

Executive Committee Minutes
April 15, 2021
3:00 – 5:00, with free the fifties
Via Zoom

Abstract

Approval of Agenda – request to remove post pandemic meeting guidelines. Approved. Minutes of 4/1/2021 – Approved. Chair Report. President Report. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. From APARC: Program Review Policy revision – 7 year review cycle – Approved for Senate agenda. Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – Approved for Senate agenda. Reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – Approved for Senate agenda. From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – Approved for Senate Agenda. From EPC: BM Music Composition Concentration – Approved for Senate agenda. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Jeffrey Reeder, Laura Krier, Carmen Works, Bryan Burton, Wendy Ostroff, Elita Virmani, Emily Asencio, Paula Lane, Hilary Smith, Judy Sakaki, Karen Moranski, Joyce Lopes, Erma Jean Sims

Absent: Sam Brannen, Amal Munayer, Wm. Gregory Sawyer

Guests: Noelia Brambila-Perez, Richard Senghas, Laura Monje-Paulson, Catherine Fonseca, Naga Damaraju, Melinda Milligan

Approval of Agenda – request to remove post pandemic meeting guidelines.
Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 4/1/2021 – Approved.

Chair Report – J. Reeder

J. Reeder noted that this morning was the final meeting of the academic year of the Council of Statewide Academic Senate Chairs. He met with folks in his corresponding position throughout the CSU and about half of the meeting time was spent on a fairly lively discussion on repopulation and how that was going on individual CSU campuses. His general summary of repopulation plans is that there seems to be a wide range of variability from campus to campus and even a wide range of variability on individual campuses sometimes within academic disciplines. This is something that we could have anticipated and expected if we had thought about the dramatically different characteristics of campuses like Long Beach, Fullerton, Northridge and San Diego as compared to Maritime or Channel Islands. What he was surprised by, however, was the level of faculty, students and staff participation that was reported by Statewide Senate Chairs in the meeting. He had been under the assumption that most campuses were going about their decisions, much as we were doing, which is that we have a variety of different repopulation groups and task forces and working groups all working in concert with specific

constituencies or functions in mind and that there was fairly even faculty, staff and student representation. What he heard from his Statewide colleagues, is that this is not really the case and certainly not the perception that's the case around the CSU. We seem to be leading, at least in the sense of having joint and shared dialogue and discussion around our repopulation. It appears that our approach probably has several effects or impacts. One of those is that it might take us longer to make decisions or come to conclusions, because we have a lot of different groups and a lot of different constituencies or viewpoints represented. But on the other hand, it seems like we have more unity and purpose than what he heard from other campuses. There seems to be a lot of people that are just now finding out things that are essential and basic to fall semester registration, and we have since moved past that and we're still trying to tweak it. He wanted to bring that to the Ex Com's attention. There has been a lot of work, a lot of dialogue and a lot of that came from this body. The appropriate level of interconnectedness and consultation and the balance between being able to make these swift decisions and being able to make these collaborative and informed decisions - he would reserve any judgment about whether we've chosen the right path - but he did want to submit that our path does seem to be much more toward the collaborative side than seems to be the norm in our sister campuses.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki said she hoped that we are as a team, all of us faculty, staff, and students together and administrators that it's important to listen and to work together. It may, as the Chair mentioned, sometimes take a little bit more time because we're trying to collaborate as much as we can and sometimes she has to make a decision that's faster than she would want to, but always, she thought we end up at a better place for our campus. She appreciated all the work. She knew that sometimes it's more meetings and more input, but she thought it really makes a difference to where we end up. She thanked the Chair for that report.

