

## Executive Committee Minutes

March 10, 2022

Via Zoom

3:00 - 5:10

### Abstract

Chair Report. President and Provost Report. From EPC: GEP Minor - Approved for Senate Consent calendar. FSAC Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Vice President of Student Affairs Report. Student Representative Report. Report from Academic Affairs Budget Working Group - delayed. Refer: FSAC authorize policy about faculty associate dean's position, description of faculty associate deans - referred to FSAC to work in conjunction with Academic Affairs. Release time for Faculty Governance '22-'23 - Approved. Follow-up on the Senate's Harassment of Faculty by Online Groups resolution of October 2020 - deferred in favor of discussion of amendments to United in Kindness resolution. Amended version of United in Kindness resolution approved for the Senate agenda. 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, Karen Moranski, Monir Ahmed, Michael Young

**Absent:** Erma Jean Sims, Judy Sakaki

**Guests:** Christina Gomez, Katie Musick, Michelle Goman

### Chair Report - L. Morimoto

The Chair started the meeting by discussing the Chair Chat and when shared governance is a sham. We learned that we often are not sure what to do when a governance policy is violated. The Provost mentioned that it is important to separate between when faculty members violate the rights of other faculty members and when administrators violate such rights and that there is a difference. The Vice Chair noted that faculty members are not always aware of governance policies and that it is difficult to enforce the rules when we often do not know them.

The Chair is working with Christina Gomez, the student rep, to have a forum where we can talk about what is going on around campus versus approving items. The

forum would be place where staff, students, faculty and administrators can have an informal place to talk.

She announced that the AS did pass a resolution about the book ordering situation. It isn't asking for our approval, but she would like us to be informed of it, and read it, and then possibly consider if the Senate wants to be part of the system to help get the message out to the rest of the faculty about the book ordering.

There is a webinar this Friday about AB 928 that originally committee chairs were invited to, and then they switched to just Senators, which she thought was odd. She will attend and try to take good notes and bring it back. AB 928 is asking a lot of the CSU. We have to change, and the UC doesn't have to. It is interesting that in a process that is supposed to be collective, the UC voice seems to be the one that's going to get heard.

The Statewide Senator said all the CSU Senators are going to be attending. They were trying to figure out how to focus it a little bit because there are some processes happening at the ASCSU level too. We could use more input, but it is such a rapid timeline that they are quite concerned that we are not going to be able to meet the deadlines and so there is a bit of fixing this. It is problematic.

### **President and Provost Report - K. Moranski**

K. Moranski said she would combine the President and Provost report today. The President extends her regrets for not being here as she is ill. We had a very successful budget forum this morning. It was well attended. There were 140 people online and there were another 50 or so in person. We had good discussions in the chats after the speeches. We are building what Joyce Lopes used to call "budget muscle." She thought that the conversations, the questions and what people need to know demonstrated a level of knowledge about budget processes. Experience with these budget forums showed the level of sophistication of the questions and the responses. This process of sharing, of being transparent, and of having these on a regular basis is having a positive impact on the campus. She was encouraged by the level of discourse and the conversations and the deep questions that people were asking. She was also encouraged that people were encouraged. We have been in a dark space and while, budget-wise, we have a long way to go and we have some very tough decisions to make, people were seeing themselves as having more agency to do something about enrollment or to do something about the budget or something in their unit and what their unit can contribute to the conversation, and that is a testament to the power of regular information sharing and the

conversations that we have had around the budget. Laura Lupei's team is going to gather all the feedback from the conversations and from our online folks who will write their own responses to the questions, and then they will make that available to the community. We can share that at Senate, or in other vehicles, and there will be a video of the event that will be available on the budget website by early next week. M. Ahmed gets the prize for the best slide, the most succinct picture of where Sonoma State is in terms of budget that she had ever seen, so he gets a special commendation for his slide.

We have been asking Institutional Effectiveness and GIG and other groups to focus on retention and particularly to focus on fall-to-spring retention because we as a campus have not focused on that. Our fall to spring retention has been below CSU averages and it affects our long-term retention rates and it affects our graduation rates. We apparently make it up in later semesters because we graduate so many people on time at a rate that is at a percentage higher than many of the other CSUs. If we could capture more of our students from in their first semester and get them to their second semester, that's going to have significant impact on our retention at later semesters and our graduation rates. After census this spring, Heather Brown from Institutional Effectiveness was able to tell her about fall-to-spring retention rates and they are up. One of the great thrills of COVID, if one could say that, is that we did such a good job of retaining students and our fall-to-spring retention rate went up two percentage points from last year to this year. That is very encouraging and it went up for all undergraduate student populations. The gap is that the retention rates increase did not happen at a greater rate for our underrepresented and low-income students, as it did for other students. We do still have a gap that needs to be addressed, but this is a critical issue as a campus we need to take on. So, there is some good news about what we've been able to do during this time period that has been so difficult for students.

