

Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
Thursday, July 23, 2020, 1:00 PM

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Elizabeth McNie (Vice Chair AY 2020-2021), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair AY 2019-2020)], Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steven Browne, Matt Fairbanks, Christine Isakson, Wil Tsai

Absent: Cynthia Trevisan

1. Enforcement of COVID-19 Safety Plan

- Commandant notified Senate Chair that staff is limited at the moment, so it's not practical to rely entirely on commandants given the size of the student population on campus. They are trying to coordinate with Housing, Faculty have equal authority to reprimand people for not following protocol. Taliaferro wants to meet with faculty to discuss what can be improved/changed. Chair asks for suggestions from committee.
- McNie reports that faculty were not happy with the claim that "we're *all* enforcing things" because of the lack of accountability; saying everyone is doing it is the same as saying no one is in charge of doing it. McNie adds: "*Of course*, we all have to say something when we see it, but we need to clarify roles and responsibilities, so for example, the Commandants will do walk-throughs of classroom buildings, ship, etc. and will create a weekly infraction summary. Residential Life will coordinate with office assistants for regular walk-throughs of residence halls and will report infractions to the Commandants and Faculty Senate. VPs are also listed as points of contact. One recommendation might be to have management have a game plan: *how* do they plan on doing random walk-throughs. It's not enough to say "they're there." You don't see infractions sitting in your office in the Admin building; you see them walking around campus." McNie feels the new plan is a set in the right direction. "Is there a single point-person in charge of enforcement? No, but there is discussion going on about reassigning someone to be a COVID point-person." McNie emphasizes that faculty can always enforce Health and Safety standards, and suggests message needs to go out to faculty again.
- Moorhead asks if there is language in the plan for management to review what custodians are doing, because there needs to be oversight on what kind of cleaning is happening at night. Faculty have reported throughout the summer phases so far that there is no proof of cleaning. It *could* be getting done, but it's not obvious that it's happening. Suggestion: have a checklist.
- McNie reports Auden is working in conjunction with John Finch on appointing cleaners for the ship.
- Chair says there have been reports (by faculty) that one faculty member in Engineering does not take COVID-19 threat seriously and has not been taking responsibility for cleaning his classroom space, that he believes COVID is a hoax. Chair suggests working with CFA on this but notes that faculty member in question is not a union member. Committee discusses that this is a violation of the Health and Safety Plan; the training indicates that we clean the rooms; anyone in violation of the Health and Safety plan needs to be reprimanded. Fairbanks notes that CFA might be "edgy" about what that reprimand would look like; they'd be concerned about setting precedent for administrative overreach of authority, but it seems like some sort of procedure needs to be worked out. Committee notes that an individual's failure to abide by the Health and

Safety plan puts others at risk, and that's the bottom line. Isakson asks if we have an indicator from the Chancellor's office about how to proceed; the CSU system obviously agrees that there is a safety issue and that's why our workplace situation has been adjusted. Senk offers to reach out to ASCSU representative to see what other campuses are doing. Chair reports he is also concerned that cadets learn from faculty and this attitude may set a poor example for cadets to follow. Tsai asks if there are disciplinary procedures for students behaving. McNie reports that Health and Safety Committee has ensured every cadet has been trained and told that Health and Safety is a zero-tolerance issue; cadets will be reported to the Commandants, Maxient warnings issued, significant demerits, but McNie reports and students have been following the rules. Senk asks if this is an HR issue. Chair reports that he is not a first-hand witness to this faculty member's behavior so is not in a position to report it to HR; others have reported it to him. But as next steps we can notify AVP and HR and ask for advice about how to proceed. **Action items: Chair will seek input from AVP Graham Benton.**

## 2. Contracts for Summer

- Chair reports that some people received Phase 1 and Phase contracts after the work was finished. (Browne notes he did not get his Phase 2 contract and it's already done.) Chair reports he expressed dismay during Cabinet meeting, and Cabinet committed to completing Phase 3 contracts *before* the start of Phase 3. As far as Chair knows, they have been signed, and faculty should have received them. Fairbanks notes this is something union has been working on, too. Administration allegedly told CFA representatives that "things kept shifting around," and that explained the delay. Chair notes that some contracts had mistakes; they are being corrected and new ones will be delivered.

