

**Executive Committee Minutes**  
April 29, 2021  
3:00 – 5:00, with free the fifties  
Via Zoom

**Abstract**

Approval of Agenda – item added: Credit Hour Policy. Approved. No report from the Chair. President Report. Provost Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President for Student Affairs Report. Associated Students Report. APARC Report. EPC Report. FSAC Report. From SAC: Discussion of Priority Registration policy. Selection and appointment and duties of department chairs policy approved for the Senate agenda. Senate reconsideration of endorsement of teaching of sensitive materials statement – Approved for Senate agenda. Credit Hour Policy approved as Information Item for Senate. Senate agenda approved.

**Present:** Jeffrey Reeder, Laura Krier, Carmen Works, Bryan Burton, Wendy Ostroff, Elita Virmani, Emily Asencio, Paula Lane, Hilary Smith, Sam Brannen, Amal Munayer, Judy Sakaki, Karen Moranski, Joyce Lopes, Wm. Gregory Sawyer

**Absent:** Erma Jean Sims

**Guests:** Stacey Bosick, Lauren Morimoto, Jenn Lillig, Richard Senghas, Noelia Brambila-Perez

**Approval of Agenda – item added: Credit Hour Policy. Approved.**

**Approval of Minutes of 4/15/2021 – Approved.**

**Chair Report – J. Reeder**

J. Reeder did not have a report and there were no questions for the Chair.

**President Report – J. Sakaki**

J. Sakaki said today is Sonoma State's first inaugural Giving Day. The Ex Com may have seen the banners and the notices and we're trying to reach out to alumni and donors and stirring up some excitement and interest. Everyone has the ability to select a cause, a part of the university, that they'd like to support. We'll keep you posted on how that's going. We've had our vaccine clinic on campus this week and she was getting a lot of very positive buzz about it. On one of her first outings, she bumped into a couple of our students that worked at REI this last weekend and they said they were so excited to come back to campus and she asked have you gotten vaccinated and one of them said no, but they signed up to go to the Cooperage this week and thank you for doing that. That was quite fun. Last night she received a message from a student who said, "Dear Presidents Sakaki, I just want to say I'm grateful that you and Sonoma State were able to partner up with Rite Aid so people

can get their vaccinations. It's been rather difficult to get access anywhere else and getting a vaccine at Sonoma State was very convenient. Thank you." We're glad that we're able to do that. We're also working out the implementation plans for the vaccine requirement. There are conversations at the system level and then we'll be working with our continuity planning group and others around our own vaccine implementation rollout here. Other things that are going on, of course, is the Provost search and the Athletic Director search and we'll be looking for faculty nominees to be part of the search committee for the Vice President for Administration and Finance. The Student rep asked in the chat if students would be on the search committees. The President responded that by policy and by practice we include, for all administrative positions anyway, students. If students are not officially on the committee for other searches, we often have the finalists meet with the AS and student leaders to give feedback from the student perspective. Many applicants want to meet and to hear what the issues are that students have, and they want to know how it is to be a student, they also ask, of course, to meet with faculty and the Senate.

### **Provost Report – K. Moranski**

K. Moranski said she had two items today. One is that we have received back yesterday the report from WASC regarding our special visit. It was very much in line with what they told us at the end of their visit with back in March. One of the things that they're challenging us to work on that, perhaps, wasn't an official recommendation, but that is very clear in the report is thinking about graduate education. They have challenged us to do more with graduate education to provide more services, to provide more ability for graduate students to participate in the life of the community, in the services, and opportunities that exist for undergraduates. They'd like us to do more data collection around graduate students, what their experiences are and they'd like to see us make graduate education something that the whole campus focuses on. There's a real impetus in this report to work cross divisionally with Student Affairs, Administration and Finance and offices such as Financial Aid and CAPS and DSS to rethink how we're approaching our work with graduate students and to make them a larger part of our community. We're going to be doing some strategy sessions and try to figure out how to prioritize some of that work. Obviously we will take it to the Graduate Studies subcommittee for further discussion, but they really want us to actually move beyond the Graduate Studies subcommittee and have it be more than the work of 15 people on this campus. So, we will be endeavoring to do that. The second item on my agenda for today is to let you know about a change of leadership that is going to happen in the Provost's office. Associate Vice President Deborah Roberts has informed me that she is going to be returning to the faculty in fall of 2021 after five years of service as the VP for Faculty Affairs. We will find opportunities to thank Deborah for her tremendous work over the last five years, and to celebrate the improvements that she has made in the service that she's given to faculty over that time period. In the meantime, what that knowledge has done for us is to let us think a little bit about where we're going to go with Faculty Affairs and she did want to give a heads up. We can talk more and can certainly talk more about this at the Senate meeting next time. But we are now working with AVP Roberts, AVP Jeff Banks and Human Resources, Joyce Lopes and herself with the support of the Cabinet and Presidents Sakaki and are

