

Executive Committee Minutes

April 7, 2022
3:00 - 5:00, Via Zoom

Abstract

Chair Report. Agenda - Approved. Minutes of 3/10/22 - Approved. President Report. Provost Report. Changes to Wellness Check-in. From EPC: Revisions to Electrical Engineering BS - approved for Senate Consent Calendar. Vice President of Administration and Finance. Student Representative Report. From EPC: Revision to the BA in Business Administration - approved for Senate Consent Calendar. From APARC: Priority Recommendations - approved for Senate Agenda. From SAC: Revision to the Attendance Policy - approved for Senate Agenda. Learning Objectives for Orientation approved as Information Item. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Senate Agenda approved. Good of the Order. CFA Report.

Present: Lauren Morimoto, Bryan Burton, Emily Clark, Emily Acosta Lewis, Richard Whitkus, Karen Thompson, Michaela Grobbel, Sam Brannen, Karen Moranski, Monir Ahmed, Erma Jean Sims

Absent: Richard Senghas, Judy Sakaki, Michael Young

Guests: Christina Gomez, Laura Monje-Paulson, Katie Musick, Sudhir Shrestha, Mike Visser

Chair Report - L. Morimoto

L. Morimoto said she hoped everyone was surviving the semester. It is that time when we, or at least her students, are dragging. She was at the Commencement planning meeting today and, just as a reminder, the students will be getting their tickets for in-person on a specific day and that announcement is supposed to go out next week. The students are using something called Marching Orders, so the names are pronounced properly at the ceremony. It means that the students need to register and upload that information. If anyone has graduating seniors, it is a good idea to make some general announcements. Students are going to get two more reminders and, even the day of, people will still be able to enter their information. It is just easier if it is done ahead of time because then a slide is also generated, so that when the student goes up to cross the stage, their name shows up on the big jumbo

screen for the lawn. That is nicer for the families. Everything looks to be swimming merrily along. And FYI - the School of Education gets four tickets per student; every other school gets two per student. Obviously it is because the School of Education is smaller.

When the Provost put on the agenda to talk about post tenure review, which, by the way, she supported, it prompted her to think in the spirit of reviewing and holding folks accountable; there is a policy for reviewing administrators. She didn't think that has been done for a very long time and, in fact, the last time she requested it for the Director of the Athletics Advisory Council, we were turned down by the then President. We should be doing post tenure review because it is in our contract. In the same light, then we can think about doing administrative review at the same time.

The last thing is dealing with the stacking classes business, which is coming up. Some students just emailed her and are concerned about the classes. For those who don't know, for a stacked class in the Art department that is two classes offered at the same time under two different numbers with only one instructor. In this case, it is actually in two different rooms, but it still counts as only one teaching load of three WTUs. What happens is that the students have the teacher for one class. She is there for both, but she focuses on one group, one day, and the other group, the other day. They were saying they all praise the teacher. But they thought the beginners could have had a little bit more attention and the seniors were fine doing their own thing. It would have been nice to have somebody there both days to give feedback. This is something that is being dealt with by the administration and Faculty Governance. EPC has made a statement and said that such a scenario is not appropriate. If these two classes are being offered in the same time with one instructor and WTUs of three units, it should be considered one course and it should go through the proper EPC channels. She knew other departments also do this practice and usually it is at the behest of the department to be able to offer their curriculum. In this case, it was not it was at the behest of the department, but more for budgetary reasons. Allegedly these two classes have enough students to run on their own. This is something that has been coming up over and over again.

A member asked about the bunches of flowers on the bridge to the GMC and if they signified anything. No one knew.

Approval of Agenda - Approved

Approval of Minutes of 3/10/22 - Approved.

President Report - K. Moranski for J. Sakaki

K. Moranski said the President was involved in an WASC site visit today. She reminds everyone that it is Giving Day today for Sonoma State. It is an opportunity to give to your favorite campus organization, club or department or whatever might fit your interests. The President wanted her to remind the Ex Com that this is a new tradition at Sonoma State. We are in the second year of Giving Day. It is a crucial aspect of community engagement with the advancement process at Sonoma State. It is important to begin that habit of annual giving that allows us to engage the campus community in fundraising. Congratulations to the folks in Advancement to Mario Perez and to Tiffany O'Neill for their work in organizing that effort and getting that off the ground for a second year in a row.

Provost Report - K. Moranski

The Provost noted the Research days on the 25th, 26th and 27th are coming up and she encouraged faculty to participate. The first day will be faculty and graduate students and the next two days the symposia. She thought that our research days are a distinctive part of the Sonoma State experience. Research and creative activities are a real aspect of our campus identity and our culture as a COPLAC institution committed to undergraduate research especially.

