

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 26, 2020

In attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary), Steve Browne, Christine Isakson, Elizabeth McNie [via remote connection], Wil Tsai, Mike Mahoney (Provost), Sianna Brito (Academic Support Coordinator)

Absent: Cynthia Trevisan

- I. Senator Elections
 - a. Department elections have closed, but Chair reports an unforeseen problem regarding one department that has been unresponsive. Chair reports that after the census he emailed Department Chairs on February 7 and gave two weeks to meet and respond. Senate Exec Chair sent an additional email reminder a few days before the deadline. Senate Exec received responses from every department Chair *except* the GSMA. One department member self-nominated, but the department did not appear to hold an election. Senate Exec debated over email whether we have the power to “appoint” a self-nominated representative when the Department failed to respond.
 - b. Chair reports that after the election closed he sent an email to all GSMA department members on the morning of Saturday 2/22 saying the following: “As you know, Department elections for the Senators closed on Feb 21st. Our understanding is that your department did not hold a formal election, but one faculty member - Dr Kate Sammler - volunteered to serve. We wanted to confirm that we are not missing any additional correspondences. If yes, please let us know by Feb 25th 2020.” Only one person (a lecturer) responded that she was happy with appointing Dr. Sammler as department representative. No other department members replied.
 - c. Provost asks if the ByLaws clarify what happens in the event of non-response from a department.
 - d. Browne: this is one of the holes in the bylaws we didn’t anticipate.
 - e. McNie suggests that if a department doesn’t “get its act together” the seat could be left empty.
 - f. Browne: The problem is that in this case there was one member who *was* interested. McNie agrees: “This is a special case because someone *did* volunteer. We did due diligence by notifying the department and asking the feedback. Their lack of response is affirmation that Dr. Sammler get the position.”
 - g. Pinisetty suggests that in the future we will send out emails not just to Department chairs, but to all faculty in the department.
 - h. Moorhead dissents on the grounds that the Department Chair’s job is to notify his or her faculty.
 - i. Tsai suggests in the future, when the process opens, we should send a reminder to all faculty.
 - j. Senk points out that we did that in several emails and Senate presentations.
 - k. In this particular case, Senate Exec comes to the consensus that we will accept Dr. Sammler’s self-nomination.

- l. Moorhead agrees, but emphasizes that this exposes a larger issue, and in the future we should make clear that departments must hold their Chairs accountable.
- II. At-Large Senator Nominations
- a. Chair asks permission to approach people who have been nominated for at-large positions to confirm that they are aware someone nominated them.
 - b. Committee agrees this would be appropriate.
 - c. Nine nominations for faculty-at-large: Julie Simons, Steve Browne, Mike Holden, Christine Isakson, Tony Lewis, Tom Nordenholz, Julie Chisholm, Brian Crawford, Ariel Setniker
 - d. Three nominations for lecturer-at-large: Bob Neuman, Ali Moradman, Jen Metz
 - e. Voting procedure: Each faculty member will vote for their top four faculty-at-large representatives. Each lecturer will vote for their top two lecturer-at-large representatives.
- III. Department Meeting Policy
- a. Senk reports that a faculty member emailed the Senate Executive Committee to express concern that Departments don't have regular meetings.
 - b. Faculty requests that Senate creates a policy mandating that Departments hold department meetings.
 - c. Chair is unsure if this is our prerogative. But when we write the Department Chair policy we can include in the policy that Chairs must hold formal opportunities for faculty feedback. During the evaluation process, faculty can include this information. When the evaluations take place, the results should go to the Dean,
 - d. Isakson says this suggests that we have a less hierarchical organizational structure; people in the department can go directly to the Dean to alert him/her.
 - e. Provost: I think you really need a Department Chair's policy. I think it should say "normally the department will meet at least once a month." The Chair evaluation should happen on a regular basis, ideally once a year.
 - f. Pinisetty reports that we have a policy that says evaluation happens once a year, but that doesn't happen.
 - g. Provost suggested that the new policy should include the Chair time-base calculation (workload formula), an external chair option, and perhaps a term limit (e.g., 2-3 three-year terms). Current chairs should be "grandfathered in" with regards to time base and perhaps more.
 - h.
 - i. Pinisetty reports that Michael Martin offered to help write the policy to accord with HR requirements.
- IV. Department Chair Policy
- a. Pinisetty requests input on how we should get feedback
 - b. Isakson reports that it's important to get all of the department chair's voices if we can. Uses her own department as an example that one person has been chair "forever" and has a wealth of institutional knowledge that we need to

draw upon. It's a good idea to have a small committee, but we should invite input from all department chairs.