moving to do a little bit of consolidation of some of the HR functionality in Academic Affairs into Human Resources. We are going to form an academic unit within HR that would maintain many of the services that are currently offered by the unit in the Provost office. AVP Jeff Banks brings to Sonoma State a wealth of experience in faculty HR. This is a terrific thing given Deborah Roberts move back to faculty. One of her concerns as Provost has been to make sure that there is a position in Academic Affairs that will function as a point person around issues of reappointment tenure and promotion, which is fundamentally an academic enterprise. That position is going to serve as a contact for faculty and also ensure that we continue to meet our goals for diversifying our faculty and for the equity of our processes. We're still working on what that position will look like, as we move forward. She will seek advice from shared governance partners as we get into it in the month of May to get some advice and that may continue as we move forward over the summer and into the fall. She will be back in touch to get faculty thoughts and words of advice. Our highest priority in Academic Affairs and Administration and Finance is to ensure that the same level of faculty support that is currently offered in Faculty Affairs would continue to be provided under the new organizational structure. She and Joyce were happy to answer any questions, but more will come. She was getting lots of questions from folks who are hearing from Deborah herself, and so she wanted to make sure that the ExCom had that knowledge and can begin thinking about what might be needed in terms of giving her advice so that we can manage this transition effectively.

The Chair said it's good to hear about graduate school and graduate programs because we've seen at Sonoma State, the proportion of graduate students has remained constant over the last three decades, but we've also seen that within the CSU the proportion of graduate students has gone up by 20%. In our comfortably sized private institutions, it's gone up by 41%, so that's where we have lost ground in a relative sense. K. Moranski said graduate enrollment is going up and it's one of the few places where enrollment is increasing, so we may have more graduate students that we need to serve appropriately moving forward.

A member said in the School of Education and in multiple subjects we are finally accepting a joint in-house credit plus MA and we've always kept those separate. We don't need to put in a new doc or anything. This is us, allowing the curriculum teaching and learning pathway to include some units from their credential program. We know we've lost lots of students because of that, and we were holding to that separate idea, but we've given that up and we are very excited to say as soon as possible, we will start that pathway. Regarding Deborah Roberts and that role, and she wanted to put in her two cents worth that the position should be for a person connected to the faculty in some fashion. This was important because whoever sat there, they knew faculty, they knew this campus. Maybe that's not a good thing, she didn't know, but she wanted to encourage that to remain. The Provost said that makes good sense.

A member said we all had the chance to meet my twin brother who is in the MPA program. He loves Sonoma State, but he does tell me often that he feels like, it's just not the resources, but he would like more group solidarity as well as more resources for him. Even in our department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, he thought

we do lose a lot of students because we don't have a more advanced program and often he would like to see more opportunities for students, because it's becoming an increasingly more competitive field.

The Provost said you're not wrong. That's something that she thinks we are very conscious of, and when we were building the office of Graduate Education and hired Gillian King Bailey into that position of Analyst and then hired Derek Girman as the Director of Graduate Studies, Gillian had started an orientation and started mixers and we were going great guns and then COVID hit. It felt like we had just gotten started to build that community when it got a little bit derailed and Gillian was out for a time on family leave and it's just one of those things. We want to have that kind of community absolutely, so we will, as we move back to campus. That's one of the big goals of Graduate Studies is to build that community.

A member asked how many tenure track searches are expected next academic year and how will they be roughly parsed out to schools. The Provost said it's a great question which she didn't have a good answer to yet. Here's the plan. As you may be aware, the EEP, the process for faculty and staff employees to notify the institution that they're going to turn in paperwork for the early exit program is this week, so next week we're going to be taking a look at the EEP at for departures to get a sense of where we are with the numbers and look at the possibilities for hiring. She was well aware that that one of the biggest morale issues is always being able to do those faculty searches. The strange thing is that right now, we have the highest tenure density at 68% in the system. We jumped because enrollment declined. That pushed up our tenure density substantially and so we've got to take a look at that, too, because we're not going to be able to sustain being first in the CSU in terms of tenure density. We have to balance everything. We'll be taking a look at that and then she has promised the Deans that she will inform them about whether we can ask faculty members and department chairs to create priority lists for searches. It's going to be an interesting process this year as we deal with the budget crisis and the enrollment crisis and deal with the important work of hiring new faculty. Remember that hiring new faculty is the only way we can make progress on the diversification of our faculty.