She reported on the activities of the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Working Group (AABAWG). This group is closing in on its recommendations. The Chair of the Faculty is part of that group and APARC Chair, Emily Acosta Lewis is one of the two co-chairs. The group has given a draft of their efforts to her and we are beginning to put together the first of a series of communications around that. The campus will probably see a communication tomorrow about their work and she wanted to give the Ex Com a heads up of where we are going. She asked the Ex Com to be very careful with these communications about the work of the group. We have had a breach of confidentiality. The Budget Advisory Working Group took confidentiality extremely seriously because they wanted to have very flexible and open conversations about everything. She told them that everything was on the table and that meant that they needed to be confidential, so we didn't dissolve into rumor, inaccurate information, and fear and instead have a strategic rollout. Unfortunately, in an odd way, the confidentiality of the group was breached by someone outside the group. There have been rumors going around that are inaccurate and are causing some panic and concern. Working with the co-chairs, we are putting out a brief memo to Academic Affairs tomorrow to give an overview of where the group is

headed. She wanted to provide an overview today of where that's headed and let the Ex Com know what the lay of the land is and where the conversations are headed.

As the Ex Com will recall, the task of that group was to find 5.5 million dollars in budget reductions for fall. They had a pretty easy time with the first 2.5. The 2.5 million are focused on division wide things that we've already done. We have the savings from the Early Exit plan, and that is a significant savings. The IT department went through an administrative reorganization and that has saved us several hundred thousand dollars, and that is being committed to this cause. Some MPP savings are going to help us get to the first two and a half million. The rest of it was much harder and the group had to think widely. They are suggesting a series of things and she provided the broad categories. There's a chart that that will have a little bit more information. They are looking at MPP savings, so further reductions in MPPs. They are looking at a small amount of some school based reductions and that is \$100,000 or so. They are looking at saving a position that is vacant right now, in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and we would not replace that. That is one of the MPPs that would not come back. The bigger one that they are thinking about is how to alternately fund some programs and looking at ways in which they could move programs to self-support or look for donor funding to help offset the cost of running some of our higher resource programs. Another suggestion that is coming is some reorganization, including consolidation, wherever that can occur in Academic Affairs. They are looking at a variety of options. Consolidation is something that will require some thought, particularly if we were to consolidate departments or programs. That would have to be done over time. As we have opportunities for reorganization, we need to be taking those opportunities, and that is another part of their recommendation. She asked E. Acosta Lewis if she had anything to add.

E. Acosta Lewis said, we have been working very hard in this group and we are trying to do things that are new and different and innovative and trying to remove some of the structures that have been limiting us as a university in moving forward and making the university a better place for everybody while also cutting the budget. We have had many hours' worth of discussions since December working on this, and it is not an easy thing. It is not a fun thing. We are not handing out money to people. We have done a good job, looking at the data, both the qualitative and quantitative data, to come up with some good solutions, ideas and recommendations to pass forward to the Provost and move forward to the campus. We plan on having some communications coming up. We are going to be in one of the Chair Chats and we're going to present it to the Senate in a more formal way. We will also present it to the Staff Council and then we are thinking that we might have a separate meeting for presenting these recommendations to campus and getting feedback.

The Provost said there is a communication plan, and it is very important that we follow that communication plan. The first wave of communication comes out tomorrow. It will be helpful if we can let that communication come from the group and herself and begin to have those conversations. It is important to help people to recognize that we are not making suggestions that are going to cut full time jobs. We know that we have been reducing the lecturer pool, and we know that that our lecturers are being affected by the budget cuts and by the enrollment declines, and we need to acknowledge that. But we have worked very hard to be careful about making changes that would be demoralizing. They have worked hard to make changes that are positive and affirming and that move us in in good directions. She asked for any questions.

A member asked, is anyone suggesting that we don't need Faculty Associate Deans?

L. Morimoto said yes, and many things we don't need are among the suggestions.

The Provost said a couple of our Deans are looking at that anyway already because there have been lots of discussions about the model of the Faculty Associate Dean, and frankly, it creates a number of problems. For example, are these people faculty? Are they administrators? If they are halfway in between, what can they do and what can they not do? Do they play a role in RTP or not play a role in RTP? It gets complicated. We may have situations in which it may be appropriate to have full time MPP Associate Deans and that's a different story. She didn't want to close off the possibility that we are not going to have Associate Deans because we don't need them. It varies greatly from one school to another, and we need to provide the support that is appropriate for each school. We are looking at that, on a school by school basis. She wanted to be clear that we may not be doing away with the notion of Associate Deans. What we are moving away from is the Faculty Associate Dean model that we are finding increasingly problematic.

The Student Rep said when the group is ready for feedback, she suggested looking at the student assistants on campus. A lot of her friends who work on campus complain about a lot of money being wasted. They are not going to tell their boss - "I think this is a waste of money." She wanted to find a ways to get them to have an anonymous interview with somebody or any way for them to give feedback because the student assistants know a lot more than people usually give them credit for. She thought they would have some good suggestions.

The Provost said excellent and noted it was very hard this semester to get a student on the Budget Advisory Working group, and we weren't able to do that. We want to

make sure that the AS has an opportunity to comment on the plan, so we will be conferring with the AS.

A member said she hoped that we are still having a larger conversation about how much money is going towards teaching and learning. Maybe there is more in the budget somewhere else that could be redirected to make sure that we are keeping the classes that we need for the students. That is very important. She hoped the campus would continue to consider that even though, obviously, this particular working group is already working on what is in the proposed budget. She hoped that the larger question is still happening on the campus and on the State level, to continue to see if they can help us.

