

Executive Committee Minutes

February 10, 2022

3:00 - 5:00, Via Zoom

Abstract

Approval of Agenda - Items added: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus status and request for Distinguished Chair Emeritus Status for Greg Sarris. Business Faculty visit postponed. Approved. Minutes of 1/27/22 - Approved. Chair Report. President Report. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Student Representative Report. Proposal for the Senate meeting to remain virtual indefinitely - amended and approved for the Senate agenda. Potential Letter regarding support for flexibility for staff - deferred. Continued discussion - Staff and ERFSA members on Ex Com. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Lauren Morimoto, Bryan Burton, Emily Clark, Richard Senghas, Emily Acosta Lewis, Emily Asencio, Richard Whitkus, Karen Thompson, Michaela Grobbel, Sam Brannen, Judy Sakaki, Karen Moranski, Monir Ahmed

Absent: Erma Jean Sims, Michael Young

Guests: Christina Gomez, Laura Monje-Paulson

Approval of Agenda - Items added: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus status and request for Distinguished Chair Emeritus Status for Greg Sarris. Business Faculty visit postponed. **Approved.**

Approval of Minutes of 1/27/22 - Approved.

Chair Report - L. Morimoto

Recording not started in time and have not received Chair notes.

President Report - J. Sakaki

The President discussed budget lobbying efforts on behalf of the CSU. Several staff in Sacramento with their legislators are Sonoma State alums, so that is always fun. They are in important positions and probably influence some of the attention that the legislators give to certain things. These meetings are happening across the

system. Some are with other CSU Presidents and others are individual. We have a \$673 million request for recurring funding for the CSU beyond the Governor's current budget. This year because of more relaxed rules due to additional state surplus money, campus Presidents and Campus teams are given the authority to make separate requests on behalf of our own campus for needs, particularly deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs. We are asking for \$170 million one-time funding for Sonoma State to help us. We identified areas for this spending: to help us recruit and retain high quality faculty and staff; additional support for the infrastructure and deferred maintenance priority projects and the Graduation Initiative. She discussed the deferred maintenance needs of Sonoma State including the water system, heating, cooling and lights. She said we've been doing a lot with the Grad initiative and this is actually a point of pride, but it's also a double edged sword. She explained that our four year graduation rate is up 42%, up from 35% just three years ago, so everyone has been working hard. Our transfer graduation rate is near the top or the top of the CSU. We are at 60% and the CSU average is 44%. Those are things to feel proud of, but they don't just happen. It's everybody, faculty and staff, working to help students graduate. The equity gap for Pell students is less on our campus. What happens when there's extra money, they're giving the extra money to the campuses that have bigger gaps, so it's this double edged sword. We need more investment in our own Grad initiative goals and we would use the extra money for that. Those are some of the things we're talking about with Legislators. The Legislators always want to hear from students and Christina and Noelia are the stars here because they are star students and they have great stories to tell and they advocate for us in a way that is even better than what faculty or she could say. The student voice is important.

We did have an unfortunate human error in admissions this week. We sent out notices to some students who had not been admitted and congratulated them on being admitted and invited them to a next steps presentation. This is not good, but as you know, it can happen. Someone presses a button and we have to be supportive. We learned a lesson and we're going to have backup for that. As soon as we knew, we sent out a message to those students that receive the message in error, telling them it was an error, apologizing and then saying if they had any questions about their status or the message they received, to call a number or email a specific person. We tried to address it just as quickly.

The last thing she wanted to talk about is faculty/staff engagement. She has been mindful of all the things she has been hearing from the Senate meeting. She has met with the Deans. She has been meeting with small groups of faculty and some of the faculty who had passionate concerns in the Senate meeting. She has been meeting

with individual faculty as well. She appreciated the feedback and the candor and the desire to work together to help us because in the time of COVID, we don't see each other as much and it's hard to walk down the halls and just have casual chats. That is one of my concerns about the Senate going virtual because people see us on zoom, but don't really see us, they see a picture of us like on TV, but not enough to be able to stop and say how's it going and just talk. She appreciated what she is hearing. Because we've been in COVID, we haven't had things like staff appreciation day or service awards or faculty recognitions because we couldn't gather. That certainly doesn't mean we don't appreciate everyone. We have to double down on our efforts as a campus to reach out and engage with each other. She is working hard, along with others to make sure that that can happen.

A member posted in the chat: Castro said ""I followed all the CSU policies and practices throughout this whole situation and made sure we acted accordingly to protect our students and staff," From the LA Times: "I followed all the CSU policies and practices throughout this whole situation and made sure we acted accordingly to protect our students and staff," Castro said. Board of Trustees Chair Lillian Kimbell maintained her support for the chancellor. "Dr. Castro's track record and deep support of Title IX are clear. As president at Fresno State, he acted in accordance with CSU policy in this case and used the management tools available to him to address the situation."

The member said what really concerns him is these claims - is this CSU policy? He acted in accordance with CSU policy and that's been claimed over and over again, so I have to ask the President is that CSU policy if whenever your chief administrator was accused of these things is that CSU policy is that you should give him a golden handshake and get them out of there as fast as possible, is that the policy?

