

Executive Committee Minutes

August 19, 2021

Via Zoom

Abstract

Agenda amended and Approved. Minutes of 5/13/2021 Approved. Chair Report. President Report. Proposal for Leadership Development course for faculty governance. Provost Report. Statewide Senator Report. Resolution of No Confidence in Library Dean – approved as an information item to the Senate. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Vice President for Student Affairs Report. Associated Students Report. FSAC Report. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – Approved for Senate consent calendar. Resolution Endorsing Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History – Approved for the Senate Agenda. Faculty Governance Release Time 21-22 discussion. Senate Agenda approved.

Present: Lauren Morimoto, Bryan Burton, Emily Clark, Richard Senghas, Emily Acosta Lewis, Emily Asencio, Richard Whitkus, Karen Thompson, Sam Brannen, Judy Sakaki, Karen Moranski, Stan Nosek, Wm. Gregory Sawyer

Absent: Michael Grobbel, Erma Jean Sims

Guests: Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Wendy Ostroff, Rita Premo, Hilary Smith, Catherine Fonseca, Laura Krier

Approval of Agenda – item added: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – **Approved.**

Approval of Minutes of 5/13/2021 – **Approved.**

Chair Report – L. Morimoto

L. Morimoto thanked the Ex Com for approving the posthumous certificate for Hugo Ramirez over the summer. It was a horrible thing to happen and whatever comfort that can give his family is wonderful. Thank you all for responding in summer, so that we could get that passed. On our business schedule, we only have seven meetings this year, both fall and spring due to the holidays falling on Thursdays, so committee chairs should keep this in mind when moving business forward. We're operating with one less meeting. She welcomed everyone to the first Ex Com. She noted we have a few new people, besides herself. Brian Burton is returning as Vice Chair. Emily Clark is joining as Secretary. Emily Acosta Lewis, (who will we will refer to as EAL), is joining us as APARC chair. Richard Whitkus is joining us as FSAC chair. Karen Thompson as SAC chair. Sam Brannen and Michael Grobbel are At-large members from the Senate. We, of course have, Karen Moranski as our new Provost. Stan Nosek as the interim VP of A&F and then we have a new Student Senator, who asked me to introduce her. She can't be here because of classes. We do have three Emily's on Ex Com, this year. We have Emily Clark, Emily Acosta Lewis and Emily Asencio, so just keep that in mind when you're

saying Emily that you need to specify which to be clear for the minutes. She did not have any more for the Chairs report. She was happy to have everyone in attendance. We have a full agenda, surprisingly, for the first meeting. She said she would reserve the time for that business and get on to the next part of the agenda, which is the report from Dr. Sakaki and then we'll see where we are at for the time certain before we go on to the Provost.

President Report – J. Sakaki

J. Sakaki said it was great to be here. She thanked everyone for participating in Convocation. It was good to see those of you who came in person and to be back on campus in the way we are. It's been a long 17 months. Thank you for all the work and for being there for the complicated times we are in. Regarding our vaccine policy, she reminded folks that masking is required everywhere indoors and that September 30th is the implementation date for the vaccine requirement. We are hoping that everyone that's on campus right now, has been vaccinated. We have been offering COVID testing as well on campus. The Continuity group that has been working throughout the last 17 months will continue. We do have Senate representation with changes in leadership. Faculty are represented, staff as well as students on that group and we will be hearing from them as we move forward and planning for our next steps during this ongoing pandemic. Chancellor Castro is continuing his campus visits in the California State University system. He will be visiting our campus at the end of September. He and his office provides us with who he would like to meet with, what he hopes his day will be like, and then we have an opportunity to give some input into that, so that is being planned right now. She had no doubt that one of the items will be meeting with Senate leadership. She discussed move in day for the students. There was so much joy. She said many parents and families and grandparents and students were so thankful and grateful. Many of the the parents said to her - "our student didn't have a senior year. When they graduated from high school, they had no activities, they had no classes and we are so ready to be back and we appreciate everything that your faculty and staff are doing to ensure that things are safe and we just can't thank you enough." We took lots of pictures. We had a Sonoma State University backdrop and people wanted their pictures taken and they wanted to post them and the vibe was very positive. Today, just walking around on campus, students still remember and say "Oh, can I have a selfie?" and they want to take selfies. We're doing them safely, we're not pressing our cheeks against each other. She saw students that said "Oh, I can't wait, this is my first in person class and I'm so excited to meet my faculty and get back" and she wanted to say, on behalf of the students and families that they are really appreciating the campus and all of you and the classes that are being held in person.

There were many people still working on campus and many of those were in our corporation yard, where the painters, the electricians and landscapers check in. They felt that, while we were away, they were the stewards of our campus, that it was their responsibility to make sure that everything kept running. She told them they have been the heart of the campus. We sometimes take these folks for granted, but they are working very hard and their love of the campus was so heartfelt. So many of them said they have been here 18 years, 20 years, and felt honored to be able to help keep this campus going.