The Provost said absolutely. She asked E. Acosta Lewes to talk about prioritizing the academic core.

E. Acosta Lewis said we have priorities about how we made some of these decisions which will come out in the full report and certainly student success and graduation initiatives and high impact practices was a big part of those priorities.

The Provost said there is a strong effort to protect the academic core and that has been in many ways the grounding of all of this, trying to protect that academic core.

A member said, thinking about graduation and commencement coming up, are there any substantial efforts to clean up the campus, to do some severe weeding and all of that? Will that happen?

M. Ahmed said it is underway. The challenge we are faced with is that for the time that COVID went on, nobody was as available. This also is the season of growing around here, things do grow much faster and on top of that we have positions on hold all throughout facilities. The budget priority to try to prioritize the academic enterprise versus everything else was not an easy decision. Facilities is mowing the lawns and holding down the weeds, but because they have accumulated, and we are a campus that made the choice to not use chemicals that are unfriendly to the environment, they keep weeding an area and by the time they make the round two weeks later, the weeds are back. That's the price we pay for choices we have made to be environmentally sustainable and friendly.

The Provost asked M. Ahmed if there is a possibility within the Union rules of having people volunteer to help weed around the Green Music Center parking lot where the commencement would be.

M. Ahmed said no, he has asked his office to work with the AS and others to do a Day of Service where all faculty, staff and students would come. We are looking at it. The Provost said she was happy to volunteer and is a good weeder.

Changes to Wellness Check-in - K. Moranski, M. Ahmed

The Provost said there are some changes to wellness checks that are coming to us and asked M. Ahmed to describe the nature of the changes that are driven by the changes in the state and county health situation.

M. Ahmed said he thought that it is a good idea that campuses usually don't make quick changes. We need to move slowly through the deliberative process. We are getting feedback. We are now looking into the possibility of how to best comply with the OSHA requirements of the daily check-ins because we have heard people are cheating. They just save the screenshot and it takes time away from instruction. We have been exploring and are moving toward not requiring everybody, faculty and staff and students, to do a daily check-in. That's our preference and we would prefer instead to move toward symptom reporting. The daily check in is an honor system. Everybody being honest is what we're counting on. He wanted to hear any ideas, thoughts or concerns that the Ex Com may have.

The Provost said part of what M. Ahmed and his team are taking into account and the Risk Management team is taking into account, with some of the feedback from AS and from faculty, are that the wellness checks are problematic in terms of class time. Students struggle to keep up with those daily wellness checks. We recognize that we are still dealing with COVID and it is going to be important to have some kind of system, so we can monitor any problems that may be cropping up.

A member said there is not just the daily wellness checks. If people are vaccinated or have done the exemption paperwork, maybe faculty could receive an update on how that is going, because that is an important piece of the whole clearance indicator.

M. Ahmed said the vaccination check or test is still a requirement. We are continuously monitoring if there will be an update and all will move forward accordingly. In fact, one of the developments in that area is that most of the insurance companies, now that the federal requirements are coming down a little bit, are starting to refuse to cover them. Up until now, we did the testing and the insurance company covered them. Now it turns out that very soon there might not be insurance coverage, so we were looking at this to see what's the best solution. We

need guidance about how we do this and how to manage it. We don't quite have a clear answer yet, but it is on our radar.

L. Monje-Paulson said she could clarify that the clearance indicator would still function as a way of monitoring compliance with our policy. If a student reported symptoms, their clearance indicator would still change color. What we would be changing is the logic of how the clearance indicator updates. If a person doesn't fill out the wellness screen and by way of not filling out the wellness screen, they are essentially asserting that they don't have symptoms, so by only requiring folks report when they have symptoms or a test, then their clearance indicator will be green for that day, so long as they've met all the other checkboxes.

While we're doing this consultative process, one of the other pieces that we're trying to figure out is what would be the appropriate timeline for the student logic to change in a way that doesn't mess up too many other things. We do have some technical things behind the scenes that we're also simultaneously working on while we're figuring out how people would feel about us removing this requirement or changing it. We have not done it yet and are consulting on this issue. We're hoping to get feedback from you about your comfort level and thoughts regarding the downplaying of the wellness checks.

A member asked what is the compliance rate? Even as a faculty member sometimes he forgets to do a wellness check. What is the compliance for students?

L. Monje-Paulson said for the daily wellness screen, she didn't have a statistic on that, and there's a couple reasons why. The main one would be that if students don't complete the daily wellness screen that doesn't necessarily mean they were supposed to. It might mean they didn't come to campus that day. There are a lot of reasons why a student would have not completed, and the only time that they know it has been completed is when presumably, the student is trying to enter a space and needs access. Theoretically, she could probably get a statistic on our residential compliance. We do have students who go off campus for the weekend, or for various points in time and then they wouldn't be expected to do that. She wouldn't have good numbers, even if she tried to run them, but it is a valid question.

A member said he appreciated being asked for feedback and he prefaced his comments by saying he is in the minority. He is done with COVID. He wants to teach with no mask and everyone else can wear one if they want, but he doesn't want to have to wear one.