She wanted the Ex Com to see what was not able to be presented at the budget forum. It showed what Elias Lopez's team is doing: the outreach efforts, the financial aid letters, the investment in marketing, the in-person campus tours and orientation that we talked about at the last Senate meeting, improving transfer credit, sending out almost 3200 scholarship awards for new students, investing in technology and in data infrastructure and our decision day on April 23<sup>rd</sup>, which we will incessantly remind you of. These are all strategies that that Strategic Enrollment has employed in order to get to some improvements. Applications are up, admits are up, and deposits are up day every day from last year as of yesterday. We are still accepting late applications. These aren't numbers that are going to rock the world or scare us

silly, but they are improvements, and they're headed in the right direction and that's good news.

We are establishing some targets in Strategic Enrollment. For fall of '22 the target is 2650 new students, 1251 first-time, first-year, 1050 transfer and 350 Post Bac. Those are targets, we may not get there, but those are targets that would significantly improve our numbers and would help us address the enrollment downturn that we are going to experience after the spring when we graduate vast numbers of students. Getting to where we bring in more students than graduate is a key part of increasing enrollment. That would be a real turning point for the campus in terms of total headcount. It would stop the decline in enrollment for the campus.

The Student rep said she was curious about the fall to spring retention rates and glad to see that they have gone down, but she was wondering if it has to do with less students living on campus because from what she has heard from students who don't who live on campus and who don't come back for the spring semester, it has a lot to do with their mental health and their feelings of being accepted on campus. For the online modality, that's not a worry. Students just going to their courses. It might be a good idea to look at residential life and how we incorporate a greater sense of well-being for first time students and then also create healthy habits for our first-year students. A lot of times they come to college, and this is their first chance to have some freedom, and they don't know how to manage that.

The Provost said what we can do is to desegregate the data and the retention rates by residential versus commuter populations and then see what happens to those numbers with fall to spring retention. She will ask Heather Brown to do that so that we get a better sense of what we're dealing with. She thought the student rep was right, particularly now that we're dealing with an explosion of mental health issues and financial issues that are affecting students and particularly for students who come back to campus who spend the money to live in the residence halls and find value in living on campus. Perhaps they find that their support systems are not as strong as they are when they're at home. For some students, it's stronger on campus. There are multiple stories; however, disaggregating the data would help us see more of what is going on. The student rep said she thought the sense of belonging for commuter students and students in general were important.

A member said he was proud of us. Years ago, there were a lot of older students just taking classes, not to get a degree, but just to grow as human beings, and, in fact, the average age was 26 at that time and then through deliberate efforts, the average age went down. As long as we're opening it up to P Bacs, have we considered

opening up to Open University students more? A lot of students would be interested in doing that, if our costs weren't so high, and we might actually be able to lower those costs and still make money because we have lots of room in our classes for students. Even at half the cost, we could make money and we would attract people.

The Provost said she liked the idea. Part of what we want to do with SEIE is to expand community outreach and bring in non-traditional learners, community learners, people who aren't necessarily interested in a degree, but have an interest in a topic or a subject in a course, marketing that and getting them registered. We can add significantly to our enrollment and to our income, even if it is via SEIE indirectly. One of the main goals for the new Dean of the School of Extended and International Education is to build that community outreach and those community programs and marketing Open University would certainly fall in that category.

#### **From EPC: GEP Minor - E. Asencio, M. Goman**

E. Asencio said EPC is bringing the GEP minor to see if it is approved to go to Senate next week. This minor came through EPC and there were some general kinds of questions, but there were not any concerns. We confirmed that there would not be any effect on enrollment in the courses that are involved and we passed it through unanimously. M. Goman said this was part of the cleanup following our major overhauls of our BA and BS and we realized that there were some slight irregularities with the core classes we required for the minor.