A member said he appreciated the statements L. Morimoto and the President gave at Convocation. Both hit on a lot of important things, and it was very nice. He loved how L. Morimoto played with the genre thing, because even though she said she wasn't going to do the genre, she did it anyway. Discourse analysis! Seriously, he thought it was an important message for us, and it was helpful to hear it from both of you, thank you.

The Chair asked to defer any more comments or questions until after the first time certain. She said she is a casual person and if people ok with being casual in the Ex Com, she would prefer not to use people's titles.

Proposal for Leadership Development course for faculty governance – L. Holmstrom-Keyes

L. Holmstrom-Keyes appreciated the Ex Com for considering this proposal for a faculty development course. She hoped everyone had time to read the proposal. She had been thinking about this for a long time, and finally got an idea about how to do it. She hoped the Ex Com could provide feedback on this proposal and let her know if this is something the Ex Com wants her to explore and move ahead with. She also wanted to know whether the Ex Com would like this to go to the Senate to get their feedback.

A member said she thought this was a great idea. She thought Laurel and herself had a conversation about this about a decade ago. It is something that's needed and it's great if it can be something that's a pre-packaged online course that people can access on their own time. Also, the idea of a mentorship option sounds good. It's nice to have someone else who can guide you through all of the intricacies of what the Senate is.

A member said he also agreed. It is a good proposal and getting that experience and mentoring would be good to keep developing.

A member asked in terms of the Canvas page, who would be monitoring the Canvas page to sign in. L. Holmstrom-Keyes said she would do that because she thought the course should live in the Senate office. She has developed a course and she can get feedback from people. She can put up the modules and then put it out to people and get feedback. She thought it should live in the Senate office so that it does get monitored. It does keep getting pushed out, it does keep getting updated. She didn't think we should give that to a committee, because she thought it would fall off, and it's appropriate for the Senate Office to do that. She asked if the proposal should go to the Senate. **It was decided to become an information item to the Senate.**

Return to questions for the President

A member asked if students don't get vaccinated by September 30, what are we going to do to have them get vaccinated aside from just that they have to get weekly tests? What other escalating levels of requirements might we have? Wm. G. Sawyer responded one of the things that we're doing is we're using point and click which is the program that we use out of the Student Health Center. What students have to do

is that they will have their card that is uploaded into point and click. He went through the program yesterday and saw an actual card that someone had taken a picture of. It's uploaded and so it's not just attesting to it, you actually show that you have it. In his report, he planned to let the Ex Com know that we have 4000 students who have already been vaccinated at this point. Faculty may have already seen them in class. Faculty will see that the students have to just simply show it on their phone, no matter what the device is, that they're cleared by September 30th. All of our students should be cleared at that point, or they have an exception for medical or religious reasons and they have to attest to that. They must be tested every week. Once the calendar runs out on that week they're going to get a yellow or red saying that they have not been tested for the week. They will be out of compliance or they will have to continue to go through the process of doing the testing every week. That's where we are right now. The member followed up asking if it gets to the point of registration time for the spring semester will they not be allowed to register? Wm. G. Sawyer said we're going to hopefully hear more from the Chancellor's Office in terms of what direction that we take on that. The President said there was discussion among the Presidents and in meetings this week, and there is concern. Some campuses are doing personal follow up with each student, hoping to get them to comply. Some of them are talking about disenrolling them out of courses. That's a difficult thing. We're not over enrolled. We don't want to lose more students. The goal is to get them to comply, so that we can all be safe and continue to work. She recommended right now that we pull out all stops to follow up with those students.

A member said one thing that came up today in our Council of Department Chairs meeting was a budget level item. It seems like we're trying to respond to extremely limited resources, and it was almost painful seeing the kinds of decisions that were being made. He knew that the CSU got a big chunk of money that we didn't necessarily expect that we were going to get and he didn't know how much the Presidents were working on trying to use some of that to help cushion the campuses that are actually being forced into more cuts. We still have this basic enrollment driven funding formula and it just isn't working, we need a cushion as we deal with this, so he didn't know if this is something for the President to address, or whether it should be the Provost or the CFO. The Provost said there are couple of things we are going to do. She suggested and L. Morimoto has suggested that we do a budget presentation for Senate, so that we can get a good understanding among the Senators that can be filtered out to campus regarding where we stand and what the relationship is between enrollment and budget. It's a pretty simple equation. Enrollment is budget and for us that is particularly true. We have talked with the Chancellor's Office several times this summer about how we might be able to adapt to the enrollment issues and they have suggested that we focus on marketing our campus and we're figuring out how to do that. She asked if the discussion in the Council of Department Chairs was more about sections. The member said yes, that is correct. She will update what the situation is with class sections and spring in her report. The CFO said we have been talking with the Chancellor's Office from different directions. Here's what we're hearing – "oh gosh we were understanding your situation. However, we're funding you from the CO at a FTEF 8450 or something like that and you only have 7000 or so students, so we're already giving you more than the southern campuses who are over enrolled and they're asking for more funds and you're getting more than, 'according to our current formula,' you

