

Senate Exec Meeting (2/11/2021)

Attendees: Dinesh Pinisetty, Bets McNie, Margot Hanson, Matt Fairbanks, Lori Schroeder (Provost), Christine Isakson, Frank Yip, and Cynthia Trevisan

- Dinesh started the meeting with a moment of silence for our lost cadet.
- The Secretary missed the Provost on the minutes distribution list. Apologies. Will be corrected.
- 2/16 Senate Exec conflicts with General Education Committee meeting. Margot and Cynthia and Bets are all on the GE Committee. It was agreed to cancel the Senate Exec meeting.
- Discussing Senate meeting agenda. Bets: would like to recruit for committees. Christine: Marc McGee should attend Senate meeting and we should have specific items for him to address.
- Dinesh: should we have Kathleen present the Student Affairs reorg? It was agreed, and Dinesh will invite her.
- Dinesh: the agenda goes out Monday (2/15/2021), so send anything else before then.
- Dinesh: Chelsea's request (President's request) came to him a while ago. She's looking for way for the President to interface with faculty. Noted the coffee hours were not well attended.
- Bets: the turn out problem might have something to do with the number of admins that usually showed up and tended to dominate the conversation.
- Cynthia: these are remote meetings, yes?
- Apparently the discussion *is* about in-person meetings. General agreement in Senate Exec that for the time being we're talking about remote meetings only. In-person is out due to the risk of COVID-19.
- Margot shared that she did go to the coffee hours a few times, but her ideas that she wanted to communicate were rejected, so she ceased attending as it appeared she was not being taken seriously. Margot suggested that the meetings should have themes or specific questions/information that should set the agenda of the meetings.
- Christine: perhaps a few faculty should commit to going for certain, which would alleviate the issue that occurred, which is that sometimes the President was by himself or with a single faculty member. Quite awkward.
- Discussion of in-person vs. online faculty and availability for these meetings. Frank spoke up, saying that the campus Instagram messaging is promoting on-campus programs only. IBL, GSMA, OCN completely left out. Students noted this as well. Unacceptable. General concurrence amongst Senate Exec that the messaging has left out faculty and students who are online.
- Dinesh: so, a sign-up sheet for having at least a few faculty there at the meetings.
- Noted that Tuesday/Thursdays at leadership hour are booked up. There should be a variety of times available so that different faculty can attend each. Evenings maybe? Needs to be worked out.
- Lori is presenting. Noted that this week has been difficult for everyone: faculty, students, staff. She wanted to address the concern among faculty about information not being shared. She said there's a situation particular to this case that makes sharing the identity of the student more widely impossible. Students and faculty directly connected to the deceased of course know.
- She says that there was meant to be a communication from Deans to Chairs to faculty about the reasons for not communicating the student's identity and also to communicate the identity to faculty who have had this student in class.
- Cynthia said she received the information from Dean Mandernack on Wednesday, and she questioned whether it was wise to communicate the info to certain faculty, for instance, a lecturer

who doesn't have an assignment at Cal Maritime this semester but who had the student in class last semester.