The President said it is not the policy and we have the authority to follow up and the responsibility to do so. That was reiterated to us last week in a Title IX training. Along with herself, other Presidents were asked to participate in a segment of the all-day training. This was a challenge for her to say, because she believes there will be an investigation, but we have a responsibility to keep the campus safe and to report, and if there are things that she hears that she needs to follow up on.

She has heard some things, not about Title IX things, but some of you that have been on campus a long time know that when she was appointed people started calling her about different things, whether it was the site of commencement or different things that were going on campus or related to the Green Music Center. The previous administration didn't tell her all those things and nor did they give her

a briefing sheet on Sonoma State when she took the job. But she learned things and she has followed up on those things, and made some changes when she first learned things that she didn't feel as a campus President were aligned with our values.

She hoped that everyone feels comfortable and safe and knows that she is involved. She gets briefings if there is a report into Title IX and she makes sure that it is addressed. She has that responsibility to the students, to the staff, and to the faculty here.

The Vice Chair said thank you. He appreciated the President for disclosing what she said and for taking a time to meet with faculty. We had that one mistake with a CSU application for the funds, and then we have a mistake with admissions. We talked before that we want to avoid that publicity like that. What can we do to avoid those mistakes?

The President said that is a good question and those mistakes were in two different areas of the university. We talk to them and talk about having backup. The grant proposal submission was a human error that was very costly for us. We have to think about how we can have backup systems, because while it is one person's responsibility to submit it and we have full confidence in that person, a mistake happened. We can talk more about that there needs to be an additional backup to check all the fields and make sure everything is ready and accurate. She thanked the Vice Chair for the question. In the different areas of the university, we're talking about how to be able to have backup systems, so that we learn from our mistakes.

The Chair noted that it was asked in chat how many students were impacted by the false positives in admissions. The President said it was close to 3000 students.

The Provost said it was a CRM error, the customer relationship management software. What happens is a query is pulled from Peoplesoft and the wrong query was used. It was the query of all applicants, instead of just those not admitted. All applicants total 13,574. That is a nice number and is growing every day. We're happy that it's growing and is bigger than the last couple of years. Of those 13,574 applicants, the number who received admissions notes in error included 116 first year students and these are students whose applications may have been denied or who may still be in review because of impaction. The good news is that some of those students are still under review. 1560 transfer students were either denied or in review and then 477 graduate students who were in the process of being reviewed. It's about 3000 students that were received the email in error. We have been taking a lot of questions and Elias Lopez has met with every Dean, and every department,

whose students were affected. We have been taking calls and questions from parents. We have been encouraging some of those students that are already under appeal, and we're able actually to look at their applications again. For example, a student was missing only a social science requirement. In some ways, it's encouraging more students to appeal. The biggest concern is we have to be careful that students who are under review, still have the full review, at the department level, and that the departments have the opportunity to do that review.

The member asked how are the people contacted that actually had not been admitted after this error was made to tell them about the error.

The Provost said there was a CCC communication that went out through Peoplesoft, so we identified the students who had been notified of the error and then instead of using the CRM, we used PeopleSoft's CCC, which is a more controlled form of contact of communication. We are in the process of looking at a different CRM, in part, because the CRM allowed the error and there are some CRMs that have further checks in place that might have prevented this from happening, but it absolutely was just using the wrong query. Elias Lopez has instituted some checks and balances as a result, and now the new Director of Outreach has to sign off on any on anything that goes out. That's a little more time consuming, but a little bit safer.

Provost Report - K. Moranski

The Provost said one of the best parts of this week was the Chair Chat earlier this week. It was a great conversation about our COPLAC-ness and how we take advantage and leverage our COPLAC identity, our identity as a public liberal arts university, what we're already doing with COPLAC, and how to we as an institution signal that identity. We talked about everything from the website and having that logo on our front page to thinking about the ways in which our curricula reflect that identity as well as our student services and our high impact practices that reflect that identity. We talked about how we do interdisciplinary work, which is often a hallmark of COPLAC institutions and of small public liberal arts institutions, and how do we leverage our size and our advantages to students? She spoke with the Chancellor of UNC Asheville last week. One of the things we talked about was that we are poised as a small public liberal arts campus to be there for students who are emerging from COVID, who have not been in a classroom in two years and who may have forgotten, in some respect, the ways of being a student. We as an institution that provides a lot of a personal attention, that provides a lot of support services, that provides a lot of encouragement and asset based learning are better poised to help than bigger institutions where students can fall through the cracks. Students need that

personalized attention more than ever, and that we should be saying that over and over and over and over again until people are clamoring at the gates because we have what their students need and what their parents think they should have in terms of an education. She was encouraged by that and encouraged participation in the next Chair Chat about interdisciplinary. We are excited about those conversations and that conversation about identity. We need to stop saying we don't know who we are and start saying we do know who we are and here's who we are.

In regard to enrollment, the first stage of the impact report has gone to the Chancellor's office and she was excited to be able to say that both Early Childhood Studies and Kinesiology have voted to remove impaction from their enrollment practices and their enrollment strategies. The good news is that we have evidence that removing impaction is increasing enrollment. Some of the programs like Business that removed impaction are showing increases in enrollment for next fall, and that is exactly what removing impaction is supposed to achieve. We're very excited about that strategy which seems to be working and we are working with other programs to help find ways to make it possible for us to remove impaction. That's another enrollment strategy that is really crucial. We're implementing it in a pretty big way and pleased about the progress and pleased about the help that faculty are giving the enrollment process by considering that option, finding out what it takes and helping to put in place the structures that are going to make it possible to increase enrollment. She thanked everyone for their work on that.

