

Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, December 16, 2019

In Attendance: Dinesh Pinisetty (Chair), Keir Moorhead (Vice Chair), Sarah Senk (Secretary) [via Zoom], Elizabeth McNie, Margot Hanson, Frank Yip, Sianna Brito

Absent: Steve Brown, Cynthia Trevisan

- I. Ad Hoc Committee Scheduling
 - a. We will be appointing three people, one from each school.

- II. Department of Culture and Communication Appendix K
 - a. Recommendation: Amend error to note “six-year” not “five-year” clock
 - b. Approved (unanimously)

- III. Watch-Standing Discussion
 - a. Vice Chair reports that he and Chair met with Provost to discuss student and faculty concerns about watch-standing.
 - b. One of the main problems is that there is not much oversight of the process. (And the person who created the current scheduling algorithm graduated without passing on institutional knowledge of how it works, so right now scheduling seems random and inequitable.)
 - c. Preliminary conclusions: the main problem is with scheduling and equity issues
 - i. eg. the FETs and the ME non-licensed juniors and seniors do not stand any watches, which is not really equitable
 - ii. eg. freshmen scheduled in class until 5:30 PM, so they were back-filling with other people to cover the watches. One of the things to figure out is what to do in those scenarios.
 - iii. eg. currently the policy is not clear on what you do if watch conflicts with a class. The policy needs to be clarified.
 - d. There appears to be no reason to have mirrored watches (or to not have them), so if they are that much of a pressure points for students, there is no reason to keep them. Biggest problem is *how*. It falls under the Commandant’s office, so we will have to work with the Commandant’s office to solve the problem.
 - e. There’s the STCW component and the Leadership component, and ship operations, so coordination is crucial. One suggestion is that we get someone from deck, engineering academics, Commandant’s office, and a student representative to sit down and propose options informally rather than setting up an Ad Hoc Committee. Next steps: conversation with the Commandant’s office to discuss how to mitigate factors that would disproportionately affect certain students.

- IV. Budget Report
 - a. Lewis et. al. are requesting Senate “approval.” However, this report is **not** a senate product; it was produced by three members of a committee that is not (currently) a senate committee. Accordingly, the Senate Executive Committee can act as a liaison between administration and faculty and provide opportunity for public forum to discuss.

- b. Senk expresses concern that the administrative response did not contain sufficient data to back up the claims first made during the September 30 Senate Executive Committee Meeting and documented in those minutes.
 - i. *Provost responds after the meeting in email requesting clarification about data perceived as insufficient. Senk clarifies she was anticipating a specific breakdown of all faculty-related expenses that were official labeled as “non-instructional” but are actually instructional or directly support instruction (eg, the portion of the IT budget allocated to faculty) so that we could compare the numbers to those classified as “non-instructional” in Lewis’s report. Provost pointed out that Lewis’s report does not enumerate what is included in the analysis of non-instructional spending and recommends we attempt to acquire a spreadsheet and explanation of data used so that everyone can understand what was included in the analysis.*
- c. McNie emphasizes that this needs to be data-driven.
- d. Executive Committee agrees to disseminate both reports and initiate a faculty-wide discussion. Our primary goals for the discussion include: a clearer tracking of how money is spent. Account of how we can use the structure we have for the greatest effectiveness. Main goal is to figure out where is our money going, and answer the question, “is our money best supporting our priorities.”

Action Items

- 1. Executive Committee will disseminate both reports to faculty and will schedule an all-hands Faculty meeting in late January.
 - 2. Executive Committee will send a letter to the authors of the Administration’s report noting that insufficient evidence was provided for some of the claims made in the 9/30/19 meeting and requesting that evidence.
- V. Website Committee Update
- a. Hanson will type up meeting notes and coordinate with Senate Executive Secretary to update documents.

Meeting adjourned.