

Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, September 30, 2019

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steve Browne (via Zoom), Bets McNie, Margot Hanson, Cynthia Trevisan, Frank Yip, Sue Opp (Provost)

Absent: Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair)

Agenda Items and Actions

1. By Laws Revision / Review of Faculty Comments
 - a. Executive Committee received 19 responses to the survey
 - b. In response to the question, “if the vote were held today, I would:” 12 people said they would vote to approve the new by-laws; 5 people said they would vote to approve the new by-laws with minor corrections; 1 person said they would vote to approve with major corrections; 1 person abstained
 - c. Executive Committee reviewed all responses to the survey and updated the by-laws document to include many of the faculty suggestions for minor corrections. Where feedback was not implemented, a justification was noted and will be presented at the next General Meeting.

Action Items:

- **Senk will prepare presentation of by-laws feedback for Senate General Meeting on October 3**
- **Yip will prepare an anonymized spreadsheet of all comments/suggestions to share with the faculty**

2. Budget Presentation (Tony Lewis, Julie Chisholm, Michael Strange)
 - a. Lewis suggests that Cal Maritime non-instructional salary outlays have increased over the past six years and suggests that total non-instructional staff related costs are higher than other maritime academies.
 - i. Question: does staff have union protections?
 - ii. Provost: everyone except MPP has union protection.Lewis reports that the authors of the report debated whether or not to account for a cost of living adjustment and provided 27% cost of living adjustment to account for salary differences between California and Maine. He notes that the non-instructional positions appear to balloon in the past five years. He points out that IPEDS data used for the report only includes full-time staff while the budget plan accounts for part-time staff. Lewis expresses concern about University Advancement. Suggests that Cal Maritime Foundation is not supporting students. Argues that there is a disparity between number of personnel positions in the Office of University Advancement compared to Maine Maritime’s Department of Advancement.
 - b. Provost responds: “I am happy to work with anyone to explain the budget.” Provost says that the study is not under the auspices of the Budget Advisory Committee, which hasn’t yet met this year but nevertheless maintains, “I will absolutely support

the rights of faculty to undertake the studies they want to.” Offers to clarify some points:

- i. IPEDs: Provost clarifies, “We don’t submit our own information to IPEDs. It’s submitted by the CSU, so it comes directly from the CSU, so it’s not possible for us to go back and look at the file because *we* don’t submit it directly. We have annual reports that we submit to the Chancellor’s office, and generally they only take them from the Fall. They take those reports and format the information so they can report the whole system in the same way.”
- ii. Provost says, “we have a lot of information we’re happy to share and to provide feedback about how [the budget] works. We can go back to the same time periods for all personnel. We can tell you exactly how much it is for benefits, etc. There are specific things we can help to clarify. For example, administration and finance has a 400K IT budget, but that includes budget for the whole university, including faculty, but the overall amount is counted as non-instructional expenses.
- iii. Provost responds to Lewis’s concerns about University Advancement: The Foundation is separate from UA, but they’re intermingled in this report. Provost explains that every year outside auditors come in and they do an audit. Administration can provide faculty with the University Advancement info, but since the Foundation is a separate entity, they will need to go to the Foundation Board and ask them for their approval to provide the information.
- iv. Provost acknowledges that Cal Maritime *is* the most expensive of the CSU campuses in *both* instructional and non-instructional costs. If you look at our instructional costs through IPEDs our faculty are paid a lot more than other campuses. The CSU knows that; no one is hiding anything here.
- v. Provost recommends that the Senate has its own budgetary committee: “The sorts of things you’re trying to do here is exactly the sort of things I recommend the Senate budgetary committee should so. It’s very important to have faculty develop a thorough understanding of how the budget works. And then this reporting can go back to the senate. I recommend that you form your own Senate Budget Committee and let’s get all this information out there so that we can explain to people.”

c. Discussion

- i. Executive Committee discusses the need for more information and identifies an additional potential problem with the report’s methodology: the report assumes that all staff are paid from general fund, and that may not be the case; however, all MPP positions are reflected in IPEDs data because we report them as staff, even though they may be paid out of other external sources of funding, including the Foundation. Because our campus is so small, a few high administrative salaries can skew the data.

Provost confirms in post-meeting email: “Many if not most MPP positions on our campus are funded from the General Fund. However, there are also a number of MPP positions funded by grants/contracts, and other external sources of funds. I don’t know if there are any MPP positions funded by the CMA Foundation. But,

it is true that a few high administrative salaries can skew the data because we are so small.”

- ii. Provost explains the next steps administration will take to provide a response to the report: they will hold an additional cabinet meeting and get approval from president to confirm what timeline will be practical to justify entire report. Provost explains that the Cabinet met this morning and hopes that in a month they can get the Executive Committee all the information from the campus here, to show how the costs have changed going back years, including salary increases that were bargained.
- iii. Provost suggests that there are some big differences structural differences for other maritime academies that may skew the data provided: they don't all have tenure, they're not all unionized, and some of their personnel areas differ in ways that would affect the IPEDs data. Clarifies that administration cannot provide information about how systems outside the CSU function and how costs may be impacted by different ways of reporting expenses but *will* provide information about how we compare to the rest of the CSU. Concludes that “we are the most expensive of the CSUs, but we also have the highest graduation rate and the highest tenure density, the smallest class sizes. We cost more to run and we have the good results to prove it.”
- iv. Executive Committee notes the importance of identifying inefficiencies in spending.

Action Items:

- **Executive Committee with follow up with Provost to confirm expected data for response to the request for information**

Table additional discussion until the next Executive Committee Meeting

Re-table the Reports and Communications from ASCMA, Gender Equity Committee, and Disability Services until the next Executive Committee Meeting.

Meeting adjourned.