A member asked had the first waves of acceptance has gone out?

The Provost said the goal was to admit 80% of the student who had applied and were admissible by the end of January, and we did that, and in fact almost 5000 additional applications were processed in January, compared to last year. Almost 10,000 applications were processed, which is an amazing testament to the work of the admission staff. If you see them, tell them congratulations for an enormous task. What that did was enable us to begin to put out our financial aid and scholarship letters earlier than ever before and that helps us get more deposits. Our deposits are up this year. Our day-by-day applications are up by approximately 100 over where they were last year and trending upward, so that's good news to us. Earlier admissions means earlier deposits and that is critical for us.

The Vice Chair said returning to the Chair Chat, how do we keep this conversation going about COPLAC-ness? We get so busy, and then it gets kicked down the road to next year. What can we do to keep it going, keep the ball moving.

The Provost said we're just getting ready to roll out a reading group exercise for the campus. We will read Richard Detweiler's "The Evidence that Liberal Arts Needs." This book has recently been published and uses a 2016 study that makes the case empirically for what students learn at liberal arts institutions that they don't get at other institutions, or that they get in in higher degrees than they do at other institutions. Because it's empirically based, it has some very interesting findings that she thought we need to talk about as a campus and promotes discussion about the public liberal arts and gives us messages about the value of the public liberal arts. The library has very kindly ordered a large number of e-book versions of the book, so that students, faculty and staff can read the book online. They are also getting some hardcopy versions of the book for the library. The Provost office is getting ready to roll out that schedule of some reading groups and which will have some facilitators to talk about the findings from that book and figure out what that means for us, what are the takeaways for us, and she thought those groups will reinforce the conversation that we had this week. One of the ways to contest it or to question it or to add to this book, is through the diversity, equity and inclusion lens and that it's going to make for some very interesting conversation to ask what's missing from that book and what we can do in the diversity, equity, and inclusion space as a public liberal arts university. This is where Sonoma State shines. This is where we have it over even other COPLACs. We are doing more of this and doing it deeper and richer, even though we have a long ways to go. It is an exciting space for Sonoma State to sit in and work on.

Statewide Senator Report - R. Senghas

R. Senghas said, tomorrow we have one of our working session days as well all the standing committee meetings. Coming out of that will be what will be working on in our plenary session on in March. Among the things that have been coming into the Faculty Affairs side things that he is involved in, we're looking at stuff about cultural taxation and issues of faculty and the load that often gets placed on faculty of color from different demographics, because they're seen as representatives and how to mitigate that. We are also interested in the current climate. There's movement afoot to ask Chancellor Castro to reaffirm some principles or the tenants of system level governance between the CSU and the Chancellor's office. This is something that previous Chancellors have done at some point, usually early in their in their tenure. We are saying this is what we're expecting, and does he uphold these or do we need to revisit them? Other things that we're dealing with are faculty mental health surrounding COVID. He has been hearing that there's a push to be recommending an Ombudsman or Ombudsperson at each of the CSU campuses. What we have been finding is on many of the campuses, they used to have Ombuds and then they

disappeared and some of us have even heard that actually there have been some Title IX or some other kinds of issues related to that. We're looking into it. There seem to be two ways Ombuds work. One is they are often seen as the student advocate for when students have all kinds of needs and they need somebody to help them navigate the system. Or they are an Ombudsperson for the whole institution, so that if anybody, in one any part of the university, staff, faculty, administrators, whatever needs somebody has. The current structures aren't working and Title IX complicates that a little bit, but we can see how institutions often need somebody who knows how to navigate the situation and connect what resources are available.

There will be some effort to be pushing against what's happening across the country in terms of legislated educational gag orders. Some of our more recent resolutions that Faculty Affairs was dealing with is the emergency decision process to keep faculty authority over modality and pedagogy the way they're supposed to when we don't have the time to run through the normal process. Coming more from W. Ostroff's side of things, there is more work being done to figure out, in light of both AB 927 and 928, the whole mess with the general education system, yet again. All that work that everybody's been doing, and now we have to change it again. That's got our attention. Then we have the Community College bachelor's degrees issues and trying to get a better set of representation for people from the CSU and coordination between the UC and the CSU and the Community colleges, so that when a degree is offered, it isn't offered at any other campus. When we drill down into it, is it just a more general engineering degree with one or two courses different. We don't want degree programs that actually undermine the CSU because we do see that the funding issues could add to the existential threat.

He and W. Ostroff will probably be pointing to some of the draft resolutions that we're seeing, so we can get campus input and we're going to try and make a better effort of reaching out to the standing committees at SSU to get more of your input before we bring some of those things to the plenary floor.

He knew that the ASCSU Executive Committee is talking about the Castro situation and whether the ASCSU needs some kind of resolution. They were looking at what the CFA was saying, calling for an external investigation and if he was following procedure, what does that mean about procedure? One way or the other, something's not right and so we are looking at what we could recommend because the diversity, equity, and inclusion issue has been really big and this past year we've been doing workshops. To have this happen is very painful.