One of the things that was fun this week was having our little informal five o'clock gathering. What she loved about it and what she got so much feedback from was that it was one meeting where there was no agenda and it was fun to just see everyone and be in community. She thought that was one thing that we have missed during the pandemic, even as we have still been able to accomplish so much, just as the Senate has, through these Zoom meetings. We are missing people being altogether. The Climate Survey is still open and available, and she hoped that Ex Com members have taken it. If you haven't already, she encouraged members to take it take the time to do it and also to encourage your colleagues and students in your class, because we want to get feedback from folks to be a better institution. She congratulated Joyce Lopes who had accepted a position as Vice President for Administration and Finance at Western Washington University. We are going to miss Joyce and we'll have plenty of opportunity to appreciate and thank her before she heads off because we still have her until the end of this semester at least to the end of May and through commencement.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said she had three items. One is that many of us may have attended the opening ceremony for AAPI month and had a wonderfully informative and rich conversation this afternoon that was a fitting discussion of the complexity of the violence that is being visited on our Asian and Pacific islander populations in America right now. We appreciated the speaker, Margaret Huang, and her perspective from the Southern Poverty Law Center. She encouraged participation in the events of this month, to learn more and looked forward to the discussion about the resolution Chair Reeder has put forward. A quick report on admissions, so that faculty have some context for where we are. This last weekend was SeaWolf Decision Day and it may be of interest to note that we had 985 total registrations and over 600 students were in attendance. The highest attended program was housing. It was a terrific event that was again a collaborative effort by all the schools, by the Student Affairs division and all the units, by Academic Affairs, by our Administration and Finance and Advancement and GMC divisions and the President's division, and so we benefited from all of that collaboration and all of that coordination and so kudos to Elias Lopez, and his team. We appreciated the participation on the student panel. It was just so great to see the students talk about their experiences at Sonoma State. Where we are right now is that we had 216 deposits that we could measure that came directly as a result of SeaWolf decision day. That is an increase over last year's deposits immediately after SeaWolf decision day. We are doing very well with transfer deposits. We are still waiting on those first time deposits, but we are not alone. Those students are taking their time to make this decision about going to school, so we have calls underway from both housing and from Academics and Student Affairs and even the Police department is calling the students to encourage them to attend Sonoma State. Our scholarship program is well underway, we have sent out a second set of over 700 offers for scholarships. The scholarships have clearly made a difference with transfer deposits, and we have a 10% gap between the non-scholarship transfers and the scholarship transfers and so they have clearly made a difference in terms of encouraging students to deposit. For first year students, the scholarships students are just slightly above the non-scholarship students, so we will see how the next two weeks go. Our decision day, of course, is the traditional May 1 deadline, and the last two weeks are always extremely busy for the Office of Admissions as we get those people who start to commit. Our students do tend to be late in terms of committing and so we'll see how that goes. Encouraging work is being done to maximize enrollment. The third thing she wanted to touch on and J. Lopes may talk more about repopulation, but she did want to focus on the academic side. Some of the faculty may be wondering where we are at this point in terms of enrollment, having registration begun and the schedule has been out since April 5th. We are right at 45% to 46% in-person, and we did a very deep dive correcting numerous errors and really ensuring that we maximize our in-person instruction. We are still working on that. We still have some labs and some other courses that we are working on to see if we can get those in-person and still correcting errors. As we correct those errors, we will make sure that we continue to remind students to check again and to see if they can get more in-person courses. We're in the range that we said we wanted to be so kudos to the Faculty and to the Deans offices and everyone who participated in making sure that we can maximize our in-person instruction.

A guest said he was wondering if, either in those calls out to folks or in the interactions that were happening on Decision Day, what were some of the biggest areas of concern affecting people's decisions and what seemed to be the reason why people end up saying no. K. Moranski said key this year is finances and issues in the family. So many of our families have been hit hard in the state of California with COVID. We're seeing declines in enrollments for the Community Colleges across the board and at the four years as well. Some of the four years, and particularly in more rural areas, finances are a real factor. In addition, students are shopping a little bit to figure out who's going to be in-person and looking for maximizing that in-person experience and that traditional college experience as much as they can. It does appear that our SeaWolf all-inclusive experience, our housing incentive program, is having an impact on housing deposits. Our scholarships help with the finance issues and the more information we can get out about being open in the fall, the more likely we will be to catch students who are still trying to make a decision.

The guest said part of the reason he was asking that is he recently heard a podcast - The Indicator Podcast titled: How an Econ Experiment Changed Lives. It was about a study that was done, where they had students get a whole package, without having to fill out all the forms. It just came as they were accepted. That really up their enrollments for the folks that might not have seen themselves making it to college, especially first years. He didn't know if there was some way that we might be about to do that or if we're already doing that. K. Moranski said she thought there's much more work to be done around helping students to complete paperwork and ways in which virtual digital paperwork, forms and the FAFSA is a barrier. The CSU Apply is a barrier and so to the extent that we can move toward some of the suggestions made by the Governor's task force towards a common app or pulling together as a State and find a way to make that paperwork easier, so that students can apply to multiple institutions at the same time would be really helpful. She thought these discussions are happening at the State level as well. We'll just keep trying. We did make the scholarship package super simple. We did a survey and some of the information that we're getting back has been about us being a first choice for students. That has been really helpful being able to predict a little bit what deposits might look. We did do that with the scholarship money.