deserve but we're going to hang in there for a little while with you and you really need to work doing an outreach program and getting more students onto the campus." That's the message we're hearing pretty consistently. We're continuing to talk with them to question the formula, as was raised earlier, and they indicated to us that they are looking at the formula as well, but that's pretty amorphous. That's no hope from his point of view. But that's where the current situation is. We continue to talk with them and any help from the Faculty Senate to talk with your counterparts certainly can't hurt us. We're trying to come from all different directions to let them know the situation on our campus. We think that it's quite unusual that is the message we are getting. We have multiple issues which have led to the current situation. We're trying to reiterate that every time we talk to them.

Provost Report – K. Moranski

K. Moranski said she would talk about money more and potentially more money. As President Sakaki mentioned, we are continuing with continuity planning. A couple of the issues that Continuity Planning will be addressing very quickly in the academic year are the plans for spring and what that looks like. We're shooting in the dark here. We're going to have to see how things progress, but she did think that it's important that we continue to repopulate the campus, that we get more in person courses going provided the health and safety situation allows us to do that. We're going to take that up with Continuity Planning, so stay tuned for more. The second issue that Continuity is, is the continuation of the issue that we were talking about last spring, which is how we develop more services for students after hours whether digitally or in person, so that we can help boost services for our non-traditional students, for our veterans, for our master's students, for our students who are on this campus on nights and weekends and making sure that that we have a good story to tell to prospective students about our services in that regard. Those are the immediate issues for continuity. She was sure that there will be more policy decisions and more health and safety considerations as we learn more about where the pandemic is headed.

We are planning a strategic planning refresh and will be developing a strategy. She's been working closely with L. Morimoto and B. Burton and E. Clark to make that a shared governance process and will certainly confer widely as we move forward and aim to do a full conversation such as we had with the strategic plan in 2017-18. We will be taking proposals on the use of Graduation Initiative funding to our Graduation Initiative Group (GIG). We can certainly do a report for Senate if that would be something that would be of interest. Unexpectedly, after weeks of hearing that we weren't going to get any Graduation Initiative money, when the budget appeared, we had graduation initiative money! That is not a bad thing, and it is going to allow us to hire a few faculty and be able to do some things that we really need, including some Basic Needs initiatives, some CAPs work. There are a number of issues that will be addressed with Graduation Initiative funding. The process has been that we take those ideas to GIG and they review, make suggestions and perhaps make additional suggestions for funding and then we approve that and deploy the resources. We did get word just yesterday that there is also some one-time funding associated with the Graduation Initiative that, again, we have not fully developed a plan for, but one of the things that it may address is the issue of being

able to provide enough sections of courses. There is money for enrollment earmarked for Enrollment Management, and so we may be able to address some of the issues that came up at your CDC meeting. In terms of the budget, we want to do that presentation on budget to the Senate and be able to provide a complete report. Laura Lupei and Mike Ogg are going to do that presentation. They'll take it from the standpoint of the university budget and then talk in more specific detail about how that impacts academics. Keep in mind that we are dealing with a structural deficit that we still have to find a solution for. Even though this year, the HERFA funds and some judicious use of one-time money is going to help us avoid draconian cuts, but it is not just the planning for this year, but the planning for next year, that is really where we need to go with budget. She did think we can begin to address some of the course issues. We are also working on how to deploy our pre-enrollment strategies and our guided registration strategies better, particularly for upper division in transfer students because that's really where the crunch came. The problem that we encountered this summer was that deposits for transfer students were way up, but we ended up leaving people on the table, because we couldn't find seats. It behooves us to not ever let that happen, and so it means deploying some strategies and also using perhaps some one-time funding to be able to make sure that we have enough seats for spring and then for next fall.

A member asked about the numbers for graduate students and asked a second related part to the services on campus. One thing his twin brother always says is when he gets to campus nothing's open for him and he's an MBA student. That's something to take a look - what are those numbers and what services can we give to our grad students. K. Moranski said our grad numbers are right around 400 for fall, which is pretty steady for recent years, so not a lot of gain, but not a lot of loss. The real loss came with first year students. We do have a higher than normal number of transfer students, but we're still at half of our capacity with first year students. That's something that we're going to be developing specific plans to address in strategic enrollment.