The Chair said to the point about the four year degrees at the junior college, one of the things that the ASCSU is trying to do is to set an agreement that the four year universities would have some input into what degrees go forward from the Community College system as four year degrees. We will see how that that goes because there are worries that people will just rename things, and it will essentially be nursing, but we're going to call it phlebotomy or something like that.

Vice Chair Report - B. Burton

B. Burton said in Structure and Functions we are talking about ERFSA's role in governance. We are also looking at policies concerning administrators who move back to faculty, what committees can we they be on.

The Chair of FSAC said if there's going be any work done about the role of faculty in committees that also has Faculty Affairs issues, they should be brought in on that. B. Burton said he would double check on that.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report - M. Ahmed

M. Ahmed said he had one item that came from the systemwide meeting that was mentioned about the budgets adjustment for enrollment target not being within 5%. It is a very early discussion and the same information was shared at the Chief Business Officer meeting yesterday as well. No decision has been made as of yet and there isn't even a policy draft yet.

The Legislative Analyst's office had a position identical to CSU, that is, that 5%, which actually turns out to be about 2.6% because of the tuition portal not being included, which is not sufficient, even for us to meet our mandatory obligations. On the other hand, the state is predicting 47 billion dollars of surplus and the rainy-day fund has reached the max that the Constitution allows for set aside, so the state has to constitutionally spend the surplus money, and this is why our advocacy is very important. He wanted to put the word out there for the Senators to consider because the money will be spent and we would like the money to be spent on the CSU. There will be an announcement coming soon that if it hasn't already about the training "returning to work during Covid" which has been updated to make it more current or reflective of our return to campus.

The Provost put in the chat that people can be allowed back to athletic events and this weekend there's a baseball game and a basketball game. If anyone wants to be outside, support our student athletes at baseball, softball and basketball on campus.

M. Ahmed noted we are following the county health guidelines, and right now we are waiting for the final announcement about masking and meeting in groups. There hasn't been anything about removing the requirement yet. We'll wait to see what the county announces.

A member asked about the California Public Utilities Commission saying they might make changes to the net metering agreement for solar power. As far as the CSU is concerned how might those changes impact our savings for university, but also the impact of our environmental commitment. Is the CSU going to try to push back against that? It might be a big question to push back on such efforts to basically kill net metering in California.

M. Ahmed said he hasn't seen the fee. It is making its way, as legislators move forward. There hasn't been an announcement.

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

L. Monje-Paulson said Dr. Young is sorry he couldn't be here. He's at a picnic for the Male Success Initiative this afternoon. In terms of Student Affairs, we are working with partners across campus and we are continuing our outreach campaign to get students into compliance with the booster element of the COVID vaccine policy. The deadline for students to submit proof of a booster, if they're eligible, is February 28th. As you can imagine that created a little bit of dizziness for all of us and trying to clearly communicate to students that again, similar to last semester, they may be in compliance with the policy now and they likely have additional steps they need to take if they haven't already. Having their booster information into their "my health portal" now is also really helpful for us if someone has a COVID exposure because the quarantine requirements for the Sonoma County public health are different for individuals who have been boosted than individuals who have not. It's a little bit of dance. We've got a couple different targeted email outreach campaigns, because we have students who are in compliance now, but won't be by the 28th, encouraging them to get their booster information in as soon as possible. We have very few students who are not in compliance right now and we're reaching out to them more personally to identify what their needs are. Most of these are new students this semester. We have very few from last semester as most weren't allowed to re-enroll until they resolved the issue. If they had a waiver from last semester and they're coming on campus now, there is a possibility that they would have flowed into a space where they'd be able to be enrolled and so we're following up with them personally. Our primary mechanisms for compliance after the deadline are placing

registration holds and those COVID clearance indicators. We've done a big push to train folks and provide options and opportunities to practice different ways that they could incorporate using the clearance indicator in their spaces. All student services should be using that clearance indicator over the semester upon entry to enclosed spaces. She is always available for any questions or feedback related to those practices, but we're excited for more students to be back next week.

A member said L. Monje-Paulson just mentioned students spaces, does that mean, for example, the Student Union, the Rec Center and soon there will be somebody checking at the door?

L. Monje-Paulson said yes, at the Rec Center for sure at the door because there is a mechanism there already. She can connect personally with the Student Center manager, to see if there's a way that we might want to add that practice at the open entry to the Student Center. That would be something she would want to do, to walk through with them personally and figure out a process that would work and be sustainable for them.

The member said that would make sense, especially given the living room situation.

A member said one thing he was wondering about is when we start thinking about a transition to stop requiring masks, is there going to be a provision for a faculty member asking, because they are at risk, that they can ask students to wear masks? He was thinking along the lines of accommodating faculty who have sensitivities to perfumes, and things like that. Or they have allergies and some of us might be immunocompromised in ways that we would want to be able to have that option of for our particular class because of the particular need. Has that even been thought about when we start thinking about that transition.