The Chair said he was very pleased to see that we're not only incentivizing students to come to Sonoma State with the scholarships, but also providing the scholarships and being aware that that's an area of need for those students. It's very illustrative to see the trends that have happened in the last year or two in higher education nationwide but focusing on public universities in California. We've seen that enrollment matriculation in the CSU and the Community Colleges are down. We've seen that they're down at places like Sonoma State, but we've seen this same year, that every single UC campus, including the medical center, brokered an all-time record for the number of applications. What this suggests, given that the UCs are the more selective segment of our state's higher education system, this is a very worrisome and troublesome trend of exacerbating and increasing inequality in educational access. Whatever we can do to slow that down and reverse it and put it back in the right direction, that's all good. He knew that many of the thousands of students that have applied to Sonoma State, but have not yet committed have also

applied to UCs and the UCs are waiting until April 30 before they will send out their acceptances. He was wondering about the date May 1 for our campus which is the day after the UCs will have guaranteed reply, and which falls on a Saturday. He was wondering if there's any thought about being flexible with that May 1 date. K.

Moranski said we have not made a decision to extend this year. It may be something that we need to do, and if so, we would not extend much. Last year we extended to June 1, and it was problematic from an enrollment perspective and didn't yield a lot between May 1 and June 1. E. Lopez has been talking with folks about the possibility of a smaller extension. We'll have more to come on that, but that would we would need to take that to the Cabinet and get approval. We'll keep monitoring and make a decision, probably not until next week. The Chair offered one tiny suggestion - maybe if it were as small of an extension as to the following Monday.

A member stated that when we shut down and don't allow people to register in the summer, there is a very good reason for that - it has to do with scholarships or something, however it's really hard for students and for Department Chairs.

Anything that can be done to reduce the duration of that shutdown could only help us. As people wait, they can't enroll, Chairs don't know where things stand. She knew there's a reason but she hoped that can be reduced in the future. K. Moranski said she assumed the member meant the shut off of Peoplesoft that closes registration to students for about a three week period. She agreed, and noted the shutdown is to allow the Chancellor's office to pull the information from all of the Peoplesoft systems. We shortened it last year and the year before, but we have not eliminated it. If she had her druthers, we would. She has suggested that to the Chancellor's office, but it has to do with the system coming in and being able to do some processing. We should talk about as a system and try to find a system solution for it.

Statewide Senator Report – W. Ostroff, R. Senghas

R. Senghas said he would start with something fun. We have a CSU alum, Victor Glover, who is currently onboard the International Space Station. He's a Cal Poly alum and when there was a live interview, Romey Sabalius heard Victor field a question - who gave you some of the best advice you ever got and he named Dr. Jim Lo Cascio of Cal Poly, one of his faculty when he was a student there, as being super important. So, the CSU got kudos from space, which is pretty neat. A couple of things that are we are circulating, our Chair Collins, put out a statement on the recent issues around hate and actions against Asian Americans and Pacific islanders and it was a moving piece. He has some personal biography that links into that and so, if anybody would like to see that he was happy to forward it along. We saw some announcements coming out from the Chancellor's Office about the GRE requirements being suspended for the EDD and the Doctor of Physical Therapy and the Doctor of Audiology programs in the CSU systems. There was a listening tour about the hiring for the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs and Chair Collins has been sitting in on that process and gathering the input for the candidates. So, your Statewide Senate is being part of that process. The Faculty Affairs committee has a survey out trying to find out from the various campuses faculty to see if they incurred expenses by teaching from home and how many, if any, of those expenses were mitigated by local campus reimbursements. He asked if

the Ex Com could discuss for a minute, if it's known at all, about will we be able to do travel this summer. He might bring that information to the Faculty Affairs Committee tomorrow, because we have an interim meeting before our plenary. Calls are going out for summer stipends for research and scholarly activities and for many of us, if we can't travel, that radically changes the possibilities of what we can do. Currently, we're not able to travel for anything right now and he was assuming that that policy is going to basically run through the end of the academic year, but does that change in July. Will we be able to go do research, will we be able to draw on grant funding and do scholarly related travel. He didn't know if that decision was made at the campus level or is the campus waiting on something at the Chancellor's level. The President said yes, that policy will change effective June 1, and there will be eligibility for more folks to travel. The question is, we want to make sure that people are safe, and hope that those who do travel will be vaccinated. J. Lopes added that we are working on a message to go out to campus about that and what will be used on campus for the approval processes. The fact is there are still travel constraints across the world and we do, from a risk management perspective, have to continue to adhere to that, so while the decisions can be made at the campus level, we're still going to use the same type of risk management assessments to determine where travel is safe.