The Senate Analyst said she didn't quite understand why, when we have to upload our vaccination cards, that we have to do a wellness check every time we come to campus.

The Provost said that makes sense and that's one of the arguments that we heard from our previous discussion.

A member said she understood that argument and this idea of symptom reporting, rather than having to do this daily unless you have symptoms, but it makes it complicated for the professors if we still don't know who has met compliance. Because before when someone had a color other than green, we referred them to the campus Health Center and they sorted out whatever vaccine compliance issue was pending. She assumed most people have resolved the vaccine requirement or uploaded their exemption, but didn't know. Does the professor still need to keep checking because some people didn't? Now students are going to come after they have not been here for a while. It's a weird situation with that particular piece, and we still don't have that information as professors. Maybe there is a more updated data we can get on the vaccine compliance rate. When she last heard the update there were still a lot of people who haven't gotten the booster.

The Provost said the vaccination rate among students is close to 70% and employees are close to 60%. On the booster, there is still some work to be done in terms of getting people to fully comply.

Time certain reached.

From EPC: Revisions to Electrical Engineering BS - E Vieira Asencio, S. Shrestha

E. Vieira Asencio introduced the item as a proposal for what would be minimal adjustments to the Engineering BS program. Most of the changes are due to GE program changes. There are a few other changes to adapt the program with changing industry demands, but other than that it is considered minimal by EPC. EPC approved the revision unanimously.

S. Shrestha said besides the GE program changes, we are also making two previously required courses electives and two previous elective courses requirements, resulting in no net change in total units. We believe these changes can make the existing curriculum more competitive and adaptive to the current industry changes and needs, and thus, better serve our students.

Approved for Senate consent calendar.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report - M. Ahmed

M. Ahmed said he had a couple of quick items. Grub Hub is now available for Lobos pre ordering. Students can order online and pick it up. Regalia is now available for online orders. As some of you are aware, students and others are working on a presentation about book access for DSS. If anyone is interested, let him know he will connect people to Neil Markley who is leading this effort with the Office of Student Disabilities Services. We are working with the city of Rohnert Park to do some signage for the walking and biking trails to the State park, so that is clear and is visible for people.

The Chair said since many are bringing up that Neil Markley is heading up this book initiative with DSS about access to books, that's the Equitable Access group where the Vice Chair on has been looking at other COPLAC institutions to see how they deal with providing access for their materials as well. There are people working on this in different parts of the campus. The Vice Chair said we are meeting with folks from UC Davis to COPLAC and, hopefully, we can provide some good information and we're hoping to get Neil to a Chair Chat so folks can get an idea about accessible items and to have materials ready before the semester. That is the whole point of it.

He also noted that all faculty governance committees will be remote next year. He asked if there was any update on our solar power project.

M. Ahmed said the new update is: we could not get the Fire Marshal to sign off on our project. We still are struggling. We have reached out to the Chancellor's office numerous times. We still couldn't get them to clear the way. We may have to change the project. It would expand the footprint to the point it is no longer a viable project. We are still waiting on the Chancellor's office and the consultant, who is helping the CSU, to see if they can guide us with some path forward because the Fire Marshal just stopped responding to us, unfortunately. We were looking forward to making some progress on our sustainability goal. If we want to be a net zero campus, we have to start doing things. We are stuck with a State Fire Marshal. This project started by the way, before the CSU had opportunity and took over Fire Marshal responsibilities, and that's why we are still stuck with the State Fire Marshal.

Student Representative Report - C. Gomez

C. Gomez said the first thing that she would discuss are the DSS desks that are in our classrooms and herself, and other students have noticed that they end up being used as faculty desks and they're not where they're supposed to be. We just got brand new furniture in the Art building and she was really happy to see a DSS desk that looks like all the other desks with slight modifications. But after a week of being in the classroom it is now pushed up in front of the classroom under the overhead projector, and if a student wanted to use it, there is no way that they would be able to use it. Please keep in mind that those desks are for DSS students and it should be easy for them to come in, sit down, and use those.

A lot of students have been complaining about advising. She has a lot of friends who know their graduation dates are no longer when they thought. They are going to be graduating and the frustration for some students is when they go and get advising and from multiple faculty professors, and the Advising Center, it's not until the last minute when they themselves catch the mistake and realize, oh no I'm no longer graduating or that information was wrong. We are trying to figure out how we can give students the most accurate updates on advising and something that is helpful is for student is to learn how to read their ARR. When she first got advising, they showed her how to understand the ARR. The next year, her advising appointments were less than five minutes, because she knew her requirements.

On the business side of the Associated Students, which has to do with not only the Academic Senate, but all of the other Senate committees, we are really struggling to find students to sit on committees. We have our Board of Directors and our Student Government and they are the ones who technically get paid a little to sit on these committees, but other students are not even signing up for on campus jobs, making \$18 an hour. They don't see any sort of motivation to come and voice their opinions, which is very difficult because we want to make sure that we always have the student voice. We are trying to come up with creative solutions to get more student voice, trying to figure out how the Associated Students can compensate them more. That is also hard because it doesn't have much to do with our corporation as a whole. We may try to find a way that students can get a unit for sitting on one of these committees.

Time Certain reached.