J. Sakaki said even if the county removes the indoor mask requirement, we as a campus can maintain a mask requirement, if we so choose, so it will be important to hear your feedback on that. For a campus decision that she would want input from others before we would make that decision. We probably should start getting a sense of that now because were that to happen, there would be a gap in time, so if you have any thoughts about that or if there's a way we can get more of a sense and from faculty and from students. She has heard many people say that they would like to keep the indoor mask requirement, but that isn't systematic.

A member said her thought is for the safety of faculty, staff, and students who are immunocompromised and maybe have health conditions that it would be really

good to keep it. Although, she understood that some people are ready to end it, but for a lot of people's comfort, people signed up for classes in person with this expectation that masking would probably be the case. She was reticent to say it, but a lot of people would feel more uncomfortable. People signed on for that being the case, and then to have that change while cases are still high, that would make some people nervous, herself included.

The Chair said there are a lot of faculty in that situation, who don't want to speak up. She has had some resentments having to disclose she's immunocompromised, just so that she can get people to do the right thing.

A member said he had a different opinion. Sonoma county is very conservative and has been very conservative about the pandemic and he would hate to see us be more conservative than our county. If our county says we no longer have to wear masks inside and we do, we're in danger of losing a lot of students. He understood a lot of the older faculty and staff are immunocompromised, but our students are not. They're young and they already feel like they shouldn't have to be wearing these masks and if we make them keep wearing masks even after the county says they don't have to be worried about the optics and the message we are sending. He understood people are immunocompromised, but they're already in danger of the flu and everything. In Japan, where he was from, people wear masks to protect themselves every winter and 40% of the population is wearing a mask all the time. There's no reason why people can't choose to wear masks to protect themselves, but to force 18-year-olds to wear masks when no one else has to, he would recommend against that.

J. Sakaki said that's really helpful.

The Student rep said some feedback that she heard from students is actually concerns about the mask mandate going away at Sonoma State because a lot of students live with their elderly family members or whatever the situation is and we still don't know. The last time the masks came off it didn't go so well, as we all know. She also thought to move forward, because eventually we're going to live in a world where masks are no longer a part of what we do. She thought students have a lot more empathy than we're given credit for. If she knew that her faculty member wanted her to wear a mask, she didn't think it has inhibited her learning at all. The students really do want to see a return to normalcy so, even if we are wearing masks in class, we're still able to have all the services, and reopen things on campus. That's really what the students are looking for when they're talking about going back to normal. It's when can they go to Charlie Brown's, when can they go out more with

friends, it's those kinds of activities that they're looking for, not whether they have to wear a mask during a lecture or not. That that's not all students, it's just some students that she has heard from.

The Chair said thank you, that's an important distinction. She noted that the question is if Sonoma State does lift the mask mandate, does an individual faculty member have permission to say in this classroom because of whatever I request that you wear a mask? Because if somebody can demonstrate, for instance, they have a scent problem or allergy, it could be a DSS matter, but there are things where it doesn't rise to that level of DSS because that's very specific. Regardless of what happens, as an instructor, she would request it, and if the students complain about it, then she would say go complain to my Dean and then take it up the chain. She agreed with C. Gomez that most students are pretty empathetic until we grade them. We could definitely get a temperature from the faculty.

L. Monje-Paulson said that's something that from the Student Conduct space we could hypothesize around and think about what existing policies we have related to syllabus and things like that so we could be prepared to support faculty, if needed.

Student Representative Report - C. Gomez

C. Gomez said yesterday she was able to do some advocacy, but it was on the Statewide level, so that was definitely a new and interesting experience for her. One of the things she brought up in her first meeting was about the PUERTA program on campus since it was recently announced that the program will be getting closed because they haven't gotten approval yet to continue with the funding. They're on a five year grant and luckily the Assembly woman that we spoke to was very concerned about the issue, and she gave the Provost some people to contact. Hopefully that's good news. She has been a part of the program since her first year and she also worked there since her first year, so it's definitely a program that she has seen impact positively so many students. A lot of the students who are in that program when asked why did you come to Sonoma State specifically students love being admitted in a special way. They got admitted as a Lobo scholar or whatever. She definitely thought it's a good strategy as we're talking about enrollment.

We agree with what the university wants, we all want better buildings and facilities all of those things. But really what it comes down to for the students right now, is just basic needs and making sure that they have their basic needs met. Right now, our Lobos pantry doesn't have refrigerators. Students can go there and get food, but they don't have access to proteins or dairy items or anything like that, so just

advocating for that. Also, across the entire CSU, housing is a huge issue and students are paying outrageous costs to live on campus or live off campus. Financial aid does not help all students and that's a common misconception, especially in the State of California. We are advocating to try to make sure that students most basic needs are being met.

Last week she had the opportunity to meet with Neil Markley about the bookstore, which is something she is very passionate about, making sure that students have equitable access to course materials, both in the financial aspect, but also accessibility access. He presented a very interesting concept that UC Davis is currently using - a student fee at the start of each semester, and it would be optional so students could opt in or opt out of that fee, and it would be about roughly \$250. Students would be guaranteed that all their course materials will arrive by the first day of instruction. She has been talking to her friends in STEM programs and they were very excited about the thought of only paying \$250 a semester. Our students who need their books in different formats, this is huge for them, because there's nothing more frustrating than looking at your course materials, seeing that there are none the first day of class or being told to buy this book on Amazon, we're going to read it next week and they can't read it next week because they need that book in Braille or they need text to speech or whatever the situation is. This would be a great way to mitigate a lot of the issues that we're seeing on course materials right now.