The Chair asked when the faculty trustee decision will be announced. R. Senghas said he believed that now it is in the hands of the Trustees, and so we wait on their action. His guess is that it's probably not going to happen until the next Board of Trustees meeting which usually is a week after we have our plenary sessions, so his guess was not until May.

Vice Chair Report – L. Krier

L. Krier said she had a few different things to report from Structure and Functions. We approved three candidates for the Instructional Related Activities (IRA) committee and unlike many other of the things that we approve those need to come forward to the Ex Com. We had no reservations about any of the three candidates who came forward and they were all elected unanimously so they just have to be approved by Ex Com. The faculty were Jordan Rose, Gina Balleria and Sena Creston. **There were no objections to the faculty approved by S&F.**

The Student Rep asked for a quick understanding on how it is decided who are going to serve on a committee. L. Krier said generally the way that works is that Structure and Functions and the Senate Analyst put out a call for nominations for people who are interested in being on any committee. Those nominations come forward to Structure and Functions. She said in the year that she had been on it so far, we have not had a situation where we had more candidates than there were positions, maybe once or twice. We generally discuss the statements they put forward, any experience that they have that seems related to the work of the committee and other service commitments that they may have, and then we vote on who we think should be in the seats. The Student Rep said as a student she's on the Fee Subcommittee, so she thought this is important to know what's going to be part of it. She had never been on Structure and Functions and was not entirely clear how the nominating process works.

The Senate Analyst said typically, when we get a request from a committee that's outside of faculty governance, they let us know their membership rules. Sometimes they'll say the Senate has to approve or the Executive Committee has to approve. If they don't say anything, then we let Structure and Functions do it. On our Senate website, we have a list of other committees that faculty sit on. Sometimes the rules show there.

A guest provided some historical context. The reason things go this way was in the past, there were times when committees were formed across the campus, for instance, sometimes within the administration a call would go out or people would ask around. A Faculty member might want to serve and Faculty Governance had no idea who was supposedly representing faculty on these university committees and so that's when the practice of funneling all requests for faculty participation on committees across campus be directed to Structure and Functions, so that we could at least know where faculty are representing faculty on campus since that's the role of governance. They may not be faculty governance committees; they may be university committees. But we at least would know about it and be able to track who's speaking for us. Some of those committees have requirements. They may have to be faculty who have a certain kind of background, or have certain criteria. That's why everything goes through S&F, even if it's not faculty governance. The Student rep said there's a policy sent out from the Chancellor's office that every committee in the University has to have at least one student representative. That's my concern because there are no students on that committee. The Chair said he would check into that.

L. Krier said next thing is the URTP subcommittee membership change. The URTP subcommittee and Structure and Functions talked about the best way to transition to the new membership structure. URTP was in complete agreement about this proposal and as was Structure and Functions. The proposal is looking at the people who are currently on the committee, and what schools they are from, despite not being elected from those schools, specifically and looking at who's terms were coming up soon. It turned out that URTP has a representative from Social Sciences and from Science and Tech, who are both going to be on for longer terms. One of the other Science and Tech reps is going to be on for a shorter term, so she agreed to be the at-large for the Library and the Library faculty had no objections to this. Sam Brannan agreed to be the At-Large position created in the new membership rules. Business and Econ and Education have vacancies that we are hoping they can elect this semester. If those cannot be filled, they would go to At-Large elections in the fall. We have reps from Business and Education on Structure and Functions, who said they didn't think it would be a problem. We wanted to bring this proposal forward to the Ex Com to make sure that everyone was on board with this transition plan. **There were no objections.** It was totally unanimous by the people on URTP and Structure and Functions and Librarians are fine with Mary Ellen Wilkosz being our At-Large rep. The final thing is what was pulled from the business calendar. S&F was requested by someone to start talking about guidelines for meetings post pandemic. The question has come up in numerous venues about how are we going to determine whether meetings are going to continue to be online in perpetuity versus things that we should be doing together on campus, in person. We had put