From EPC: Revision to the BA in Business Administration - E. Asencio, M. Visser

E. Asencio said this proposal is for some revisions of the Business Administration BA. It is the elimination of the pre-business major. When EPC talked about the revision

with the folks from business, we asked how it would affect the percentage of majors in the program, what their classes be, would there be an increase in demand for some classes over others. What we heard from them is that from their new understanding and research and calculations, it would all even out. EPC did have a discussion. We had a first and second reading over this and we spent time talking about mainly the issue of what it would mean for students to no longer have the pre-business major. It sounds like it is going to be easier for them to make their way through the business program in the end by doing this, so EPC approved it unanimously after two readings.

K. Thompson said the focus of this change was to streamline our major to make it less complicated for students to navigate. There are actually no changes to coursework. Essentially, we're removing the pre-business major, so that students simply enter as business majors. We are also taking away the C or better requirement from the lower division Business classes and removing the extra computer competency requirement. The basic aim is to make fewer hurdles for students and less paperwork. We had a cumbersome process because students came in as pre-business, and they had to be moved into Business when they were juniors. This goes in hand in hand with the removal of our impaction requirements as well. We are hoping this is in the interest of students. M. Visser said we have had some good conversations with folks like Katie Musick about how we might implement this and one of the things that became clear is that it is best to think about the pre-business program as an advising structure and not a program unto itself. Pre-business forced everyone into a particular advising group, and then we had to manually force them into the next stage, and it was very cumbersome. The de facto requirements aren't changing, with the exception of the C or better and the computer competency requirements being removed.

The Senate Analyst clarified that if curricular items are unanimously approved at EPC and the Ex Com, then the item can go on the consent calendar for the Senate.

A member noted we can discuss it at the Senate. If someone wants to take it off the consent calendar and make it a business item, and any Senator can choose to ask to do that, then we have to do that.

The Chair asked, will students have the perception that it's going to be a bit harder if they don't come in as Business, to change to Business? K. Thompson said she thought they would find it easier. She noted how much paperwork and staff and faculty time this whole process takes and that doesn't include what students have to

do to make sure they're meeting all of the hurdles along the way. It's going to be a nice improvement from the student perspective.

M. Visser said it is also going to allow for the department, which is already planning, to have discussions about reducing some of the prerequisites on upper division coursework. Right now, the entire pre-business program is prerequisite to everything in the upper division, but by merging the programs we will be able to have different prerequisite pathways through so students won't necessarily need accounting classes in order to take upper division marketing. This is an important and big step for the program, but it will facilitate additional streamlining in the future.

A member said she wanted to be sure that the current students who've already declared and are going to graduate after the fall are not going to have to change everything now just because of this change, correct? This is for people who are going to be coming into the program. K. Thompson said that was correct.

The Provost said she would add another layer of discussion. One of the things that makes this a good move is for transfer students. They had to come in and be admitted to the pre-business program and then be admitted to the Business program, so there were two hurdles to jump through. Now going straight to a Business major enables transfer students to have a much easier time to come into to Business and that is another reason for eliminating the pre-business major. M. Visser affirmed what the Provost was saying and noted it was a particularly acute problem for some transfer students. There is one additional vein of conversation that the department had, that there seems to be some in-group/out-group feeling with the pre-business program. Students get admitted as a pre business major, so they are not really a business major yet, and so there was some out-group feeling, and they don't feel like they are fully fledged members of the community. He didn't know how substantial that was, but thought there was some of that perception and this would certainly go some distance towards eliminating that.

Approved for the Senate consent calendar.

Return to Student Representative Report - C. Gomez

C. Gomez said students in one of her classes and other people have been reporting to her about students not wearing masks in the classroom. She noticed her Professor doesn't say anything to them, and he might be scared to say something because the Professor wears a mask, and she imagines he is very COVID conscious. Not masking probably makes other students uncomfortable, and she noticed it started with one

student last week and now there's more of them in that class because they all feel comfortable to not wear a mask. Regardless about how we all feel about the masks, that's the policy that is in place. We need to figure out a way to implement this policy. She didn't know if she needed to reach out to the Chair of the department and let him know what's going on, but this is a bigger issue than just in her one class. Another issue is figuring out ways for students to be able to report misconduct regarding faculty and other people on campus not following the policies. For example, she doesn't have a syllabus for one of her classes, and she learned today that is not allowed. Sometimes students do not even know what the policies are and what their rights are as students, so figuring out how we can make sure students know what to report and where to report those issues is important. She has been working with Dr Erica Tom to do the first ever Native American Cultural graduation which she was super excited about. We are going to be accepting new IRA programs this year. We are keeping all the basic requirements and nothing that doesn't fit into those requirements will be funded. We will be receiving presentations and looking at those to be able to get funded, but as previously mentioned, we are going to see a big change in IRA funding in the next coming years because students are upset about what the funding is going towards and a lot of things just don't make sense there.

Another thing we were talking about is the symposium and students doing research. The McNair Scholars program is an awesome tool here on campus for our first generation or low income or marginalized students to be able to conduct research. It is awesome to work with the faculty on research. It helps the student and helps the faculty members, so if anybody's interested in that they should definitely reach out.