L. Morimoto said it seems like for, at least her first few years at SSU, there was a real emphasis on first time freshmen, and whether or not this is true, the perception was because we needed to fill the dorms. E. Lopez was telling her at Convocation that we did leave about 200 transfer students on the table who were not able to get classes. Do you see that as a long-term strategy going forward, that we might be shifting more to try to grab the transfer market rather than the first time freshman market? K. Moranski said the short answer to that is yes. There's a longer answer that we can talk about more, but she thought that's in the face of changing demographics for high school students. We really must focus more on transfer students and we have been not operating according to the usual pattern of CSU issues by focusing so heavily on first time, first year students. We have traditionally in the CSU been focused on serving transfer students, and so we need to up our game with transfer students, in her opinion. The good news is that a number of those students like to live in the Residence Halls, not a huge number but enough that we were able to fill considerable numbers of beds, so that's it's not necessarily a killer to the beds problem to focus more on transfer students, particularly if we're able to offer competitive rates.

L. Morimoto asked Wm. G. Sawyer what discounts would be offered for housing, such as bookstore money or free parking. Does he anticipate being able to do that next fall for the incoming students or does he think this was one-time thing and we would be able to absorb the cost of it. Wm. G. Sawyer said right now, we have not had that additional discussion. It was a way, hopefully, to get folks back to campus because remember we went from 3200 down to around 500. We're really trying to say - look don't be afraid to come back and these are some of the things that we wanted to do to assist them. When students left the campus, we also had to reimburse them for the rooms and reimburse them for food, which was absolutely the right thing, but that means the coffers would be down. Because we didn't have anybody else putting money into it, those 500 students weren't really helping us. We wanted to do something to get them back. You may recall from the spring, we were trying to get to 2000. Now we're at about 1814 and the breakeven number was 1800 for food service. We're still trying. We're calling folks because not all students were following the directions. We're still cleaning up what we have for Sunday and Monday, so we'll be able to give a more accurate number later. In answer to the question, he would have to go back to the cabinet and discuss what is it that we have an appetite for, but there's not a lot when you start talking about where we are right now financially.

Statewide Senator Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that the Statewide Senate will be moving the plenary session on September 1 - 3 to virtual because of COVID. He said we have gotten our committee assignments and he will be serving on the Statewide Faculty Affairs committee. Wendy Ostroff will be serving on the Academic Affairs Committee and she'll also be on the Academic Conference Implementation committee and she'll also be working on Services to Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee. Basically, the thing he was hearing most about on the CSU channels is people comparing what's happening with the pivoting or not between remote and face to face and at what levels it's being done and how much say faculty are having, more options and even some of the labor concerns about whether fear of being at-risk warrants accommodations. We're getting different views and different interpretations from the different campuses. At this point we haven't started rolling out what's going to be the agenda, so if any folks have any topics that you would like us to bring to any of our committees or to the CSU at large, he was happy to do that. He knew he would be bringing up some of the budgeting issues, of course, because he thought it did need to be addressed with faculty input.

Resolution of No Confidence in Library Dean – L. Krier, Rita Premo, Hilary Smith, Catherine Fonseca

L. Krier said the Library faculty are bringing this resolution forward as an information item for the members of the Ex Com. She said this summer we unanimously passed a resolution of no confidence in our Dean. We did not undertake this action lightly and it came after several years of attempting to address our concerns with the Dean directly and through administrative channels at the University. The President, the Provost and our Dean, have all responded. They have responded with a proposal to bring in a library consultant to look at the

organizational issues that we raised and have made promises to develop a plan to improve communication in the library. We're open to working with the Dean, to develop a plan and to move forward, but we know the problems in the library go beyond communication issues and differences of opinion. Any plan that is developed will need to address the climate of mistrust and fear that has been developing over the last six years. We are not bringing this to the Ex Com with a specific request for action at this time. We know this is an unusual situation with very little precedent. We were aware of one similar resolution from the library at Sacramento State several years ago. In that instance their Senate issued a statement of support. Rather than come with a specific request for that, we thought it would be more fruitful to have a conversation about what an appropriate response might be from governance and what the role of shared governance might be in something like this. If, at this time, you choose not to take any action while we wait to see what happens, that is also fine. We just wanted to alert the campus community that this is happening in the library.

A member said it seems like we could bring it to the Senate as a recommendation or a suggestion that we have a select investigative committee, like the US Senate does because we certainly can't just take one sides word for it. We could have an investigation and we could have a Select Committee that would do that and we could have a report.

L. Krier said one of the recommendations of the President and Provost was to bring in a consultant to do something like that, and what we requested back to the President was that the Faculty be allowed to be part of choosing the who that consultant would be.

The member said we're an independent body and the US Senate has their own investigations and we could have ours. The Chair asked if such an investigative committee had ever been formed by the Senate. The member said he didn't think so, but he was excited by the prospect. The Chair asked for other comments from the Library faculty.