**The Chair asked if there was any objection to putting this item on the Senate's consent calendar. No objection.**

#### **FSAC Report - R. Whitkus**

R. Whitkus said he had a quick report, and it had to do with the SETEs. Since the SETEs are going to be issued in the spring, he wanted to make sure everyone was clear about what changes have occurred. They are minor changes, but FSAC wanted to make sure that everyone is on board, and we have full transparency. At the start of the fall '21 semester FSAC was informed by the AVP for Institutional Effectiveness that the SETE software license we currently had at that time was up for renewal. Therefore, a search for an alternate vendor would be taking place. Ultimately, the company that was chosen was Anthology. A demonstration of their software was conducted in early November, and at the demonstration he was present to examine and ask questions. Early this semester, AVP Brown sent a query about how certain changes with the new software can be incorporated into the SETE itself and wanted

to know whether or not that was going to be acceptable to us. A minor one is to change the general question that all students apply to the current SETE - what is your class level. The software can actually do that automatically now. Once the student logs on, that is going to be put on all their SETEs automatically. The student is no longer answering that general question.

The second change is that the software allows us to add a class attribute to the class. Therefore, we can add a method of instruction, that is whether the class was face to face, synchronous, online, asynchronous online, etc. We said that would be fine. For both of those changes we said there's nothing that seems to be of any interest to actually come forward to faculty governance. It doesn't change the basic set of questions. It is only about the general question about the student class level and now the class attribute about the method of instruction. This new software is going to be in place and will be used for spring '22 SETES. He wanted that to be clear and everyone to understand about these small changes and the new company that is supplying the software.

A member asked: is only the method of instruction to be entered automatically or will the students have to enter that? R. Whitkus said it's going to be an automatic class attribute for the class. The member continued, asking if the student questions are identical. R. Whitkus said yes, except they will not be asked about their class level. That will be done automatically as well. The member had a general comment about SETEs. When he was on URTP, he noticed that the SETE response rates are low to the point of almost meaninglessness in some cases, and, statistically, they are meaningless. Many universities get much higher response rates by offering students the ability to see their grades a week early if they fill out the SETEs. Otherwise, they get them a week later. They have remarkable results getting students to fill out the SETEs because everyone wants to see their grade. Can we do something like that and get better response rates?

The Provost said that's a great question for a Senate committee or subcommittee to talk about. What would that mean in terms of the dates by which faculty have to turn in grades? That may mean that faculty would have to turn in grades sooner. Faculty need to agree to do that. The member clarified that his thought was actually not to have to turn the grades in early, it was actually to delay students who don't fill out the SETES by one week. The Provost said she would still say that it seems like a Senate committee should take up that issue and talk about ways and talk about that idea and, perhaps, other ideas for increasing SETE response rates.

The Chair asked the student rep if she had a perspective. C. Gomez said she liked the idea of an incentive. She didn't know if that is the right incentive. She would be pretty upset to have to wait. If students have some sort of incentive and it could be a really small one, show that you did your SETE and get donuts or something like that. Those students who respond the most to the SETEs are the ones who have class time to do them, when the faculty member is literally sitting there waiting for students to finish it. That's the easiest way right now. Any way that we can encourage our students to do so she was open to and getting student feedback on what they like, and even an opportunity, drawing, or any of those things could ramp up participation.

A member said he sees the issue implicates more than one of our subcommittees. Our standing committees certainly, as part of faculty review, and Faculty Affairs needs to have some chance to look at that, especially what's the reliability of the SETEs? How much of those are affected or skewed by incentives or disincentives? We need to see that, from the faculty side, are these getting any better or any worse as instruments reflecting faculty delivery of information. Coming in from the program assessment side, if we're trying to do any kind of aggregate work on how programs are doing and are we having no problems or less problems. It seems the assessment side should be thinking about resources and things like that. What we get from this might feed into what CTET folks do in terms of where do we need the most help improving our faculty. They are finding the faculty that are good at certain things and using them to help the other faculty out. It makes sense for us to think about it carefully and break down the parts of it to the Standing committees that have relevant areas and see what those folks would want to be doing. He worried about trying to do something to get an increase. We know that the instrument itself is problematic and in some sense he was less interested in incentives to get more SETES. If the instrument itself isn't helping very well, that is a bigger problem, but worth our time for getting better.

The Chair said maybe that's the question. What are the SETEs good for? That depends on who you ask. Even with giving students time in class, students didn't always fill it out. She proctors for her colleagues and when they're in and they're doing it online, and even then we still don't get an extremely high response rate. She was not going to get into a debate about the effectiveness of SETEs, because there's a ton of research that indicates that women are not rated the same. Women in STEM fields, in particular. In terms of whether it is evaluating teaching effectively is debatable.