A member said talking about the difficulties of getting students involved on committees and governance, she had one question and one suggestion. Do all students know that it's very valuable experience that they can include on their resumes?

C. Gomez said yes, that is one of the tactics that we use when we're recruiting students. It's a resume builder. It's great experience. We try to target some political science students. We are living in such a different world right now. Our students don't have time to volunteer their time to do things.

The member said something that came up as a suggestion, what if each student who is volunteering their time could get receive a certificate that is official looking, that can be included in their future job applications or graduate school applications.

C. Gomez said she appreciated that idea and would definitely bring that back to the Associated Students.

The Vice Chair said this is more of a question for the Provost. He has noticed when he teaches in a classroom every time he comes back to that classroom it is in disarray. There is a piece of paper on the wall that says move the furniture back to where it started. Not doing so creates all sorts of problems, particularly if a person is disabled or has to use a wheelchair. He asked C. Gomez, what else can we do to keep improving advising?

The Chair asked if the Vice Chair was asking us how we can improve advising or asking the Student Rep?

The Vice Chair said it was an open question about advising. The desk one is more of a Provost question. How do we hold folks accountable? People are violating a rule, he believed.

The Provost said she did not think the signs in classrooms about putting furniture back were consistent. She said she would work with Matthew Paolucci-Callahan on this issue to remind faculty to adhere to the signs. We need to establish more of a culture of doing that. In terms of advising, this is an ongoing question about how to ensure that we do the best possible advising that we can for students, particularly around graduation. We need to explore, in conjunction with the Registrar, the timely dissemination of information to students about what they have not fulfilled, those who have red boxes on their ARR. We continue to need good advising and it is very important because this affects our graduation rate. The more students we can clear those red boxes for, the better off we are. She asked Laura Monje-Paulson to bring that back to our groups for discussion about how to make sure that we continue to get good timely early information, especially in the spring, to departments about students who have red boxes in their ARR.

The Senate Analyst said she was talking to C. Gomez with her Dispute Resolution Board hat on. The Dispute Resolution Board has a different kind of quorum which requires a student to be on the board to make a decision. If the AS is having trouble getting students onto our committee, we may have to rethink that quorum and we value students on that committee immensely.

C. Gomez said we are looking more into not taking away students from something like that. She did know about that issue and that one is a very unique circumstance. However, we are looking at some committees, for example, the Copeland Creek

Committee, we are not going to put our resources there next year and are being very strategic about what we're doing. Going back to the desk situation, sometimes too, if we go back and we look at what they do in elementary schools where they have some sort of markings on the on the floor would be extremely helpful. That way students know exactly where to put the desk back. Students are always willing to put the desks back.

A member said it does have to come from the faculty, setting the classroom back, and she knows that Dennis Goss makes a valiant effort, at least once a semester, to remind people to put the classroom back the way it was found it. Maybe we need a communication that comes from somewhere else, telling them why it's important, how it serves students. Maybe that would be more convincing.

A member said for a lot of people is their first semester back on campus, so a reminder would be helpful, because maybe faculty were in that habit. If then you are gone for a couple of years from the campus, we now need to get back into those habits.

The Chair asked if C. Gomez was hearing advising issues from people at the end of their career or across the spectrum, from when they first land here and are trying to figure out GE, or is it primarily at the major level where the concerns about advising are voiced.

C. Gomez said it is across all boards. When students first come in, they get upset when they realize they took a class that they didn't need to take at the end, especially when students realize they are not going to graduate when they need to graduate. Towards the beginning, it is that culture that gets set up between the students and their advisor, especially their major advisors where a lot of students report bad interactions with them, so it is difficult to build that trust and to want to go back and to continue to ask questions when, to be quite frank, some people are rude to the students. Students are admitting that they need help on something, and for them to be met with so much rudeness is why a lot of our students who are in their upper division courses still going to their CASSE advisors or the Advising Center. Avoiding those situations to begin with will be helpful. She wasn't sure about what to do when students think they are graduating and find out they need more units.

The Chair said she would touch base offline because, as Chair, she is dealing with a lot of students who realize, two years later, they never got their diploma. It is a huge amount of work to resurrect those and deal with it. In the Registrar's office we are

talking about making a checklist or something. She noted in the chat, the Chair of FSAC said if a student has issues with advisor, go to the department chair, and if that doesn't solve the issue to go to the Dean. It can be hard, especially for younger students, to go to one person, then have to go to somebody higher. One thing she asked C. Gomez to tell the students is that some of the departments have crazy advising loads. Her advising load right now is 120 students. We need to rethink the graduation application because before students had to get a signature from their advisor and students don't have to do that anymore. There was further discussion about the graduation application, the effect of COVID on the application process, referral to GIG to discuss issues with the graduation application process, and how to improve it so that students are not surprised in their senior year. C. Gomez noted that students in High School are not allowed to argue with their teachers and there is the larger issue of students being able to report microaggressions.