together some guidelines to send forward, but as we were discussing them again on Tuesday, it occurred to all of us that we're really ahead of the game essentially. We're ahead of where we are and that they're not stand alone guidelines. They would probably be an amendment to the standing rules for distance meetings that we had already passed at the Senate. Rather than bring them forward as a separate standing rule, we are hoping to bring them forward sometime in the future as an update to the distance meeting standing rule. She said essentially she wanted the Ex Com to be aware that we are talking about this question of how to handle the online versus in person meetings for governance in the future. The general feeling at this point was that committees themselves should decide how they want to do their business. But that that decision should be made the year ahead, so that whoever's running knows what the expectations are. When we are in a position to be thinking this through, there will probably be a broader discussion about the best way to manage it. She suspected that we will be continuing our 100% virtual meetings, through the 2021-22 academic year just because we wouldn't want to change how committees did their business midstream. Everything changes, constantly, all the time now, so who knows what's going to happen in a month or six months.

3:50 reached. The Chair led us in archery stretches.

From APARC: Program Review Policy revision – 7 year review cycle – E. Virmani

E. Virmani asked Catherine Fonseca to talk about the revision. C. Fonseca said this policy revision proposal is to extend our current program review cycle from the current five years to seven years. The rationale for doing this started in 2010 and 2019. UPRS recommended to APARC that we provide an extension to the five year cycle based off the Kincaid fires and previous campus disruptions and as we got into COVID and struggling to understand the ways that COVID has impacted the review cycle. We definitely are advocating for this extension on the basis of the short term benefit of relieving UPRS of the backlog of those programs who have been impacted. Beyond that UPRS also has more informally observed a lot of programs that come before UPRS are in need of more time to be able to achieve the measurable goals that they set out in the previous program review cycle. Some of the high level changes to the program review cycle that we're proposing are that the program review cycle would typically run on a seven year cycle. Our current policy does make accommodations for those programs that are accredited, so we are continuing commit to providing accommodations for those accredited programs, if they want to remain on a five year cycle. This way, they're synchronized and in line with their accreditation cycle. The other major change is that in the case of new programs, whether they are externally accredited or not, that those programs will have a developmental period of no more than five years before their first program review. Then they can revert to the seven year timeline and that keeps us in line with the COs expectation that new degree programs are going through the program review cycle within five years. As far as other CSUs, there's certainly a lot of precedent for a seven year cycle. We are one of 10 campuses that adhere to a five year cycle. Other campuses have a five to six year cycle and then the remaining CSU campuses are on a seven year cycle. It's certainly not unheard of for campuses to be on a seven year cycle.

Naga Lakshmi Damaraju, Chair of UPRS, said if external accreditation is seven years, then they will automatically come into the 7 year cycle. E. Virmani added that APARC reviewed this carefully as a whole body and everyone was on board unanimously.

The Vice Chair said this policy revision makes complete sense. The policy is clear and is 100% ready to go. After seeing how difficult it is for programs to go through in five years, she thought this is a really good idea. A guest said generally it does look ready. He anticipated a question that might come to the Senate - why did we pick five years in the first place. The Provost said she would try to provide an answer which isn't a very good one, and it is so long ago that none of us are able to speak to that it certainly occurred. It must have occurred back when we started doing program review more formally back in the early 2000s. She believed that it was a standard back then in the CSU and that's why five years was put in the policy. Since then, campuses have veered off from that five year pattern and it's more mixed now. That's the best explanation she could give. A member said she thought this looks great and is ready. She thought we need to have this shift in the time. Looking at the policy overall, some conversations that had come about have to do with helping departments to get their data as well, which goes hand in hand with extending this time period because it's also a piece the departments need in terms of needing more time. She noticed in part four of the program review policy that the resource piece is in there. She interpreted that first as having that data and it's about a stipend or release time. There might be more adjustments, if they need to be made at Senate, in terms of being more specific about what those needs for resources might be, just in terms of little tweaks to make sure that the department has everything they need, so that when they are ready to go, they can hit the ground running because it has been very stressful. M. Milligan said one of the unintended benefits of moving to the cycle is that, then it allows programs that are set to begin their program review in fall 2021 an additional two years before they start and so that creates a lot of breathing room for those 15 programs that are actually scheduled to start next fall. She thought that that would be a real reason to, if possible, move forward with making this change this semester, so that way those programs can get the information they need, as they move forward. There are lots of other issues on campus and in the campus conversation about program review and about assessment. It's great if they come up and if you all can make minor corrections or fixes to the policy as it moves through Senate, that's fantastic. She hoped that there's a way to make sure that any of those issues don't derail being able to change to the seven year cycle, by the end of the year, because she thought it really would serve those programs well. In addition, part of the challenge is also on a pragmatic level. The backlog that UPRS and APARC are going to be facing because of the delays of program reviews linked to the wildfires and COVID delays. There are quite a few departments that are that are rightfully behind right now, and so they'll need to go through UPRS and at the same time, another 15 are starting. The shift right now would help with the workload for a lot of departments, but it also would help with the workload for governance as well. Those are tangential benefits to the other reasons that were described. It was suggested to APARC to pay close attention to the first reading of this policy revision and be ready to incorporate those suggestions for the second reading. **Approved for Senate Agenda.**

Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said discuss the resolution that he was bringing forward. Our campus at noon today had the opening ceremony for AAPI month and the Executive Director of the Southern Poverty Law Center came and spoke to us about some of the work that they're doing, and in particular Anti-Asian and Asian American and Pacific Islander rhetoric and actions that are happening in the United States and in the community and the increasing level of those actions and how historically, these have evolved from and derived from hostile governmental policies that have existed throughout different points in our history. With that in mind he wrote this resolution in support of the Asian American Pacific Islander communities condemning Anti-AAPI harassment, violence and micro aggressions and also pledging to use our voices and positions to increase understanding and reduce xenophobia, not only on our campus but also in the community. The third resolved clause is in response to the intent of legislation and CSU policy stemming from AB1460 that Sonoma State University direct resources and support toward the development and delivery of academic coursework in Asian American studies. Two bits of background are worth mentioning here before discussion. One is that earlier a version of this resolution was circulated in a very limited manner around campus to key population stakeholders, people that would be impacted or interested in knowing about this. The earlier version had specified a particular academic year by which we would have academic coursework in Asian American studies. He changed that and made it simply more generic to direct resources and support toward the development, with the intention of leaving curricular development and curricular matters to those bodies of the Faculty, of the Administration, of programs and other departments to create them and develop them organically rather than as the Academic Senate prescribing them. That's one improvement. The other thing is a little bit of historic context which is that at various times in the university's history, we have had courses in Asian American studies at the University. We have several faculty members among our colleagues now who are academically qualified to teach such courses and some of the courses have been offered in various departments and various schools across the university.

Support was voiced for the resolution to move forward. The Senate Analyst suggested that someone on the Ex Com move to include the rationale of this resolution when it is voted on at the Senate as that will provide historical context for the resolution. **It was approved for the Senate Agenda.**

Question for Structure and Functions report (Vice Chair report)

A member ask for a comment to go back to Structure and Functions. When Structure and Functions are thinking about the meetings, can they also consider hybrid, synchronous or asynchronous. That's how we have done classes. She had a question, perhaps for the Provost, or for everybody to think about when we are back. In the fall some departments will be largely in-person and that made her think of meetings globally. A lot of times many departments have impromptu meetings in the hallway or small informal meetings and sometimes decisions are made and sometimes they're not.

It made her think about those types of things that may not happen, and some people may feel excluded as we start to transition back into what the new reality might look like. She wanted to put that on people's radar. The Chair said that's a valid and important comment because if we're not careful, we could become the new GA. If you know what is meant by that analogy. (Historical note: at this point in time, Georgia had recently passed restrictive voting laws.) The Vice Chair said generally it is a good rule of thumb for any team, no matter the size, to have a sense of how they make decisions together as a group, all the time, in any circumstance. A member noted that that problem exists, regardless of the mode. People meet in the halls all the time, without other people and decisions are informally made all over the place, so the answer to her is not anything about the mode, but it's about communication in departments. Perhaps Structure and Functions might include something that addresses what was said and include how to communicate that whether you are at home or not, decisions can be made without you or that everyone deserves the right to know what's going on. If decisions are made, they need to be public. In some departments, some people are going to be on campus and some aren't. One must revisit all the time and figure out how people are being included. She hoped when the document that comes out about how we will meet or what we should do, will include the communication necessities to have an informed group and a public and informed workplace.

Reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – J. Reeder

J. Reeder said this concerns specifically two things that have been brought to our attention. One is an Associated Students resolution and response to the AFS/PDS statement on teaching sensitive materials that the Senate endorsed at our previous Senate meeting. Also, we have a statement from the University Administration on that same document. First he congratulated the Associated Students for their thoughtfulness and careful research in preparing this document. It clearly is thoughtful and well researched. Much of the discussion that happened on the Senate floor, which was reflected in the minutes from our prior meeting, centered around the representation of that document in such a manner that appeared that both CAPS and DSS had been consulted throughout the process and had an influence in how it was written and delivered and also that they were in favor of the resolution. Given the additional information which is most succinctly worded in the administration's document, the one which has as signatories, the Director of CAPS and of DSS, it appears that we may have made a decision which was based on possibly erroneous information or misrepresented information or possibly just misinterpreted information, but regardless, he thought a lot of our decisions had to do with the influence of the DSS and CAP statement which were presented. Since now it appears to be the case that both DSS and CAPS have stated that the statement is not their position and that it is, in fact, the opposite of their position, what he wanted to do is point out at the student resolution calls on us to revisit our endorsement. What he thought might be appropriate in revisiting the endorsement is not necessarily that we have to endorse the student resolution or that we have to endorse the administrative statement, but rather that we revisit our endorsement of the AFS/PDS statement and reconsider whether or not it is still our intention, based on this new information.

The Chair of FSAC said since it was actually FSAC that brought this forward as the standing committee to AFS and PDS, the reason she thought she should try to bring it up at the Senate would be for her to suggest that FSAC should have asked for a letter of support from CAPS and DSS. In the future we certainly should ask for support documents if another entity on campus is referenced in a document. It appears there's been a problem that we did not ask for that.

The Senate Analyst discussed Robert's Rules in this context. The endorsement is already been a decision that's been made by the Senate. The correct strategy is a motion to reconsider. This motion can only be made by someone who voted for the item previously. What the Chair of FSAC said would be the argument that could be given during the discussion of the reconsideration. We haven't ever done this in our Senate, so people are going to be a little confused. It's a regular motion to reconsider. The only thing is, it has to be moved by someone who voted in the affirmative at the original vote because somebody voted against it can't move to reconsider. The Chair said since the majority of people voted for it, which is why we're having this discussion now, it shouldn't be too terribly difficult to find somebody in that population. A member said she knew our job is to decide whether this is ready for the for the Senate and how we're going to approach this, and she just wanted to say that, she was very glad and relieved to see both of these statements. It took a lot of bravery and a lot of work for the students to come back and speak so eloquently and so strongly for their beliefs. She wanted to say that, the idea that the AFS/PDS statement states that you would need a diagnosis of PTSD to receive an accommodation, our Counseling Center does not diagnose students and diagnosis is something that's also an equity issue. It's very expensive and very complicated and very time consuming to receive a diagnosis. Quite a few people at the Senate were saying, let's defer to the experts. As a psychologist, she knew this is fraught on many levels and one of the levels that is fraught is this concept that if you had been a survivor of sexual assault, that PTSD is the only possible outcome. There are a lot of levels in which this is fraught and we don't have to get into all that now. She was so relieved and happy that the administration and the students are taking the time to revisit this statement. A member felt a similar sense of relief and did not vote for this to go through. She wondered how can we center the student voices. The Chair said there probably is a way to do that if we connect the student resolution, however he thought it would be best to keep them separate just to have a greater likelihood of favorable outcome.

The Senate Analyst said the Ex Com might want to discuss whether as the Executive Committee, since you set the agenda, if there's anybody here who voted for endorsing it could move that this be reconsidered and have that on the Senate agenda or do you think you should wait until you get to the Senate and say do we have a motion from someone who previously endorsed this to make this motion to reconsider. We've never done this before so that's why we need to walk people through what we're doing and understanding what we're doing. The second thing she want to say is that after this is all done, whatever happens at the Senate, anybody can always make a motion to do something else, such as now I move to do this, that centers the student voice.