A member said as a newer faculty member she has taken on a bunch of graduate students and it's actually hard to manage without the resource allocation. It is service, she understood that for the most part, but was wondering if the campus could think systematically about how to support faculty supporting graduate students better because she would like to invest more than she felt like she currently could. Perhaps there's something we could do differently and she wanted to keep the conversation going.

The Provost said she appreciated that and Graduate Studies can work on some suggestions for how to build community and in and among graduate students that is not so labor intensive for faculty. One of the things that we can do as we go back to in person instruction and as we are back on campus in the fall, is when we put out that call for faculty / student mixers, come and participate and meet the graduate students. They're so fun to talk to and having the opportunity to talk to multiple graduate students from different programs and get their feedback is one way to

create a sense of community. We'll let you know about those mixers and encourage you to participate so that's at least one pretty low time intensive way to help build some community.

The Chair said the importance of diversifying our faculty was demonstrated by his new Zoom background. This is an image that came from a CFA publication with state data and statistics of faculty and basically it's the proportion of Latinx tenure line faculty members in the CSU and Latinx students and the ratio is 200.3 to 1 and so you know we've heard this discussion about cultural taxation and the implications and this is just a graphic visualization of that.

A guest said she had one comment and one question related to the Provost report. One, the Graduate School piece, she thought some consistency across the university about how faculty are compensated could help make for a much more robust program. Some departments give release time to the graduate coordinators, some don't. Some give release time for people who supervise, etc., some don't. Having something institutionalized that gave real support could help make for a more robust program and she knew that's going to be difficult under the new budget constraints, but thought that those resources are critical. Her question was about the new organization with possibly having an academic person in HR and AVP Banks was mentioned, she was curious about what kind of experience he has working with faculty on a unionized campus.

The Provost said he worked on a unionized campus in Arkansas and worked with faculty unions, so he does have experience. Obviously, nothing can compare to the size of the CFA but he does have that experience of working with unionized faculty so we're really fortunate. He's been here since fall of 2019 and has established relationships with Faculty Affairs and with HR colleagues across the CSU.

A member asked will he be charged with the RTP files next year? The Provost said that is the crucial question. What she had in mind is that that the RTP process will be handled by the person in the Provost's office. We've talked about this a great deal and she really wanted keep that process on in the Provost's office, so we will be figuring out how that works.

### **Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – J. Lopes**

J. Lopes said we are searching for a new Athletic Director. The finalists will be on campus the week of May 10<sup>th</sup>, so please look for those open forums and provide your feedback, because it's so important that we get faculty feedback on these hires as we move forward. The vaccine clinic this week has had over 400 signups, and we do appreciate that that Rite Aid could assist us. They were prepared to do over 1000 vaccines, but we didn't have quite that many people sign up. They will come back and do the follow up vaccines in a few weeks and we're delighted that people did sign up and got their vaccines. We will be supportive as we work through this transition with Faculty Affairs and she knew that the good team in Faculty Affairs will continue. Many of them will continue doing the work that they've been doing so, she did think this will be a fairly seamless transition, and of course, the utmost priority is to provide the support the faculty needs, so you can keep your attention

on teaching and our students. That will be HR's focus - to ensure that they're providing faculty the service that they need so they can put their attention where it's most important.

### **Statewide Senator Report – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas**

W. Ostroff said we have a call for CSU faculty experts in ethnic studies to serve on the CSU faculty discipline review group for ethnic studies and the new due date for that call is May 12th and, in particular, these faculty experts are going to be looking at the California Community College and CSU area of emphasis transfer model curricula and ethnic studies. It's very important that we can get on with this new requirement so that we can get our transfer students a fair transfer model. We also received a review of the master plan and the California higher education system and there were several key findings of that report. Most of them, we were familiar with, but she wanted to point out a few that stood out. One of the trends, linked to her previous comment, is that the transfer process is complex and difficult to navigate. Many students attending Community College are having a difficult path from Community College to four year institutions which are often complex and confusing. We have different guarantees that differentiates the CSU and UCs and so that's something that we need to work on. Another point was that our California higher education system faces a capacity challenge. We have an increasing share of high school graduates that are doing their college prep coursework. In 2007 it was 36% of high school students doing college prep now, we're at 43% and that was in 2015. We also have a shortage of highly educated workers in California, so there's going to be increased need to educate our students. Students are increasingly shouldering the costs of their own higher education, not their families, students themselves. Student's total cost of attendance includes more than tuition and it is just as important to remember that a lot of students have other fees and students are struggling to meet their basic needs, as we know from our campus. The infrastructure at our public institutions in California is aging, and hopefully we are moving toward helping that, but we need to clearly defined higher education goals to plan for the future. No big surprises. This is just to remind us where we're heading and what our challenges will be.