From APARC: Priority Recommendations - E. Acosta Lewis

E. Acosta Lewis said APARC changed our timeline with the priority recommendations to present them in the spring and as opposed to the fall, which is what our previous charge required. We wanted to get this through to Senate and get approval before the end of the semester, so then it can send it out to Academic Affairs and other divisions. Our recommendations are: creating a faculty hiring plan - this is going to come out of the Academic Affairs Budget Working Group and there was discussion about APARC taking this on. We are actually already doing some research this semester, but we want to actually lay out a faculty hiring plan for the future. The University of Oregon has a great plan that lays out data driven qualitative and quantitative recommendations based on enrollment and growth and all kinds of things, and that would help departments plan for the future, and be able to project whether or not they're going to get a hire and how long it might be until they get a hire. APARC is still working on multi-year scheduling. It is a lot to unpack, and we are going to keep working on that next year. Included in that are some strategic scheduling recommendations and looking at low enrollment and excess enrollment policies and when those cut offs could or should be, depending on if it is fall or spring. Another recommendation is to continue transparency in faculty collaboration and the budget process and we are recommending a standing committee that builds on the work of the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Working Group. This would become a permanent committee moving forward that would advise Academic Affairs and the Provost.

A member said in regards to that third recommendation, one of the charges of APARC is to review university's budget processes and resource allocations. As a

reminder, several years ago, when we tried to resolve what he called TMDC disease, too many damn committees, we had more committees than we had people to fill. He understood, that the Academic Budget Working Group is doing is a new and additional workload. But is this something that APARC cannot take on currently and that needs to have another committee and would this committee be a subcommittee of APARC or another free standing committee?

E. Acosta Lewis said the idea is that this would be a free standing committee and no she didn't think APARC could take this on. It would be the only thing APARC could focus on. Right now, APARC has so many other things under the scope of APARC, there is no way that they can take this on top of we are currently doing.

The member said one thing more to remind this group, APARC was put together because we used to have the Senate Budget Advisory committee and that is where that committee work went. Again, he worried that our TMDC disease is coming back. We had a heck of a problem, years ago, finding enough members of the faculty to fill slots on committees. We did some things to help make it better and it is not going to get better with more. He realized this is a workload issue, but we need to be very careful about saying we need another committee.

E. Acosta Lewis said this group digs deep and just does the budget part and works directly with the Provost. She didn't see that this committee would be a part of faculty governance. It would probably kick things to APARC and work with APARC closely.

The Provost said what we are talking about here is one that is indeed outside of governance. APARC is a committee that actually looks at the whole university and must address issues like facilities and classrooms, the modules, etc. The idea here is to have more involvement, more engagement with the issues around the Academic Affairs budget, and more feedback to the Provost. There are lots of ways to do this, and she took the TMDC warning seriously because we're all over loaded. The impression she has from the conversations that we have had is that faculty want to be more of a part of the conversations around the way budget works in Academic Affairs. Part of the impetus for this is not necessarily coming from administration. It's actually coming from faculty wanting to be more of a part of it, and that's fine and great, and this working group has done phenomenal work. We have a year or so to think about this. She thought that we are going to have to make more cuts next year, so we will need to continue this ad hoc group, but at some point we do need to think about how this group becomes a more formalized body, rather than an ad hoc Task Force working group. She was proud of the model because the model is super

collaborative and super engaged and is the most transformative thing that we have done in her time at Sonoma State to really think about doing things differently.

E. Acosta Lewis said the other thing is APARC doesn't have representatives from the staff. That is something that this group would have, staff and student voices and admin voices in a different way.

APARC Priority Recommendations approved for the Senate agenda.

From SAC: Revision to the Attendance Policy - K. Thompson

K. Thompson said the Student Affairs Committee was approached by Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes and Jerlena Griffin Desta who proposed the addition of one additional example of what is a suggested list of legitimate reasons for missing class. We have always had reasons such as illness, accidents, religious observations and obviously athletes attending sports on behalf of campus. This proposal is suggesting the addition of immigration related issues to that list of examples of legitimate reasons for missing class.

A member asked if the note in the revision would be part of the policy.

K. Thompson said yes, that note is intended to be there.

The member said by doing that it highlights this category of student and he thought it does the opposite of what we're trying to do. Mentioning it as another example makes it as a matter of course that we would accept this, but by singling it out with this note, if he was undocumented he thought it would make him uncomfortable.

K. Thompson said thank you for the feedback.

The Student Representative said this is obviously a legitimate reason to have an excused absence, but it goes back to the bigger issue of what is excused and what's not. For example, if a student needs a mental health day, some professors require documentation. For an undocumented student, how they would document that and she would imagine they wouldn't want somebody to know of their immigration status either. It goes back to all of these other things that are on the list, students having to provide death certificates and those sorts of things. She agreed with the addition, but thought it was a larger issue when it comes to the Attendance policy.

Approved for the Senate agenda.