Next week we're obviously going back on campus with students who are super excited. Some of them are nervous. For some of them, this is their second year at Sonoma State and it will be their first time in the classroom. She wanted to making sure that everybody recognizes that because there's so many little things that are often overlooked when it's your first time at college. Little things like - do I raise my hand to use the bathroom in 100 person lecture hall. Let's make sure that we're meeting our students with compassion or being friendly, walking around campus with a smile on our face is always a great way to welcome our students.

A member said thank you so much, especially a reminder to be considerate and compassionate about those students who are not familiar with being on campus and physically in class. She had two questions. One, she didn't understand how this optional student fee of \$250 would work. How will that help the bookstore to make sure that the materials will be there in time? The other one is related to housing. SSU is one of the most expensive places and it deters a lot of students to come here because of the high housing costs. Are there ways that those costs can be lowered?

C. Gomez said as far as the bookstore orders, one of the critical things that's going to have to happen and it's going to be a collaboration between academics and the bookstore and all these different entities, is making sure that faculty are able to order their books on time, and one of the other things that they're doing through this program is bulk buying which brings the cost of the materials down, especially when we look at our STEM students and they'll be able to deliver these all electronically as well, so soon as a faculty member puts in the book they need, it's no longer that the bookstore is waiting for shipments. That's another issue, even for our faculty who do what they are supposed to do, and they're not seeing the books on the shelves. We will be working together. For people like myself who is a history major, and never spends that much on books, we will opt out of that fee, but all the books will be ordered already. As far as the housing prices go, there is a lot of debt surrounding housing, right now, so she would hope there's a way to get it down, but she has no idea.

The Chair asked on the book question, her question was to Neil Markley, if we're leveraging bulk buying what's the magic number, how many students need to opt in? If students do have the ability to opt out, where's that balance between being able to cover all the students? What if X number decide not to? Her students always seem to be able to find stuff online and get full copies of their books and then they share it with each other. It is an interesting idea and if it could solve a lot of problems, her students would be all over it. That's her understanding of how it works, but N. Markley didn't have answers about the numbers and that's the one thing that concerns her.

A member said those students who do put in that money, they wouldn't have a guarantee if a faculty member didn't put in the book orders on time, for example, so there would have to be thought about, do they get a refund or what would happen in those cases.

C. Gomez said she thought what N. Markley is really trying to work towards is making sure that the book orders do get placed on time. Obviously there's some circumstances where a faculty member will join late, but the whole point is even if a faculty member joins late and finds out about a class the week before school, as soon as the books are ordered, it'll be instantly available to those students in the online format. Justin who is our Vice President of Finance is also very interested in the numbers aspect. As far as the housing goes, it's about \$13,000 a year for first years with the meal plans. Another thing about the book orders is making sure that they're ordered on time, it's really important.

The Chair noted that L. Monje-Paulson put the housing costs in the chat: Here are the rates for on-campus housing: <http://housing.sonoma.edu/housing-rates/fall-2021-spring-2022-rates>

M. Ahmed commented on the housing costs. The current rate is not increasing because of the difficulties people are facing. Eventually, even though we know that with inflation, the cost of everything is going up, they also, a number of years ago, instituted a program where a person can be grandfathered into the rate that you sign up for. If you sign up in one year, you continue to pay the same regardless of what happened to the market condition. This is information that's good to know. Not very many CSUs are we doing this, so at least here Housing is trying to do all that and that is a good thing. He asked if the Ex Com would like N. Markley to visit to answer questions.

The Chair said we definitely have time on our next agenda as of now and he probably could explain things. The only major way she had seen housing costs go down is when housing had triples and the then Vice President of Administration and Finance was really surprised that those were the first ones to get filled. He didn't realize that it really did make a big difference in cost, so she didn't know if that's possible again or not.

C. Gomez said she thought a lot of students do pick whatever the cheapest housing option is, which is obviously the best for their financial situation, but we do also have this issue going on campus depending where you live. It's almost like there is "segregation" on campus and there's certain villages known as not being the nice ones. It creates these social networks of certain students who live in these communities, and it does restrict some of our lower income students from being able to have social relationships with some of these students, which is something that we don't always think about, but it's happening here on our campus. Obviously it goes into a lot of our students of color living in certain communities as well, and not being around other students.

In the Chat: We should have "classless" housing.

Yes, we hardly ever talk about class in the DEI realm and we need to.

Yes, we need to add class into the DEI conversations.

The Chair said thank you for reminding us of that because you know Verdot is called "Ver-ghetto." For a while she was proposing random assignments, everyone pays a flat rate for housing and then people by lottery get into different housing, but

people said folks would lose their minds, or something. She agreed there is that segregation, it does replicate what we would not want to replicate.

A member said going back to my background in Japan, everyone has to wear uniforms at school, so you can't tell who the rich kids are, you can't even wear jewelry and you can't wear expensive watches, and you can't wear expensive shoes. We should have equity here and we shouldn't be able to distinguish between the rich kids in the markets or by work or which door.