H. Smith said she would speak briefly to the resolution. She echoed what L. Krier said that we did not come to this lightly. We have spent over a year considering this action and only after we had exhausted every other reasonable avenue open to us, did we move forward. The resolution lays out some specific concrete issues. But it doesn't fully encompass the tremendous damage and harm that has been done to the faculty in the library because of this ongoing situation, so she wanted to emphasize that that is something that needs to be addressed in any process that moves forward and certainly when the university is talking about a community of care. When the university is talking about inclusivity and equity, being able to take a critical look at some of the structures that are creating these issues, is going to be important, and very painful as well, but she hoped that this can be the start of taking a more critical look at some of the structures in place.

The Vice Chair asked how do we prevent these things from happening? That's to be the goal for faculty governance, at least in his point of view. L. Krier thought that there were also meant to be administrative structures that prevent these things,

review processes that she didn't think have worked very effectively in the past, such as the Periodic Evaluation of Administrators policy. When a 360 evaluation of our Dean did happen, no faculty were selected for it, and she handpicked everyone to be on it. There are processes that have not worked the way they were intended to work to prevent this kind of situation.

The Chair said she echoed what L. Krier was saying about the administrative piece. When she was on the Athletic Advisory Council, some member had raised the question of the Athletic Directors or Senior Director and shouldn't there be a review process, and at that point, it was shut down. She didn't think that position has ever actually been reviewed in the time that she sat on that committee. But she also has the thought that reviews are a waste of time and energy if nothing happens from them. If we're doing it we need to make sure it is done with an eye of actually trying to address some of the inequities or the problems or the structural flaws and such. This is a chance to take a critical look at how we go about the business of reviews and see if there isn't a way to address some of the issues that you've brought up in your document.

A member noted there are six signatures on the resolution. She was wondering how many faculty are there in the library to get a feel for the percentage who signed it. L. Krier said there are seven and the one person who did not sign is currently on maternity leave. The Chair said all the library faculty are open to the Ex Com figuring out what might be an appropriate governance response. She was interested in people's take on that because she didn't know if there is a response that governance usually makes in response to these votes of no confidence. From her perspective she hoped that whatever action the faculty governance takes is supportive and useful.

The Provost thought that that there's a shared governance moment in this situation in terms of looking at our policy around review of administrators. One of the things that we deal with a lot on our campuses is that we have policies that lay dormant and that don't get fully activated or deployed or are enforced. It's a shared governance opportunity to figure out how this could work more effectively, given that we do have policies. Then how do we make sure that process follows policy. She thought it was a good opportunity in response to this kind of situation.

The Chair said if we discuss this a bit more, then we may think of some things that we could do. Would it be kosher to bring the Library folks back here to discuss with them if they would like us to take it to Senate or what they would like us to do. We'd like to be able to do something like to take advantage of this moment, to make sure we have a chance to set the course right. The Library faculty appreciated the chance to talk to the Ex Com.

A member said he wanted the Ex Com to think a moment. Either we want the administration to investigate this and select some faculty members to be on their committee or maybe we want to do it the other way around, and have our committee investigate and invite some administrators to be on our committee or maybe have a bipartisan committee. But sometimes it doesn't feel that shared governance is truly shared. Consultation is not shared. True shared governance

includes decision making, before the consultation and not informing people after the decisions are made. He thought it would be more *shared* governance if it was a bilateral Senate Commission that had administrators on it. We could always broach this with the Senate and see what the Senate thinks also, but he would like to hear what Ex Com members think about such a Commission. We don't usually do it, and he thought it behooves us not to accept the faculty position without doing our own investigation. It makes us seem much more neutral, if we do that. A member said she liked that idea and thought it should go to the Senate in some way.

The Senate Analyst pointed out that we do have provisions to create ad hoc committees which is pretty easy to do and the Chair has a lot of authority over who's on an ad hoc committee and usually ad hoc committees have a set time period. We might look at that language and see if that fits this need.

The Provost said she thought we ought to work together to see how we can use an external consultant. It may be that the consultant could get a variety of points of view from not only the Librarians and the Dean and people who work in the library, but also from other constituencies and that by having a neutral party could be a real benefit. We can work with faculty governance and we'll work with Librarians and the Dean, to ensure that there's lots of participation and communication. She worried a little bit about a Senate Commission because she was not sure that it would help us obtain an objective perspective on the issue. She realized the good intent, but she thought in cases that are particularly contentious, it's helpful to have an external perspective. A consultant who we can mutually agree on might be a better way to ensure objectivity on this.

A member said one thing that might be worth doing is referring this to FSAC because it does seem to be very much about faculty relationships.

L. Krier said we are not necessarily looking for an investigation from any party because we're not really proposing that there's something that needs to be investigated. The purpose of our no confidence resolution was just to say exactly that we don't have confidence in the leadership of this person and investigating it isn't really going to change that. She was not even sure what that would accomplish or be what the goal of something like that would be. Either there are steps that are can be taken to improve the relationship and to build trust or there can't be. Investigating something would not be a thing that would help build trust in a situation where it may or may not be possible.