The Chair noted asked if there was any objection to the Learning Objectives for Orientation being an information or item for the Senate. **No objection.**

Vice President of Student Affairs Report - given by L. Monje-Paulson for M. Young

L. Monje-Paulson said she had a couple of very relevant updates today. The first is the same topic regarding student involvement and challenges and getting students involved and even knowing who to outreach to. We are talking in the Division of Student Affairs about an opportunity to identify students who we are calling "movers and shakers," as opposed to "rising stars," because many of our students who are new to us have already been making moves and shaking things up in their lives, and we want to recognize that. This is an opportunity for faculty, if faculty have students who come to office hours or stay after class and help clean up or you notice are demonstrating positive contributions to our campus, we are encouraging you to nominate the students,

(https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeaPTF4hWFVXtCh6TU1kbrM_wiZ0YRD_rWAb32a2eyf53Ezt1g/viewform) It doesn't take much to nominate and everyone who is nominated will be considered a mover and a shaker. We are not doing any selection of this group. It is simply to do some early identification of students who might benefit from being encouraged to get involved in a number of different ways. The movers and shakers will be invited to a celebration at the end of this semester, which are the Noma Awards, so it's a party in some ways for individuals, but it's also an opportunity for them to see students who are being recognized for their time at Sonoma State and the contributions that they made. There will also be a leadership retreat that students will be invited to participate in in the fall. The idea is that this would be a way of us also identifying across our campus students to invite to participate in that leadership retreat. It is not necessarily a direct funnel. It is an opportunity for us to cast a wide net and give folks a quick and easy way to put some names forward for students who are going to be great contributors and may benefit from more knowledge about ways to get involved.

She provided information about some good work that Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have been working hard on which is addressing registration holds. This conversations been happening in GIG and in all sorts of wonderful collaborative places on campus. From the Student Affairs angle, how wonderful it has been to have a good grasp on which students have holds and what some of the key issues are and thinking that the advising opportunity to connect to our students is a kind of wrap-around in understanding what the hold means, how students can go about resolving them and making sure that students are ready for registration this next

week. Hopefully, the impact will be that students who are clueless about what the heck they are supposed to do to resolve holds have some good support whomever they go to.

The third thing was just an information item on the male success initiative. The young men of color consortium happened this week through the CSU and we sent a very large delegation of students. If folks follow Dr. Gerald Jones on social media, you can see all the great, wonderful pictures and updates what's happening there with our students.

A member had a question regarding the movers and shakers recognition project. She liked the idea and wondered if the survey gets mailed out to all faculty once a semester or at one point only during one semester.

L. Monje-Paulson said this is a new re-invigoration of a practice that happened several years ago, certainly before her time, so she didn't know what it used to look like. Right now, the goal is to do it this semester, and then we would be inviting folks to submit names once a semester. After that, if a faculty member missed this semester, we will probably do another call again next semester. If faculty identify students in the fall, she couldn't guarantee there's going to be a party related to it, but that call will go out to folks to submit names and identify individuals and should be happening once a semester, if all goes well.

Senate Agenda

Consent: From EPC: Electrical Engineering B.S. revisions

<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:3004/form>; Business Administration BS Revisions <https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2400/form>

Information Item: From SAC: Student Learning Objectives for SSU's 2022 Orientation developed by SAC and AAS

Special Report - Chief Oweis TC 3:20

Business:

1. From APARC: Priority Recommendations - First Reading - E. Acosta-Lewis
2. From SAC: Proposed revision to SSU Attendance Policy- First Reading- K. Thompson

Approved.

Good of the Order

The Chair said it is Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage month and the opening ceremony is on April 13 at noon in the Seawolf Plaza and we are going to have Taiko drumming. There is a lot of good programming going on. Please come support our students who are doing these great things, and that will run until May 12th. Our closing ceremony will be online.

CFA Report - E. J. Sims

E. J. Sims said CFA is hosting a retirement benefits webinar. It will be next week. There are two times available April 13th from 4:00 to 6:30 and April 14th from 3:00 to 5:30. Register online at CFA.calfac.org. If you're thinking about retiring or just want to get some information about retirement benefits, this is going to be an excellent opportunity. Jonathan Carp, who has done this webinar for a number of years, will answer questions in the chat during the webinar and will post his email address and phone number for folks who have questions. We hosted a tenure track faculty luncheon this afternoon. It was hosted by our wonderful, outstanding, and amazing Emily Clark, who is on our Executive Board. It was a chance for our tenure track faculty to come together to share information and to get questions answered. CFA will participate in virtual Lobby Days. Those are going to take place on April the 19th and the 20th, which is a Tuesday and Wednesday. We do this every year in April to talk to the State Legislators about increasing the amount of money in the CSU budget. The Governor's January proposal already includes 211 million dollars in an allocated funding increase, but our goal is for over \$300 million. We are going to be pushing for that money because we know that if there's at least \$300 million in the CSU budget, they will be able to give the faculty the 4% increase for the academic year. As always, we work very hard to get more money in the CSU budget and we've been successful in the past. Our Executive Board members have been asked to

participate in Lobby Days, and it is a lot of fun. It is faculty, it is also students in the CSU, and we are usually partnered with the campuses in the north of the state.

She knew many of you, as with all of us, have been frustrated and disappointed at the CSU management's lack of urgency in processing faculty members much deserved and much needed salary increases. Since the CSU Chancellor's office is not communicating with its employees, we will relay the most current information that we have and that is available in a CFA email to all CFA members. It was dated Tuesday April 5th, if you would like to review it for how these raises are going to be rolled out.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes with help from Zoom transcript