## **Statewide Senator Report - R. Senghas**

R. Senghas said he will be participating in the webinar for the CSU about AB928. That whole process is problematic. We are trying to bring up the issue on the Statewide level. The UC GE pattern has seemed to have been the default and the difference coming in from the CSU has been pushed aside. We are starting to see from many of the campus's statements and assertions about the importance of the parts that the CSU tends to want to include. If we can have some political negotiation that allows for more of that, however the law doesn't require it. It is also silent on which of the GE patterns we would both use the same acronym. It seems that not enough attention has been paid to how different those work. There are some politics happening. Coming into the next plenary session, which will be later this month, we will be following up on some of the issues around former Chancellor Castro, including what's going to be happening as far as external investigations. There was quite a bit of dismay expressed within the CSU when they saw the golden handshake package for the Chancellor, which seems to be right in line with what everybody was so upset about at Fresno to begin with. This is the thing that we don't want to do. They are getting rewarded for moving along instead of us saying, no, you do not get a prize as you go out the door, you have to finish successfully. He is seeing that kind of language in some of the drafts of the resolutions coming in. If people have feedback on this, it would be helpful to hear from folks.

A number of the Statewide committees have been told to trim down the number of resolutions we are bringing forward. In his own committee, we had 10 we were working on, and we were told bring forward only three. There is little bit of a mutiny and pushback coming because we are saying, there's so much business that we are trying to do, but we are running out of our calendar, in terms of first and second hearings on items. A third of those things that we're dealing with were somehow related directly or indirectly to some of what we saw with the former Chancellor's issue. Any other things coming forward, we will see if we can get the drafts to the relevant standing committees to give us some input. We have two sessions left, one this month and then one in May, so we're getting down to the end. He would love to hear if there are priorities for us for our resolutions.

#### **Vice Chair Report - B. Burton**

B. Burton said the Chancellor's remuneration reminded him of CEOs in 2006 - 2008. They ran companies into the ground and got a huge \$1 million bailout when so many Americans were suffering during that time. We want to teach our students that is not appropriate. How do the corporate giants keep doing that to us? They'll do it again. As a side note, he remembered a professor at UC Irvine saying, if you get



great students evals, it is because you are too easy, and if you get bad evals, you are too hard. The election is going on, so please vote.

He and the Chair are trying to decide how we want to move the ERFSA matter forward. Do we forward that to FSAC, how do we want to approach that? We are still working on that. We are doing some release time work. A huge number of committees in faculty governance have decided to go virtual.

### **Vice President of Administration and Finance Report - M. Ahmed**

M. Ahmed thanked the Provost for the budget update. It was a collective effort, and he hoped it continues to be as good as it was. He did hear comments as to how we are continually increasing and adding on to budget knowledge and so forth. That was good to hear and kudos to the Budget Office.

Our team is planning on limiting access to certain buildings during the spring break. He understood that has been the case in the past as well because students are not present here and limited staff and faculty are present. There will be an announcement coming out soon.

The team is working on something that we have talked about - the mask mandate. The CDC has changed the rules, the state has changed, the county Public Health as well, so the team is trying to gather information and come up with something that allows the flexibility that is sound in practice and creates an environment for people who may need a safer environment. Thank you for a very good conversation last time in the full Senate last week on this debate and the feelings expressed and what's right. There is no easy answer. It is looking like that the team is recommending that on campus most areas must be strongly recommended, with the exception of instructional activities which must be required, and, again, that is coming from the perspective of the proximity of people. We may have some who are vulnerable or live with vulnerable family members and so forth, and we do not want to make them feel unwelcome or uncomfortable. That will be coming out soon.

The Governor has signed a law extending the 80 hours of additional leave time for anybody who is impacted by pandemic. The CSU has qualified that information, and it was shared with CFA for discussions. CFS just signed up today, so it's available. There will be additional information that HR and Benefits will be releasing, but it is done now. 80 hours total with 40 of leave and 40 additional hours of sick leave. He hopes nobody needs it, but in case they need it, it is available.

He thanked the Provost for supporting and the entire team that our campus is one of the 26 campuses nationwide participating in a grant program for guided pathways. They call it something different, the College Student Success, which is too generic for us, but it is intended that we try to institutionalize the practices they have that has brought success in moving students forward with their degree plan. Often times they hear that either the campus groups are not quite as interconnected on this initiative, especially when it comes to the CFO, the financial planning and budget process, so we come up with great ideas. It dies out because it wasn't really incorporated into a budget process or the into the DNA of the organization. They are bringing us together to put a framework that could be shared and used by all institutions who chooses to, and we are fortunate to be one of the institutions throughout the in the nation. It is a three year long grant of \$300,000

A member said in mask wearing related guidelines or recommendations or requirements that will come out soon, there was mention of instructionally-related activities. Is the team distinguishing those activities from extracurricular activities?