- Lori noted that faculty who have been contacted directly by counseling sometimes didn't know anything had happened, and Student Affairs is trying to coordinate the information sharing.
- Kevin apparently noted that faculty were reporting absences in their classes and they didn't know if that student was among them (Tuesday). Lori said that she then told the Deans to communicate that unless faculty have been contacted directly, the student was not in one of their classes.
- Graham has contacted the faculty who had the student in their classes.
- Frank expressed some frustration with this lack of information. Lori apologized, noted this was all happening in real-time, first time being handled. She would do things a little differently. There was clearly an issue with the timeliness of communication from the Deans on down. Dinesh related that Dean Neto had communicated the information to him as ET Chair immediately.
- Cynthia suggested that an all faculty message would be a good idea to communicate the if-you-haven't-received-a-direct-communication thing.
- Lori noted that Student Affairs has a list of students who were close to this student. Faculty will be contacted to show some grace in accommodating them.
- Dinesh noted that even students who didn't know the student well know about or have seen the situation. All faculty should be aware of this and show some leniency.
- Lori presenting on course classification issues. Cal Maritime is a little out of step with other CSUs in terms of some classes. Dean Neto will be running a training on the classification stuff, and the Curriculum Committee should definitely be included.
- Cynthia pointed out that CFA should be included in these conversations since any changes to workload would be controversial. Lori agreed, but noted this is about equity, not about coming after course caps and WTU values. Also that our chapter CFA should be certain to be in sync with statewide CFA on the issues. Cynthia noted that we aren't another CSU, we have fewer resources than many in terms of teaching support.
- President has committed to some start-up funds for new tenure-track hires.
- Dean policy is in draft form, and Lori anticipates being able to share it with us soon.
- Cynthia: are there new tenure-track hires? Has this been communicated?
- Lori: no, it hasn't been communicated, but it shall be. Stated that there are four.
- Bets: what about Qualtrics? You mentioned it last meeting.
- Lori: we have the budget now, but the CSU system is pushing back about us using Qualtrics at all. Julianne Tolson is relaying this information back to Lori. Apparently Sonoma State is working with us on this.
- A brief discussion on the A/V hire (or the attempt). Faculty have issues in some classrooms. It has been 2.5 years since we had a dedicated A/V person.
- Bets: noted that Long Beach, CSULA, and other large campuses probably don't have these problems in acquiring Qualtrics. Appreciates Lori being persistent on the issue.
- Bets: what constitutes a failed search? There's apparently 3 applicants for 2 positions in Marine Transportation. One is not qualified at all. She says this suggests that our offer is not competitive.
- Lori says it could also be about where we're advertising. (from chat, apparently Dean, Chair, HR all have input on the ad placement) She generally would defer to departments on whether searches are 'successful' or failed.

- Dinesh shared what the engineering folks are doing. Wil has placed the ad on his LinkedIn. Their last successful hire was when they got to use a search firm. They don't have that luxury this time. They had a sequence where they had a failed search 3 years in a row, which is a real problem.
- Dinesh: on to the response to the response to the IBL letter. We received a little feedback (Margot and Tony). The plan (from the last General Senate Meeting) was for Senate Exec to draft a letter and solicit feedback, and here we are.
- Reviewing feedback from Margot: she explained that her first point was that we did not address the President's omission of a response to one of the Resolved clauses in the Resolution.
- Bets: appreciates the feedback. Maybe the question is what we're trying to get out of this letter?
- Margot: I thought that this letter would be documenting our dissatisfaction with the response and the omissions from his response.
- Dinesh: some of the material seems outside of the scope, particularly the material in Margot's second paragraph. Margot: it was meant to be a supporting, explanatory paragraph to the above.
- Dinesh: now Tony's feedback. Pointed out that some of Tony's assertions are factually incorrect. Noted the sequence of events before the IBL department meeting with the President was not correct, and we have that recorded in the minutes from the time.
- Cynthia: perhaps we can explain that to Tony. Dinesh: yes, definitely.
- Margot: I think it's about establishing evidence for retaliation from Tony's perspective.
- Frank (and others): expressed that the Senate's approach has always been about the disregard for the faculty vote and the importance of having faculty as department chair. Should keep the focus on these.
- Now reviewing the letter draft.
- Margot: since the President took the option of placing a faculty member, but not a member of the department, would recommend adding a question regarding the timeline for replacing the conservator department chair.
- General agreement with Margot's suggestion. Margot has volunteered to add in this question, and then the letter will be sent to General Senate for approval in the February meeting. Should be ok for a final reading and approval given that we did circulate it for comments in December.
- Dinesh: ASCMA rep nominations were Christine and Julie Chisholm. Julie withdrew. Should we conduct an election?
- Some discussion on this. Perhaps for the record, her statement should go out to Senate. Dinesh will explain she is the only candidate, and so she will be appointed without election unless there are objections lodged.
- Meeting adjourned.