The Vice Chair said it might be challenging or problematic to endorse the Associated Students resolution because they have resolved that the Senate take three specific actions and she thought that their final requested action is what we're discussing doing, reexamining our endorsement of the joint statement. She thought that is a good idea and she was hopeful that somebody at the Senate will be willing to step forward and make that motion. She thought endorsing the resolution also says that we will do the other two things and she thought that those things need a lot more conversation than we are ready to have at this point. A guest said in terms of procedure, one of the things that we can do is charge our committees or subcommittees to revisit the statement. We can revoke our endorsement, but that doesn't make the statement go away. It now stands as a statement of those committees. Do we want it to stay sitting out there in that form because it could then be cited by people saying, here's the committee stance on those things. So, we could charge FSAC to revisit it. That is an action that the Senate can do, and it might be good, because anything we do from the floor is dangerous. We're going to make mistakes, because we're trying to frame something or people are going to try and edit it. We've just watched what happened, so we shouldn't do the same mistake again. We should request that the committee and subcommittee revisit this and come back with something supported by CAPS, supported by DSS and whoever else might actually surface along the way, have it properly documented and then we can move forward. That might be the safest, most productive way to move forward.

The Chair of FSAC said the Administrative letter was sent to the Chair of the Faculty and to her as Chair of FSAC. She thought the Chair could direct her as chair of FSAC to revisit this issue. It does not have anything to do with the Ex Com or the Senate.

Motion to extend meeting to 5:00. Second. Approved.

The Chair said he was favor of what the Chair of FSAC proposed. He asked if there were any objections. **No objections.**

The Student Rep said she wanted to thank the Ex Com for taking the time, and being open to possibly re-examining the statement. This means a lot to the students, especially for our survivors and everyone else that has been involved. We have support from all over the university, such as other faculty, students, support from the Admins, the Cabinet. It is important that we have the conversation, if not now, then soon, if we're going to make it a requirement to have trigger warnings, because our students are in a tough situation and we want to help them the best that we can.

A guest said literally this morning, in his class, we were dealing with discourse around rape and racist language. He sent out a warning out to his students last week to prepare the students and part of the reason he made sure he did that was because we had been having these conversations and he realized that it would be helpful. He had no problem. His students were fine and we still used the articles that we were dealing with and we had a very productive conversation. It didn't take anything more than just saying I'm recognizing this is sensitive material, if you want to talk with me about it, I'm available offline. The Chair thanked the member for that concrete example.

From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said this is just a name change, and in fact EPC was originally thinking of putting it through as a consent item, but we realized it needs to go all the way through to the Chancellor's office. It's been unanimously supported at every level. The name change is from Computer and Engineering Sciences and to Electrical and Computer Engineering. A guest said he was looking at the curriculum and there was one thing that made him wonder and it's under the Program learning outcomes. It says "pursue graduate work in their areas of specialization," so it sounded almost as if the outcome is that they're expecting everybody to go to Grad school. He didn't know - if that's not what those words mean maybe somebody could be ready to speak to that. Otherwise, the rest of it made sense as a revision. It was just that one thing that he couldn't quite figure out what was going on with that as an outcome. The EPC chair said thank you she would relay that to EPC and the proposers.

Approved for the Senate agenda.

From EPC: BM Music Composition Concentration – E. Asencio

E. Asencio said was an item that EPC had actually approved a while ago. We were waiting for the school curriculum committee to catch up to us, which they did. This is also something that needs to go through all the way to the Chancellor's office and it's been unanimously approved at all the levels as well. It was a concentration that was never actually added to the degree database originally, even though it was being offered. This is just to make this formal and official. **Approved for Senate Agenda.**

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

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

Consent Items:

Business

1. From EPC: Electrical and Computer Engineering MS name change – (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2090/form>)
First Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:20
2. From EPC: THAR Concentration in Dance Discontinuance (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2228/form>)
– Second Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:30
3. From EPC: BM Music Composition Concentration (<https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:2145/form>)
– First Reading – E. Asencio TC 3:40

4. From APARC: Program review policy revision - 7 year program review cycle – First Reading – E. Virmani TC 4:00
5. Resolution in Support of AAPI Community and Related Curriculum – First Reading – J. Reeder TC 4:15
6. From FSAC: Revision to the RTP Policy – Second Reading – P. Lane TC 4:25
7. Request for motion to reconsider endorsement of AFS/PDS Teaching of Sensitive Materials statement – J. Reeder TC 4:40

Approved.

Adjourned.

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