R. Senghas said he would do his best to attend as much of tomorrow's grievance procedures around the CCJS issue, so that he can report back to the Faculty Affairs Committee. He knew these kinds of things tend to have all kinds of rumors ripple out and propagate. He's trying to take as disinterested a position in that as he can to help carry that to the Faculty Affairs Committee at the Statewide Senate.

### **Vice Chair Report – L. Krier**

L. Krier said S&F has been looking at the by-laws and we have a pretty extensively revised version with lots of grammatical and structural edits as well as issues of bigger conversation. We talked a little bit about the voting process and the question of majority versus plurality and how we would establish runoff voting, but have not come to any conclusions yet. She did not think we will be able to get our by-laws revisions through to this body and the Senate this academic year, so it will have to

come back next year. There was some discussion about the Scholarship committee and how appointments get made to that one, but that was all resolved.

### **Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Wm. Gregory Sawyer**

Wm. Gregory Sawyer said we have approximately 1748 students who have signed up for housing. Our goal has been 1950, so we're almost there. We have 482 first year, first time students; 186 transfer students and 1080 current SSU students. We have reported previously about our campaign of calling and emailing students and getting their interest in coming back on campus and a lot of that was going to be determined by what classes are going to be offered on campus. For first year students, we have emailed 6886 students and it's about 82%. We've made that many phone calls, in terms of 2823 actual phone calls that we have made to the first year students. The total for first year, transfer and SSU students and our email and phone call campaign emails - 11,988 emails have gone out and 5120 folks have been contacted by phone. He thanked everyone that has been involved. Faculty, staff, and students have been making these phone calls and emails so we really are getting the bang for our buck. He was grateful because these are major initiatives and it took the entire campus and will continue on until we get that magic number.

The Chair said that's quite impressive, the amount of outreach that's going on. He did a quick iPhone calculation and it looks like if one person made all those phone calls and if the average was five minutes per phone call it, would take 17 continuous days non-stop no sleep, no eating, to make all those phone calls, so it's good that we have a team.

### **Associated Students Report – N. Brambila-Perez**

N. Brambila-Perez said the AS is coming to the end. We approved the budget for the upcoming year. Something that's interesting – she was part of the different Disability Awareness events that happened this month. We really got to understand our students who are part of the DSS programs, their experience and their feelings and how they want to see disabilities be more incorporated in the diversity mission that we follow. Today was also the first year graduation ceremony. It was really nice to see how powerful that program was and what an enormous day it is for our student. Every single student that was there was saying how much they appreciate it, and if it wasn't for DSS being there, they don't know where their academic career would go. As we're coming to an end of the school year she thanked everyone for the continue shared governance with Associated Students. We are still around during closing down, so if you do have a student as part of a committee and they're graduating maybe congratulate them for all the hard work that they've done. We're going to celebrate our representative soon too.

The Chair said he had been so impressed this year, working with Associated Students and at the amount of work and the quality of the work that they do to support themselves, to support each other, and ultimately to support our campus and what we all do. There's some powerful testimonials that that he had heard and some powerful work that's come out of that.

## **APARC Report – E. Virmani**

E. Virmani said APARC is working on priority recommendations. She asked if we're trying to both provide feedback on where we've been and where we want to go, or what has been working, who does she seek support from for how to best communicate that. If there's something more than the priority recommendations, if there's also a review of what has been working well.

The Chair said this question that may require a little bit more reflection, so please hold on to that question, and if you have any answers or thoughts, please share that with her and with APARC.

## **EPC Report – E. Asencio**

E. Asencio said EPC passed the WIC content area criteria last week, so look for communication about that. We're not going to be prepared for the Overlay subcommittee to start reviewing those types of proposals until the fall semester, but we will be publishing out that WIC criteria in the next couple days with some information about how that will work going forward.