The Chair said one possibility she was talking to the previous AVP about were to try to make housing equitable, so that we don't reproduce the inequities in society.

M. Ahmed said it maybe a little premature, but we are working on this in the CSU. The Governor has put out that any campus that gets affordable housing funding, that we make no distinction between which one has a grant and which one does not, everybody gets the same access and we are working to see if we can partner with them and get some help.

L. Monje-Paulson said these are conversations that are happening in Student Affairs and in Admin and Finance and the answer isn't easy, but every opportunity we have to make steps toward positive change, we do. There's the need for some real infrastructure change and that's obviously requires a lot more conversation and action. Many of us would agree with the sentiments that have been shared here today as well.

Proposal for the Senate meeting to remain virtual indefinitely - L. Holmstrom-Keyes, L. Morimoto

L. Morimoto said L. Holmstrom-Keyes wrote up the rationale for moving Senate indefinitely online, and this went to Structure and Functions, who approved it and said, it to be revisited when Stevenson Hall reopens and we allegedly have our own Senate space conference room.

L. Holmstrom-Keyes said the first few points are about how the space issue on campus - how we asked for space for the Senate for years and years, and never got that in the Stevenson remodel. All Faculty Governance committees, except the Senate, will be able to meet in the conference room in the new remodel. The students have made it extremely clear that they do not want us in the Student Center building. We get bumped out of it all the time and there are lots of issues with that building and having our meeting there. The last point, number six describes all the

positive things that can happen if we keep the Senate virtual. People can hear, they can see the presentations, we don't have as many disruptions, we have so many more guests. This needs some serious discussion because there are accessibility issues here too. If people need a transcript, they have that with Zoom, they can hear and we've always had this problem of not being able to hear in the Ballrooms and that's a real problem. Also, some people have told her over the years, they only came to campus for this meeting. That's a sustainability issue. People don't need to be on the road and drive if they if that's the only reason they need to be on campus. She hoped the Ex Com would discuss this seriously and send it to the Senate for them to discuss it as well, S&F approved it, but they want the Senate to vote on it.

A member said this is interesting because several committees he is on have decided to go virtual. The Math scheduling committee finds it much easier to be able to share screens and to share in work in Google docs simultaneously when we're scheduling and so on. We find that, even if we could meet in person, we'd probably all rather be on our own computer so, that's going to go virtual. There's some other committees he is on that are small. He worried a little about the Senate, and said we'd have to set up some rules for chat. If he was Chair there'd be no chat, except when he asked someone to put something in chat because we needed them to write down their motion or something. That would be the only time. He suspected, fully half the people are multitasking at the Senate, because their computers right in front of them, they've got their email, they've got their web browsing, etc. Of course, some people brought their laptops to the Senate and maybe were doing those things there too. But they are a little bit embarrassed to be doing that in front of everyone else. We had a previous Provost that used to send emails during the Senate. We'd have to have some rules and we lose all the talking to each other, before and after. Maybe we could have a hybrid meeting, where we have a physical meeting space and everyone goes there with a laptop. The meeting is actually conducted by Zoom, so people that can't make it are there, virtually by Zoom and but at least those who are on campus at that time and can all get together in one space and they can do their talking before and after. A lot of stuff got done in that way.

The Statewide Senator said this has been a topic in the ASCSU - the chat issue and we've been working out a few different things. One of the things is the Faculty Affairs committee is going to be talking about adding a point of order for if somebody says something that's exclusionary. Could we have a point of interruption or can we just note that something was done there with language. The rules of chat are for the text of an amendment to the resolution and things like that, but really minimizing it. One of the other things that's harder to see is whether they're allowing point to point communication. If we do continue indefinitely, it would be great for us to look at

chat rules and other kinds of Zoom rules we've been seeing at some of the other Senates, because some of us have been working out some parts of it and that we wouldn't be starting from scratch.

A member said this is probably ready to go to Senate. This could be an interesting discussion on the floor of the Senate. It's ready to go so.

The Chair said she was going to take that as a motion that we move this to Senate and put it on the agenda. **Second. Vote - Yes = 8, No = 0.**

The Chair said L. Holmstrom-Keyes put some points in her proposal and thought that we would address some of those points, not just our opinions when we bring it to the Senate. Our opinions are valuable, of course, but she did make some very specific rationales, and we should address those when we take it to the Senate.

A member wondered why we can't use the Cooperage. The Senate Analyst said it's never available. It's not available on a consistent basis as we need for the Senate.

L. Morimoto said for the Student Center we're second priority. It's paid for with student fees. In every building, actually, student sponsored things have priority.

A member said but the university has a commitment to give us space. The Chair said they have a lot of commitments.

J. Sakaki said let us take it back and see. The Provost and VP of A&F and herself are committed to see what kind of space we can come up with. She was sure that we can find some space for the Senate meetings.

L. Morimoto said it's going to the Senate and other people might have other ideas. We haven't decided for Ex Com if we would like to be virtual or in person. Maybe it could be done separately, but it seems to me that if the Senate decided they wanted to go virtual for consistency, we probably might do the same. We don't need to take that to Senate, obviously, so she wanted to see where people are at.