A member said this is a tough one. She teaches Human Resources and thought there might be some HR legal issues associated with some kind of an investigative committee. It's probably a good idea to have someone external to do the review or the investigation. From a structural standpoint, it sounds like it's more administration HR and maybe there are some things along the way that that didn't happen the way they should have over time with previous complaints, but now it's been brought to this level. Of those things could be addressed with this external body that comes in and looks at it, whether it's a consultant or whoever else on campus, the new HR person, or whoever does this thing, there are a lot of the legal issues and risk to the university that could come from an inappropriate action.

A member said he wanted to avoid what happened last year when issues with another Dean were brought before the Senate which was incomplete and, in one case at least, misinformation was given or incorrect information was given to the Senate, and then the Senate went ahead and endorsed the opinion of faculty just based on their word, which to him seemed unprofessional and biased. He didn't doubt the Library faculty, but these are very serious accusations they're bringing that should concern all faculty. He thought the Senate should investigate it and if they find that if they agree with the Library faculty, then they should make a statement. He said we have no authority to punish anyone, but we can certainly agree with the library faculty that the actions of the Dean were outside of the norm or outside of ethical practices or whatever we want to say, and we certainly have the authority to do that and he didn't think that was a problem.

The Vice Chair said let's say a consultant comes in and says whatever they have to say, then his question was: what actually happens? One of the concerns of the library was that something actually concrete happen. He did understand the legal issues and all, but that'd be nice to know. H. Smith said she appreciated all the attention the Ex Com was giving to this issue and she acknowledged that we have sent you a pickle here when we brought this thing forward. It isn't well defined and we're not even quite sure what we want from it, or what could come from it, and she agreed that the Ex Com can't just take our word for it, but what she would ask is that the Ex Com is at least mindful of the fact that the Library faculty has been working on this through every possible channel for five years through meetings with the Dean, through bringing in Faculty Affairs, through bringing in a mediator, through bringing in our current Provost and at each of those junctures the burden to demonstrate that harm or problems were happening has always fallen on the library faculty. That is a heavy burden to have to continually demonstrate harm over and over again, so she understood the quandary that the Ex Com is in, but she asked everyone to note that this situation has led to us losing almost all of our faculty at one point and the loss of 23 people from the Library. Do what you must do, but be mindful of the burden that we have already carried. The Chair said thank you for reminding us of that because we don't want to have to keep putting you through this process.

The Provost said she wanted to address the question of what could come of having a consultant and there are two things we can do. One is to ask the parties what they hope to get out of such a process, so asking the librarians what they're hoping for, asking the Dean what she would hope for, asking other constituencies and then developing a specific action plan. We can put that burden on the consultant to make recommendations about specific actions, because she did agree that we need to resolve this, we need to improve and we can't keep spinning. It's really important that we have action steps.

The Senate Analyst said she noticed in the resolution that the American Library Association is indicated, and she wondered if they have any processes or procedures for this kind of situation. She knew that the AAUP censured one of our past Presidents - this is a long time ago. She was not suggesting censure, but they had a

process to do something and was wondering if there was any help for the librarians there.

The Chair said this should go to the Senate, at the very least, as an informational item, but maybe we're not ready there to take it there, even as an informational item. A member said they had the vote of no confidence. It's information. We should pass on the information. It's not something we should hide. **It was decided to make it an information item for the Senate.**

Vice Chair Report – B. Burton

No report.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – S. Nosek

S. Nosek gave a brief overview of the budget: from a State budget perspective, the operating budget we have is about \$147 million in expenses with this current year in 21-22. We have about \$130 million, so we're looking at about \$11 million deficit for this current year. We are looking at one time monies this year to deal with that. We have \$7 million approximately, so that takes a big chunk of it out, but again that's one-time funds. We're working to identify the other \$4 million or so, but we will solve that for this year. We'll have that same problem for next year, so that's what we have to really make very clear in all of our discussions for the budget. We're dealing with a problem this year with one-time monies and we have to figure out as a community how we're going to deal with a bigger problem coming up. That was the main point he wanted to make. You'll get clear numbers from L. Lupei and M. Ogg when they give the presentation to the Senate, but that's what we're dealing with now. That's the big picture.

Vice President for Student Affairs Report – Wm. Gregory Sawyer

Wm. G. Sawyer said, in addition to what he already reported, testing will be done in the gym which is in the Rec Center and that means that the students who are not vaccinated are going to be tested on a weekly basis until we get to the point where we have everyone completely vaccinated or the we have the exceptions on record.

Associated Students Report – C. Gomez given by L. Morimoto

L Morimoto said unfortunately this meeting happens when the AS Senator and Associated Students EVP Christina Gomez who would normally sit on this committee have classes. We are going to try to work with them to set some time certain so that one of them may pop in from time to time and give their perspective. She sent a statement and asked her to read it.