## **FSAC Report – P. Lane**

P. Lane said the Excellence in Teaching Award dossiers were reviewed. There were eight of them and they have been reviewed in a different way in the past. We took that back to FSAC for this year and then we are passing on the review to PDS for the future. We have been trying have all the awards get to one entity. We have been very concerned and wanting to continue to work on issues of equity and looking at how the process has unfolded. It's certainly been very cool up till now, but instead of it being the way it has been in the past using past winners and a student, all eight members of FSAC read all the dossiers. We developed our system of review and our student joined us and, as well as our CFA REP, who is a non-voting member. We deliberated and discussed all of it and it helped to have eight eyes on what the call reads and what the criteria are. We gave our top three candidate names to Faculty Affairs and then we wrote up a set of recommendations. We passed those to PDS who will take it over from here next year. Since Deborah Roberts will be back as a faculty member, she's going to be a liaison to help PDS with the exact discussions we had. It was a fantastic pleasure to read eight files and very educative of finding out what our colleagues do. It was great to think about the award itself and to help make it stronger if possible.

A member said she was thankful that FSAC took that on because she thought it's long overdue and she thought the whole process for the Excellence in Teaching Award has been so opaque and nobody's ever known what's going on, and so, bringing some transparency to it and some process is excellent.

**3:50 reached. Video of desktop yoga.**

The Chair asked for any questions for the Student Affairs Committee and seeing none, went to the first business item.

### **From SAC: Discussion of Priority Registration policy – H. Smith**

H. Smith said she was bringing this to the Ex Com for some guidance. The Student Affairs Committee and its Subcommittee, the Priority Registration Subcommittee determine once a year groups that might we recommend for eligibility under category C of the Priority Registration policy. We have begun looking at this policy more closely in the past year, and it has raised questions for us. We did attempt to answer these by sending the questions out into the world, however she wanted to come to the Ex Com for guidance. The Priority Registration policy which is a policy of the Academic Senate, outlines groups that are eligible for priority registration. In one area, category C, the Priority Registration subcommittee has the authority to review applications and make recommendations to the President, who would then approve that for inclusion in priority registration. SAC has met with Sean Johnson, the Registrar and he has some concerns about the increasing number of students who are eligible for priority registration and making sure that we are properly reviewing the groups that are included, and removing groups that should no longer be included. Her question was outside of category C, how do groups get added to the policy? We know of at least one instance, students under the California Promise program, who have priority registration, but are not on this list, and she could envision instances where an application might come to Student Affairs where we decide it doesn't meet the criteria of Category C, but perhaps the Administration or the Student Affairs would want to consider whether that group should be included. What would that process look like.

A member said he coordinates the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation and on every campus that has this LSAMP program, they have asked and gotten their participants priority registration. He had considered asking for that for his participants as well. He thought that's the process. People just ask and they get it. H. Smith said from her reading of the policy and her understanding of category C, there are very specific criteria under which the Priority Registration subcommittee would advise inclusion in that. That category is meant to be a fairly narrow way to get groups into priority registration, not a catch all. She could envision groups coming to SAC who don't fit that criteria, but who perhaps we would want to grant priority registration. She didn't think that lies with SAC though our priority registration process. She thought it lies, maybe on the Student Affairs side, but this is an Academic Senate policy. The California promise students may have priority registration; they are not on that list. Sean Johnson would love for us to figure out exactly who is on that list. Were they added by an Executive Order or a Chancellor's Office memo or were they just granted it. I have no problem with that, but the process seems to have gaps in how it works. The member said he would say the California Promise students do qualify under categories C 1, because the feeling is they would not otherwise achieve their academic goals within a reasonable period of time. They are participating in an ongoing, University sanctioned activity that significantly benefits the university, namely the California Promise Program.

H. Smith said her understanding of this category has been that it is for students who are involved in an activity like Peer Mentors or Mesa students who are involved in a mentorship Program and who are supporting other students. That's the benefit. They're doing something that supports the university beyond themselves because, frankly, all of our students would benefit from priority registration, though, that would make priority registration meaningless. For Peer Mentors, having priority registration is critical for them to be able to continue to participate as peer mentors. That's another one of the criteria. They could not participate in the activity without priority registration. A member said her read of this is that because the policy is a Senate policy, and it's the policy that stipulates what groups are in it, if a group needs to be added to the policy that doesn't fall under category C, it probably needs to go to SAC for policy revision. Adding the California Promise students probably should have happened as a policy revision and if there are additional groups, that probably should also go to SAC for policy revision because it's the policy itself that specifies which groups are categorically eligible. She agreed with the reading of category C, that it's not saying that you're involved in a group, it's saying you specifically are doing something that provides a benefit to the university beyond yourself. Just being in a particular group wouldn't necessarily make a student eligible. H. Smith said in terms of California Promise students, they were already added outside of this policy and it doesn't look possible to take it back if we wanted to. She didn't know if the Senate had the authority to override CO policy on priority registration. A member said he was going to respectfully disagree with the interpretation of category C and how it's being interpreted for Peer Mentors. It doesn't actually say that and what the other campuses are claiming for their LSAMP students is that these students are underrepresented minority students who otherwise might not achieve their academic goals without priority registration. They do significantly benefit the university because they help our diversity efforts. I would argue from this policy that my students are eligible. He didn't think we want to make a category list that every time we add a new group, we have to change the policy.

