process... not too late."
- Mahoney says McGee keeps asking if he can make a statement, President and Provost say no because we have to wait until plan is approved.
- Committee ends meeting by thanking Benton for the clarity of his presentation, notes that this was the clearest presentation of budgetary matters we've seen.

Meeting adjourned.