A member said students vote on fees, but it's really a fee that's going to have to be paid by students who aren't there. For example, if we are going to build a Rec Center and the students who come in the next five years are going to pay for it and they had no say in it. The current Senators are going to decide what the format is going to be indefinitely. Whoever is going to run for Senate is going to be bound by what this current Senate decides. He thought this should be put to a vote of the whole

faculty. He didn't think this belongs to this Senate. He thought every faculty member has a say in this question.

L. Morimoto said indefinitely doesn't mean forever, it means we revisit. Indefinite means not a set time. The Senate Analyst said she has asked all the committee chairs to decide how their committees want to meet next year because she has to schedule soon. It doesn't matter to her what the Executive Committee wants to do. Her proposal is only for the Senate.

A member said one thing that is really important is that when people are deciding whether to run for offices or committees, they need to know what they're getting themselves into. The Senate has to plan for next year's meeting modality. What's going to prevail for next year, even if it doesn't go further than that is time sensitive.

A member said couldn't this proposal just be for the Academic Senate meetings to remain virtual next year. Can a motion be made that we change it the proposal for the Academic Senate meetings to remain virtual next academic year? **That's my motion.**

It was noted that the Ex Com had already approved the proposal to be on the Senate agenda.

**Motion to reconsider the decision to put the proposal on the Senate agenda.
Second.**

A member said it's fine as a proposal. It is ready to go, we can have this whole conversation at Senate, because it should be raised, one way or the other anyway. Then we can get the input there. We need do not need to do any more. It's well enough formed and we can have the conversation there.

The mover to reconsider said his proposal is for "the Academic Senate meetings to remain virtual indefinitely" and replace the word and "indefinitely" with "for the 2022-23 academic year." A discussion of process ensued.

The Chair asked the voters to vote on whether to change the title of the document to proposal for Senate meetings to be virtual for the 22-23 Academic year. Vote Yes = 5, No = 4. Approved.

Potential Letter regarding support for flexibility for staff

L. Morimoto said a potential letter to support the staff to have an option for there to be more consideration with telecommuting was on the agenda, and she would like to revisit it because we just changed our distinction of being able to say our modality changed for fall and that faculty have the option of extending the tags. For the letter, she would like to postpone that because she wanted to make sure it reflects what the new policy actually says about our options and then reflect the choices in that extended temporary tags for faculty, if that should somehow be reflected in what the staff are being asked. If there is no objection, she would like to **defer** that. **No objection.**

Continued discussion - Staff and ERFSA members on Ex Com

L. Morimoto said staff are fine being standing guests to Ex Com. Only ERFSA said that they would like a voting seat on Ex Com and they would also like a voting seat on certain committees. They have tagged FSAC and EPC where they believe they should have a voting seat. The proposal being brought forward will be that ERFSA along with keeping their voting seat on the Senate, will get a voting seen on the Ex Com and voting on other committees that they deem of interest and relevance to them, but so far they specified FSAC and Ex Com. Richard Whitkus has pointed out, and shared information about how this will require a change in the Constitution. Before we actually get there, she wanted to get a sense of where people are landing on this or whether folks have a take on whether we want to increase the membership of Ex Com.

A member said this is such a hard thing because we just tried to streamline Senate not that long ago. There isn't a staff person on Ex Com at the moment, and she did think there should be. It makes sense to have people who are currently employed at the university and if they're in a relevant group that is impacted by what we do. She loved her retired colleagues, but didn't think that it makes sense for them to be on all these other committees as voting members. She did not mean any disrespect by it, she thought that the university is owned by the current employees and staff and faculty who are living with the challenges that they have at that moment.

L. Morimoto said she didn't think anyone took it as disrespect because it's a legitimate position to have. Membership should be representing bodies that must live with the decisions made. It seems like there is some concern about the voting aspect on this particular committee.

A member said one thing to consider is he still needed to know why would ERFSA, which already is a voting member of the Senate, need to be sitting here. Ex Com

doesn't do anything other than approve what goes to the Senate and where the rubber meets the road is in the Senate. Therefore, they have a strong voice, like most other representatives at the Senate to vote on actions. We don't do any action here we just say, is it ready to come to the Senate. Why would we need to go through a constitutional change to allow someone another entity to sit here when they already have a voting seat on the Senate? That just does not make a lot of sense.

The Vice Chair said he would voice ERFSA's opinion which is they would act as gatekeepers, at least, to help prevent issues from coming forward, and also just because they are retired does not mean they are not active at the University, in fact, they do a lot of things for University. We are going to be retired one day, so how we treat them could happen to us one day.

The Chair said she was glad to throw this out to get us started thinking about it because the Vice Chair will bring this to our next Ex Com. We should try to move relatively quickly because they have tried to get it on S&F's agenda for last semester, but we just were dealing with other things.

Senate Agenda

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – L. Morimoto

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Business:

1. From EPC: Early Childhood Studies BA - Second Reading - E. Asencio
2. From EPC: Education Minor - Second Reading - E. Asencio
3. From EPC: Discontinuation Early Childhood Education Certificate - Second Reading - E. Asencio
4. From EPC: Discontinuation Concentration in Early Childhood MA
5. Proposal for Senate meeting to remain virtual AY 22-23- First Reading - L. Holmstrom-Keyes, L. Morimoto

Approved.

Adjourned.

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