H. Smith said without having looked closely at this group of students, her impression would be that those students should be included in the list who need priority registration to meet their academic goals, because the University has determined that's in their best interest, but in this very narrow category, they're engaged in an activity that's supporting other parts of the university, but we can we can agree to disagree on that. That's not the broader question anyway.

The Chair noted that the policy as it's currently written asks for the committee to review three factors. Among those three factors are participation in an activity, so in order for, for example, the LSAMP students to be considered, they would have to have a specific time limited activity associated with the request, which may or may not already be the case, but the policy specifically states that all three classic categories have to be met.

A member said here is that classic tension that we have about policies that say what you must, you must not and then the implementation of policy in terms of procedures. We've been increasingly trying to shift to have only what's needed in the policies, and then to indicate how those decisions are delegated to outside

groups. If it's feeling like it's hard to interpret, then that's the kind of language that we might want to tweak a bit. We always have to comply with whatever's higher up on the level. If we open up this policy, to move it in the direction, where the policy will be that much more stable and will point to who gets to interpret it. Then have some level of appeal rights, use the more general criteria and leave the actual procedures of the decisions outside of the policy.

The Chair said the committee could choose to put an upper limit on the number of students who have access to priority registration because if 80% of the students have access to it that's not very that's not going to mean much and if only 1% of the students have access to it, then we're not spreading around that opportunity very well, so that might be a consideration.

The Senate Analyst said a lot of the policies that we oversee have Executive Orders or something from the Chancellor's Office that governs them and then the campus gets to add things or add the details of what the specific campus wants to do. She suggested to check in with the Chancellor's Office, to see if there's anything from their office about which students should get priority registration on every campus and then what is our procedure for granting it to other students.

Wm. G. Sawyer said he really appreciated the discussion. He noted that currently we have 650 students with priority registration. That's quite a few. The meaning as you've all talked about - well, if athletes that simply would have to get X classes, because they've got to do it in order to be eligible and because they're going to be participating throughout the year, then they have to do the pre-registration, or at least be able to do this before others. But there's folks like the RAs that are going to be working during times of registration. Sometimes they don't really even get a chance. He thought the idea of special exceptions makes so much sense, but they're also those groups such as the minority communities that sometimes don't even know they're getting that information and they're learning what they should at least sign up for. It's very helpful that they can get those classes early on, because faculty are already giving them advice in terms of what to sign up for. He didn't know that we need 650 folks that are going through an early registration, as you all are looking at it and giving it critical and thoughtful consideration, he will look at those groups that we know, that we need to pay special attention to, as we really start focusing in on our values. Being from a Student Affairs background he appreciated all that was being discussed. He said it has been very helpful to listen to the discussion.

H. Smith said she absolutely agreed that there are groups that would benefit from this, and just wanted to be careful that category C doesn't become a catch all. She wanted to know what would be the process if we were to review something and say it doesn't fit Category C, but SSU wants to consider this for this group of students. How does that happen. There was general agreement that a thoughtful approach and a group to discuss these issues was a good idea.

S. Bosick said she would love to continue to have this discussion too, and especially as we look at it holistically across categories and think about how it's going to work holistically on our campus which is what's needed rather than looking at any one particular category. She offered a couple of pieces of information, one is that EOP

and Puerta came up particularly recently because of the GE reform. Those groups have been holding seats in a few different classes and EPC has concluded that that violates the policy of the GE program because it's saving seats for students and GE courses are supposed to be available to everyone. In addition to that, one of my concerns is that it was a way to save seats rather than going through the priority registration process and early on, she sent them over to SAC to see about getting priority reg. We can start to look at this holistically and understand what groups we want to prioritize. We are implementing guided registration now and if we can better manage those seats, perhaps it will become less necessary to have priority registration.