“Hello, I first want to start off by introducing myself. My name is Christina Gomez, I am a fourth-year history major with a minor in Chicano Studies and I am the executive vice president of the associated students this year. Unfortunately, my senior seminar class is at the same time as this meeting. In the future I will have a designee come to give my report and I will try to hop on as much as possible

throughout the semester if my class ends early. For my report I would like to start off by letting you all know what the Associated students are up to starting with Lobos pantry which will have its soft opening this week. The pantry hours this semester are Mondays 2-4, Tuesdays 10-1 and Thursdays 4-6. ASP will be hosting many events throughout the year both online and in person. Lil' Big Nite will be next Friday at 4pm. The AS senate will be starting their meetings in two weeks and we are very excited to get to work. Some of my goals for the year will be to see how we can better serve our students to make sure they have access to their course materials and the best quality of education possible. I am also excited to see how we can shift instruction back to in person and ensure for the classes that stay online they are of equal quality to what would occur in our physical classrooms on campus. I am eager to get started and excited to have the opportunity to be in this position. I am always open to having meetings with our faculty and staff on campus to answer any questions you may have or if you are curious about what students think regarding a multitude of things. You can reach me via email at executiv@sonoma.edu Thank you all!"

APARC Report – E. Acosta Lewis

APARC has not met yet.

EPC Report – E. Asencio

EPC has not met yet.

FSAC Report – R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus said after the first day of instruction, criteria and procedures shall be made available to faculty for the purposes of reappointment, tenure, and promotion is paraphrasing CBA 15.3. Our new university RTP policy that was passed in April 24, 2021 is still not up and posted on the polices website. We were in day 1 of the 14-day countdown. He noted that several attempts to request this were made in July and August to both Faculty Affairs, the Provost office, and the Senate office and in each case he asked, if there's anything he could do to help push the process along, please let him know. This is the next step. He wanted this to be officially in the record.

Question for EPC about temporary tags on courses.

E. Asencio said we do have a temporary authorization for online through spring 2022. She was not sure if we send continue that to summer or not. As far as any permanent changes, those would need to go through a review as any modality change would, but as far as next semester goes, those are already clear through EPC.

The Provost responded to the FSAC report. She was baffled and has taken this forward multiple times, so we will find out what's going on about the RTP policy and we will get it up immediately.

SAC Report – K. Thompson

K. Thompson said SAC's first meeting isn't until September 1, so she didn't have a report today. We're still constituting the people on the committee.

Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status

The list of faculty for emeritus status was approved as consent for the Senate Agenda.

Resolution Endorsing Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History – L. Morimoto

L. Morimoto said she was asking that the Ex Com put before Senate this resolution to support the statement opposing the dismantling of the teaching of history. Is there any question or objection to putting this on the Senate agenda?

A member said he wanted to talk about procedure. In terms of the signatories to this he did not see any other campus or university. He saw national organizations and, since this is a national issue, it's understandable that they would be the ones fighting for this. He did not see any State campus, nor any other CSU campus and nor is this actually something that's being put forward by the CSU Academic Senate. The question is, is this the place for this to come from, that is from Sonoma State versus working with maybe the Academic Senate of the CSU first. And second even so, we would then be the only state that would have a campus or a university in support of this. As a state, we don't represent the nation. All of these other signatories do represent national interest. This is a national interest, understandably, and very important one. It just seems procedurally we're kind of out of our lane.

L. Morimoto said she thought it may be because she talked more about her personal take on it instead of the resolution itself and the resolution is to ask the President to support this or our Senate calling on Senators and President Sakaki to endorse the statement, not necessarily a sign on, but endorse it and to ask Chancellor Castro to endorse it. The resolution isn't necessarily for the Senate to have signatories on it, but that we kick it up the food chain and ask the President and the Chancellor to support this statement. The Statewide Senator said he would bring it to the attention of the Statewide Senate.

A member said he was confused because it doesn't sound like we're being asked to become signatories to this. He was not sure that we would even be allowed to be. This is their joint statement. We are just being asked to endorse this statement. He don't think our names are ever going to appear on this list. It's ready to go to the Senate. We endorse all kinds of things. **It was approved for the Senate agenda.**

Faculty Governance Release Time 21-22

L. Morimoto said the last agenda item is about the distribution of units to the faculty governance for release time. She shared via Zoom the current distribution of units for faculty governance and the Provost office provides 60 units and this year, she has

once again through her office provided extra funds to give the GE chair two units of release time. L. Morimoto will be speaking to Mike Ogg further about this topic. There are longer range issues to talk about such as units versus courses, because our governance had recommended that, instead of saying X number of units, it would be X number of courses and she understood that units are more precise, for reasons of budgeting. But there's a difference between possibly units and courses, so as she was trying to parse this it out and figure out how she could redistribute or suggest redistributing, she wasn't quite sure about whether to go with classes or units. The Senate Analyst has asked Structure and Functions to initiate a process to see if we could quantify workload somehow between the different committee chairs because right now, it is subjective. This isn't saying that nobody deserves it, but rather to think about how can we encourage people to be involved in governance by giving them the release they need for the amount of work they have to engage in to do that governance.