## 3. LRPG Report

- Tsai reports that Long-Range Planning Group has reconsidered intensive license required in-person classes to speed-up the F2F classes. There is no longer motivation to get everyone completed by Thanksgiving because of the situation with COVID. Tsai reports that the committee also tried working with the Registrar and was unable to figure out a solution for scheduling; there are potential labor issues, availability of physical resource issues, etc. That led to a series of meetings over the last week and by yesterday all of those factors combined to make the committee realize there was no benefit to the compressed classes. F2F courses will now run at a normal schedule; they will still start on August 17. Tsai asks McNie about the Health and Safety task force understanding of Thanksgiving. Chair reports that Health and Safety task force hasn't even begun to tackle Fall 2020 since the focus has been on Summer 2020. Tsai said LRPG is assuming that students do *not* return after Thanksgiving (due to the potential to bring COVID back on campus when they return), but that classes continue virtually; that means faculty will need to make sure STCW assessments happen earlier in the semester. For the online classes, for all majors and programs, classes start August 20. LRPG is pushing up the start date but there's no more compression. It's not optimal; it exposes us to the same problem we had in Spring if we shut down. But LRPG has responded to changing circumstances: months ago the assumption was that a second wave would come in November; now there is no predictive tool anymore. Tsai reports he knows this is frustrating and wishes committee could provide more certainty, but it's a moving target.
- This document, once finalized, will go out to everyone on campus. It's being presented to department chairs tomorrow.

- Browne notes you can't really "speed up" sea-time accrual. If you meet all of the course requirements you get the sea time. Browne suggests running the wording by Mike Kazek and he can advise the committee on whether the language makes sense.
- Chair notes that another thing that people have to remember is that the 23-25<sup>th</sup> of November are currently non-instructional workdays but in this new calendar they will be turned into *instructional* workdays (with the intention of ending the semester sooner).
- Tsai notes addition to the plan in case of a mandated shutdown prior to 11/25/20. Committee is proposing two options: 1) classes are suspended for a week across the board, or 2) suspend some classes but not others (ie. those that are already entirely online and not living on campus), but this could be problematic because some IBL/GSMA students *may* be living on campus. Browne suggests LRPG consider MT/ME folks who are taking minors because they take classes in the other programs. Tsai says they have already been identified.
- Senk reports that during an Orientation Executive Committee several weeks ago, David Taliaferro said it was going to be communicated to students that they needed to "pack light" (ie. bring no more than 1-2 duffel bags worth of stuff to campus) so they could leave campus quickly/efficiently in the event of a shutdown. Senk does not have confirmation that this message was communicated to students, though.
- Tsai reports that LRPG communications strategy is to run these plans by the chairs first (tomorrow); the committee needs to understand that an email needs to go out to all faculty. Chair suggests sending messages to Deans and Chairs. Tsai says that LRPG has experienced issues where some constituents are reporting back that they are "out of the loop," that people meant to report information to them have failed to do so.
- Senk suggests that we formalize a communication process so that specific parties are accountable for communicating information. As heads of schools it seems to make sense that Deans communicate information to Chairs and then chairs communicate information to their department faculty, but this process has been very uneven in practice. Senk notes as an example something that was reported to Department chairs from the Orientation Executive Committee, but faculty in some departments were completely unaware, as well as L&S faculty feeling "out of the loop" regarding LRPG planning efforts. Senk recommends that for now, due to the time constraints, we report this information about the new calendar to all faculty rather than relying on Deans and Chairs, but that in the future we need a systematic process and a way of confirming that communications happened formally.
- Tsai suggests as soon as new provost arrives we should clarify and formalize in writing the procedures for communication.