A member said to get back to the question that H. Smith brought to us, how do groups get added to this policy. It is clear that because it's a Senate policy and we have determined that it lives with SAC, if groups should be added, that should go to SAC for revision of the policy. We haven't heard anybody disagree with that and probably groups shouldn't be added often, because we're trying to make sure that it means something. We probably should revise it to meet any policies of the Chancellor's Office, so that it's accurate, but other than that she didn't perceive there being any other body, other than SAC and the Senate who would determine an entire group of people that should be part of this policy. She thought it might be a little troubling to consider being an underrepresented minority and activity that benefits the university in the way that this is described here. That opens up a lot of things that she was not sure that we really want to be thinking that way about our students.

There was a tangential conversation about GE policy and saving seats in GE courses.

A guest said one thing is policies are meant to help us make bigger decisions to make all these smaller ongoing routine decisions more routine and easier. The purpose of all of these policies is to help us do what we want to do with our values and our visions. If we're finding our policies getting in the way of the things that we're wanting to do, then, we do need to change our policies. We don't have to subordinate ourselves to the policies. These are a means to the ends and if we can keep that insight, if we step back and think about what are we trying to do with priority registrations. There are a few different tensions going on, but as he was saying before keep as little in the policy as you can and only as much as you need and keep everything else out of policy and put that into procedures, so that we don't have to come to the Senate to change these things.

H. Smith said to sum up what she thought she heard was we have a policy that lists the number of priority registration categories that SAC does not have any role in determining plus one category that SAC does. It's unclear to me and to everybody here how that process works, but it seems like we need to have a broader conversation both about what that policy should look like and about who needs to be involved in it. Maybe the next step forward is to create a group to start discussing this and figure out if it needs to go back to SAC for some revision or there needs to be a conversation with a dedicated group around the topic of priority registration before it goes back to SAC.

### **Selection and appointment and duties of department chairs policy – P. Lane**

P. Lane said a couple of years ago FSAC was asked to look at creating a department chair policy, so we started to look at it. We knew there were some policies, so we didn't take it on and do anything with it. Some stuff happened, some people brought some stuff forward, CFA took it up and has done the work to get a document together. They brought it to FSAC and FSAC took it up and we would like to bring it to Senate. There were some technical issues with the document that have been resolved. P. Lane said she was asking the Ex Com to help her get this to Senate this next week, so that it can happen this year, if it's at all possible. The Ex Com received one draft and there are a couple other edits that she would like to bring forward. There's nothing really weird in the policy. There's not some new brand new rule. It's just clarifying things. It includes how to proceed if someone needs to be removed, what are the practices, what's the policy. It talks about who gets to choose, how departments select their chair and that there be no less than two weeks notifying the Department.

A member said it just concerned him to hear that what it's going to be brought to the Senate is not what's in our packet. He thought we need to see it before it goes to the Senate.

**Motion to vote by email on the document P. Lane will send out with the further changes. Second. It was decided to send in the votes by Tuesday to the Chair and Senate Analyst. Approved.**

### **Senate reconsideration of endorsement of teaching of sensitive materials statement – L. Holmstrom-Keyes**

The Senate Analyst said when she was doing the minutes for the Senate, she was confused about the motions after the Senate approved reconsidering the endorsement of the teaching of sensitive material statement. She asked the Ex Com to note that she's looking at the Zoom transcript when she does the minutes or listening to the recording if the transcript is not clear. The motion to postpone the discussion about reconsidering to the next meeting seemed appropriate to her, however, that motion was withdrawn. Looking back closely at the transcript she now saw where we had a problem. A member said "My question is because we had already voted to reconsider we don't want to postpone our reconsideration we just want to postpone our next steps." This is where the misunderstanding of the motion to reconsider occurred. A motion to reconsider is agreeing to actually reconsider a decision. A body cannot approve the motion to reconsider and then not reconsider the decision. An approval for reconsidering a previous decision cannot be referred to another body, it is a Senate decision and the Senate needs to reconsider it. Referring this statement to FSAC for review is a completely separate matter. The appropriate thing to do is to bring this up in the Senate and ask for discussion on reconsidering whether the Senate should continue to endorse the AFS/PDS statement based on the new information received from the Associated Students and

the Administration. Robert's rules states "Every Member has the right to debate in the reconsideration. The question begins over again, regardless of speeches made previously if reconsideration takes place on a day, other than that, on which the vote to reconsideration takes place." Because we didn't reconsider it on the same day, it's just talking about what to do on a different day. The motion to reconsider has already been approved, so the AFS/PDF statement comes again in front of the Senate, as though it were a new item, for endorsement. At the meeting, then the Senate would have the statement, the AS resolution and a letter from the administration for deliberation. The Senate need not worry about referring the statement anywhere, that has already happened. The Senate would be reconsidering the endorsement of the statement. She hoped the Ex Com would approve putting the reconsideration of the endorsement on the Senate agenda, even though the motion to postpone was withdrawn.