A member said back in 2006, we did change our recommendation to always recommend courses, instead of units, because of the complexity involved with some departments having only four-unit courses or some departments having mostly three-unit courses and so on, and again this is always a recommendation to the Provost. His recommendation was that we continue to ask for courses. The Provost's Office can counter if they think that doesn't work for them, but he thought courses makes more sense. The wisdom back in 2006 is still holds.

A member said units are the coin of the realm. We all are judged on our WTUs. We do no counts courses at all here. To fill out a FAD, we actually complete how many WTUs we have in our total faculty workload. We don't care if that's one course or 20 courses, you've got to get to 12 units. What we need to do is keep this as units and then the Ex Com can make a recommendation to a maximum number of courses.

K. Moranski said she agreed with the notion that WTUs are a better way of measuring this. The problem is that in different schools, and for different faculty, three- and four-unit courses are the norm and so, if we give a faculty member course release, then, that could mean different things to different faculty and there's a sense of inequity. WTUs are a more approachable and a more equitable way of distributing the release time.

A member said but what happens if, let's say the buyout is two courses and that gets changed to six units and someone's in a department, where they don't have three-unit courses. So, what do they do with those six units? They get out of one course, and now they eat the one unit. So many times, he has taught one unit extra. He said he has done it probably 10 years, but faculty never get to teach one unit less. Faculty don't get to bank those units and use them later. He understood everything that the member said and the Provost said, but in reality, if you don't get out of a course, the whole course, then you don't get out of anything.

A member said keep in mind you don't have to take all the units in one semester, this is the number of units across entire year. If faculty teach an overload, they would have a little bit of an under load the next semester. Faculty have to teach 24 units in a year, not just 12 units each semester. That's how you make it work.

L. Morimoto said this is interesting because that wasn't the discussion, she was going to have, but it's been fun. It came up, as she was trying to figure out this question about distribution, and she realized these are two different things. Her question was - do we think we could distribute units, because she knew people's teaching loads have already been set, but, because things go over the whole year, there are adjustments that could be made. She was surprised at some of the committee's that got the release time they did, and the amount of release time other people did not get. For instance, she was grateful that K. Moranski has given units for the GE chair, because the thought not giving that person release time with their current workload seem like such weirdness to her. L. Morimoto has expanded the role of Secretary and E. Clark has been a critical part of the meetings with the administration, so even though she said she does not need it, she was still trying to find a way to get release time to her.

A member said she was just as surprised to see the Scholarship chair receiving release time. She sat on Scholarship for three years and we meet twice a year and the workload was in the spring, when we grade the essays. She couldn't even remember who the chair was because Sarah Golightly from the Scholarship office basically ran the show. She was the one we corresponded with, she was the one who sent the emails with the agenda out, and she coordinated the meetings.

It was clarified that the GE chair units were specifically tied to the GE reform and its implications for the GE subcommittee.

A member said he suggested that we not make this decision today because it sounds like there are some issues we should consider and it sounds like we might want to consider not recommending any assigned time to the Scholarship chair and we might want to notify the Scholarship chair of that and invite them to come defend their case, if they object to it. He was on URTP this year and he was just wondering if that Chair does as much or more than the other people because it's not one of our Standing Committee chairs who do a lot of work.

L. Morimoto said the URTP Chair does a lot of work and it's a brutal committee. URTP actually went to S&F asking for release time for all the members, but that opens a whole big ugly can of worms. She asked if waiting on a decision would be a problem. We aren't going to expect people change their teaching loads this semester, but it'd be for next semester. Is that going to be a problem in terms of timing if we delay the decision?

The Provost said we'll have to look at the match between the units and the changes that are proposed and the people in those roles. We're going to have to figure this out, and we can work together to try to figure out the best way to resolve it. Let's get it right, and then we can figure out how to work with each individual who is affected by the change. It won't be huge numbers.

A member asked why we don't make decisions about these release times in the spring, prior to the year in which we are. The Senate Analyst said she neglected to tickle the previous chair about it last spring.

L. Morimoto said it's good we get to have a discussion about it and it'll be festive, I can tell.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – L. Morimoto
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes

Consent item: Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status

Information items: Proposal for leadership development in faculty governance;
Resolution of No Confidence in Library Dean; Faculty Services through
Academic Personnel

Business

1. Crash Course in Robert's Rules
2. Resolution Endorsing Joint Statement on Legislative Efforts to Restrict Education about Racism and American History- First Reading – L. Morimoto
3. Group Photo

Approved.

Adjourned.

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