- c. Provost recommends soliciting info from "past department chairs" who have no skin in the game.
- d. Senk suggests rather than starting from scratch and to work more efficiently we (Senate Executive Committee) copy the policies from similar campuses and then send that document around and invite people to cut/add as necessary.
- e. Browne suggests deadline show be soon enough so that it can take effect before the new chairs start on January 1, 2021.

V. Open Floor

- a. Provost reports noticing at the retreat that it's clear there are campus divisions and would like to set up a meeting with Senate Exec and the Commandants to facilitate communication.
 - i. Moorhead: we've had an admittedly slow start to the CSI committee, which forces the Commandant's office, Student Affairs, faculty, and students "to play in the same sandbox." Reports that the first thing they started working on was messaging, particularly the existence of "handbooks" sent out by the ship, administrations, sports, licensed faculty. And there's a sub-committee that is working on centralizing that. So if we have a meeting with the Commandant it should be informational only because there is already a committee at work on facilitating communication across these groups.
 - ii. Provost asks who is on the committee. Moorhead reports: Kristin Tener, Graham Benton, David Taliaferro, and Keir Moorhead.
 - iii. Tsai asks if we can have the CSI come to us (Exec) and report on consensus).
 - iv. Moorhead: *have you read the minutes?* We have accountability.
 - v. [Senk and Moorhead high-five.]
 - vi. McNie notes that "we are heading in the right direction with the task force focusing on Cadet experience, and one of the issues that will be addressed is watch-standing." Suggests that it's good for Commandants and Deck and Engine department to sit down and talk before cruise about mutual expectations.
 - vii. Browne concurs and notes that a lot of work has been done over the years regarding campus identity, including the purpose and value of watch-standing. The problem was that we talked about such things and didn't do anything with it; it didn't permeate who we are; we didn't make decisions based on that identity, and then people who were part of the conversation left and new people came in, and those things left with the people who left. So every time there's a new Commandant or new Faculty member or new Administrator, basically we're starting all over again. So in my mind the real issue is that we need to *not* start all over from scratch again; we need to locate the work that's already been done, but the real battle is to figure out how to live in it. Historically, if you ask a student or a faculty member, "what are our core values," they can't answer because 15

different offices are making difference decisions based on who *they* think we are.

- viii. Pinisetty agrees and says we should take the lead regarding informing faculty. We need to have an action plan when we step out of these meetings.
- ix. Provost will hold off on convening the Commandants and this group and will review the CSI minutes. But reports that at the Retreat the commandant expressed help working with faculty.
- x. Moorhead reports that the other “hot issue” discussed by CSI is the First Year Experience.

b. Isakson asks for update on IBL Chair Election.

- i. Pinisetty reports that elections close on Friday. So far five votes are in.

c. Tsai asks how we are communicating what we did at the retreat. Students want to know to know. Faculty want to know.

- i. Tsai suggests he and Senk draft a summary to ensure that such a message goes out in a timely manner.
- ii. Senk expresses concern about workload given the other policies we are drafting right now, asks if we can solicit help from someone in administration.
- iii. McNie: having some urgency in this is *so important* for organizational change. The update should be going out by Monday. And even if there is a document drafted by the administration that says everything we say, I think it’s still important for Faculty Senate to provide additional voice of support to express a bit of unity.
- iv. **ACTION ITEM:** Senate Chair will reach out to President and Chief of Staff
- v. **ACTION ITEM:** Tsai and Senk will draft an email summary aimed at informing Faculty and Students tomorrow (Thursday).