The Chair said thank you for that summary. We have essentially two parallel processes which are going on, one which was as Chair he referred to the FSAC Chair the matter, which was based on the reaction to the AS resolution and the Administrative statement. Then the parallel matter of the Senate reconsidering its endorsement of the matter, which belongs to the body of the Senate, and so it seems appropriate that we do consider that next week at the Senate since that's where it would reside.

A member said he agreed with this interpretation and that's why he originally moved that we reconsider at our next meeting, because he thought that the Senate would have to reconsider, but it seemed like the sense of the Senate was that's not what they wanted to do. But he agreed with the Senate Analyst, that that's not appropriate. He did think it should be on the agenda, and given that with our new information, we should reverse our endorsement of that particular version of the statement. We should not endorse because that statement is flawed, because that statement made claims that are not true. Therefore, we should reverse our endorsement of that statement. That does not mean we believe there should not be trigger warnings, that just means that the statement is flawed and we don't endorse that statement. FSAC will then produce a new statement because we asked them to do so. When they produce that new statement, we can endorse it or not at that time. This is not about whether there's trigger warnings or not, this is just about whether we continue to endorse the statement that now we realized is flawed. **There was no objection to adding this to the Senate agenda.**

P. Lane said this means that FSAC will take this up next year. It will not be on our agenda next week and because of your new need to do your own thing first.

A member said no, he didn't think that's true. These are parallel processes. We don't need to do our thing first. They should be working on a new statement because that last statement was flawed. That's not their fault, but we've already charged them to do that. P. Lane asked what if the Senate upon reconsideration keeps its vote, as is. The member said the probability of that is so close to zero, as a mathematician, he would say it's zero. P. Lane said FSAC will move forward with our work, but it still won't happen until next year.

## **Credit Hour Policy – S. Bosick**

### **Motion to extend meeting to 5:00. Second. No opposition.**

S. Bosick said this is our credit hour policy which is a response to a change that was made by the Federal Department of Education that pushed responsibility for having a credit hour policy and adhering to credit hour policies, down to the State level and to accreditors. The CSU has a credit hour policy that is consistent with the Federal guidelines and we simply needed to ensure that our policy also lined up with those requirements. J. Lillig worked diligently with faculty governance in putting this through. J. Lillig said the CSU is now in charge of making sure that we follow the credit hour policy. The credit hour itself has not changed at all, but part of it was that we do need to make sure we have a credit hour policy and it has to have certain requirements. Our credit hour policy was a little tiny paragraph and the catalog defined a credit hour. We took that and we have the other pieces of the credit hour policy requirements and that includes making sure we have a way to confirm that everybody's following the credit hours. We essentially took CSU Long Beach's policy and tweaked it and made it better for our campus.

A member noted that in the definitions of a credit hour, first it says one hour of classroom or direct instruction time and then much later it says credit hours are assumed to be a 50 minute period. It just seems weird in that order. S. Bosick said that language comes straight from the CSU. The member said he understood, but that doesn't mean that it can't be improved. J. Lillig said this language which came from the CSU, which came from the people who created it, which she thought was the Federal Department of Education and thus we cannot touch it.

A member said it was mentioned that this policy went through governance. She wanted to clarify -was that EPC and or APARC, or what body would normally own this policy. J. Lillig said it was sent to EPC. They discussed it. UPRS reviewed it for pieces relevant to them. We got feedback from N. Brambila-Perez. Those are the main bodies and they had a month or a month and a half to respond.

A member said she was confused about the procedure here because she didn't think she had ever seen a policy coming from Academic Programs and then getting the Senate to approve it. It's not coming from a Standing committee. It's coming from Academic Programs and it's the Senate approving and endorsing it or what? J. Lillig said it is an information item. **It was approved as an information item for the Senate.**

## **Senate Agenda**

### **AGENDA**

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – J. Reeder  
Special Student report  
Approval of Agenda  
Approval of Minutes

**Information Item:** Credit Hour Policy

**Business**

1. Reconsideration of endorsement of AFS/PDS statement on teaching sensitive materials – J. Reeder, L. Holmstrom-Keyes TC 3:35
2. From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2090/form>)  
Second Reading – E. Asencio TC 4:00
3. From APARC: Program review policy revision - 7 year program review cycle – Second Reading – E. Virmani TC 4:10
4. Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – Second Reading – J. Reeder TC 4:20
5. From FSAC: Department Chair Policy – First Reading – P. Lane TC 4:35

**Approved.****Adjourned.**

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