#### 4. Future Resolutions

##### a. Resolution on Research Support

- o Senk reports that she and Yip would like to propose a resolution regarding research support and funding on campus.
- o Parker described to Senk an incident regarding his own grant, submitted in 2018, which was pulled "in the eleventh hour." As a result of that, Parker's collaborators at SF State are not keen on him being the lead on proposals anymore, so in Fall 2019 Parker's collaborators invited him to be the sub-contractor, not the PI. That meant Cal Maritime lost out on F&A funding. The fundamental problem, Parker says, is that there is virtually no incentive for faculty to go after grants since grants don't support research. None of the

indirect cost (IDC) gets returned to the school, department, or researcher. The tricky part is that the university did build an oceanography lab, and that *could* have been funded with F&A, but Parker does not know because the process lacks transparency. And key problem is that there appears to be no discretionary funds held back to go to the School to support, say, startup money or course releases for future grant proposals. Another issue is that they do not support buyouts even though they make money on a buyout because you have to pay a rate that corresponds to *your* salary, *not* the cost of your replacement (who may be a lecturer on a much lower salary).

- Senk reports that she also spoke with Alex Parker regarding a recent issue with a grant awarded to Alejandro Cifuentes-Lorenzen, and Parker encouraged her to reach out to him directly regarding the details.
  - Chair says it's good we're bringing this up now. He asked that exact question at this morning's Cabinet meeting and the President reported that the funding goes to auxiliary services including Enterprise services.
  - Yip says "at any university that wants to sustain research, that money should go back into sustaining research." And that's the problem.
  - Yip clarifies: so hypothetically, you write a grant for a million dollars, the university gets F&A university is committed to paying 10% but as part of the grant they *get* \$400,000, so that leaves a net of \$300,000 that should have gone back into research. The fact is we said no to \$300,000 of additional money because we didn't want to commit to the \$100,000. Yip asks that the risks here are substantially limiting and, frankly, make us look like jackasses. In the past we have said "no" to free money because of the structures in place. We've lost faculty because of it.
  - Chair suggests that we go to President Cropper directly. Yip adds that the budget model we currently have is *not* conducive to supporting research. Isakson notes that the problem is that the F&A is getting funneled to other places on campus as opposed to funding future grants – the "committed costs" – whatever the agreement with the grant association is.
  - Yip adds this is urgent, we are not only losing faculty, we are giving up the opportunity for prestige. Browne notes that it also affects our ability to hire and retain quality faculty in the sciences.
  - **Action Items: Senk will correspond with Parker and Cifuentes-Lorenzen to confirm details of the recent Oceanography grant process and communicate them to Pinisetty. Pinisetty will meet directly with President to discuss and report back to Senate Executive Committee.**
- b. Resolution Regarding Department Conservatorship
- Senk notes that we need to return to the issue of the IBL Department conservatorship; faculty have reported to Senk that they would like clarity on how the conservatorship works. One potential problem multiple faculty members brought to Senk's attention is that the data about retention and recruitment for IBL and GSMA is very similar, so the argument that IBL and not GSMA required conservatorship is confusing to faculty. Faculty members have reported they are still concerned about administration "overturning" a faculty vote, and we may be able to address those concerns by drafting a resolution encouraging the Administration to clarify in writing the metrics regarding conservatorship (eg. what are the conditions under which a department is put in

conservatorship, what is the timeline, what exactly are the metrics for returning to normalcy?)

- Browne notes these points could be included in the Chairs policy.
- Yip says we need a separate policy that at least specifies when a conservatorship ends and why. Senk suggests this may be beyond the purview of a senate policy because it's a university policy. Tsai notes it would be better for us to write the rules on that, we control it to make sure faculty have the power to determine the constraints/parameters. Tsai says we should get a list from Chairs and Deans about what they think they should be doing and that they think the other role should be doing and cross-correlate and see where we're at.
- **Action Items: Senk will check with other ASCSU members; Pinisetty will check with Senate Chairs to find out if other campuses have policies regarding conservatorship.**

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.