M. Ahmed said instructional activities are very specific than other learning opportunities. The Provost said instructional activities in this case are defined as classes, labs and other official instructional activities related to scheduled courses. The answer would be that in those officially scheduled courses and activities masks would be required. In other activities, including extracurricular activities, masks would be strongly recommended.

M. Ahmed said it's very difficult to find one solution that works for everybody, in every environment. He hoped, as we have been in the past, we will would continue to be respectful of our colleagues and our surroundings.

The Student rep said she wanted to check because she was glad that the Governor is giving pay for people for COVID exposures and sickness, but some of our students are being penalized for missing classes due to being exposed to COVID or being sick and not coming, and that's not an excuse. She was wondering if there's any plan for a campus policy to make sure that students are not in trouble for doing the safe thing by staying home.

The Provost said let's follow up because it sounds like we need to put out some guidance on that. She will let Matthew Paolucci and Stacey Bosick know that is happening.

A member said he wanted to be sure if we have cases where there is a classroom where either the instructor or a student is immunocompromised, for instance, could that that particular class be required to mask, even if we're not doing it at a broader level. He knew that there were issues of disclosure that might come into this. It would be great to have that issue addressed and communicated as well.

The Provost said all classes are required to wear masks for the rest of the semester.

There were some questions about this and it was clarified that if it is not a confined space then it is strongly recommended, but not required.

A member said every time a student has told him that they're not feeling well and that might be COVID, their roommate's friend might have been exposed to someone who had COVID, he has excused every such absence. His classes have presentations every day, and if they're not prepared, they get docked. He is getting a remarkable number of students telling him that there is some reason they shouldn't come to class. The students who are doing this are the weakest students, who are failing his class. Those are students who he suspects are not prepared to do their presentation. They are falling behind because they're not coming to class. They are not losing points, but they're not getting an education.

The Student rep said she understood. A lot of the students are falling behind in their grades, reflecting the effort they are putting into the course. It's great to encourage your students to attend class, and there are other ways to do it other than penalizing the students if they are sick. It ruins it for those of us who really are sick. At the end of the day, we are paying for the course. If we are paying for it and we are not putting in 100% effort, sometimes that is going to fall back on the student and that will be reflected unfortunately in their grade.

### **Vice President of Student Affairs Report - M. Young**

M. Young said the celebration of life for Aysia Dural, the student who passed, is going to be held this coming Saturday the 12th of March in the ballrooms in the Student Center. It's a campus-wide celebration, and if you are interested in coming, he urged the members to do so.

The Chair asked if the search for a permanent Vice President of Student Affairs had begun. M. Young said yes, it has started.

## Student Representative Report - C. Gomez

C. Gomez said she has been talking to students, going to her classes, and it has all been super exciting. Right now, the students' biggest concerns are making sure that they get their classes for the next semester. We also talked about a scheduling issue that sometimes occurs with students, where their major classes they need that semester are scheduled at the exact same time and on the exact same day and usually that is when there is only one section or the course offered. If there is a way to look at that and ask, would there be a better time to make sure more students will be able to attend? She is also encouraged people to start reminding their students as early as possible to seek advising. She works in the CASSE office and we get so many students coming in at the last second. One piece of the feedback that we have gotten from students, unfortunately, is they don't always feel comfortable going to their faculty advisor because they don't take the time to sit down and explain things to them. She was in a meeting where a faculty said they won't sit with the student if they don't know how to read their ARR. They need to come with that knowledge. That is difficult, especially for some of our students, who are trying to learn that information and then hearing that can be very discouraging. We are trying to figure out how we could work with our students that way, the first time they go and see a faculty advisor, they could figure out how it works, the next time after that they will have a better experience and easier experience. Accessibility is always a concern. There is a governance resolution and it is talking about primarily what the issues are. The CSU and their mandate for accessibility and their initiatives that they are doing CSU wide, what Sonoma State's website says, and then what needs to occur, which is basically order books at the bookstore. That way students who can only buy their books there can access them that way. They can get the books converted, and that is super important. There is misinformation about why it's important to order through the bookstore. Spreading this knowledge of why it's important and letting them know that even if faculty order at the bookstore, students can go on Amazon or go buy the book any other way.

She is also working on DEI issues. Tramaine Austin-Dillon came and spoke to a large group of students looking for feedback on DEI initiatives, and we were able to get some feedback from a lot of our students. She is going to be continuing those conversations with him. One of her main concerns is the constant micro aggressions that seem to occur on campus. That's the biggest part of our campus climate when it comes to DEI and students need a way to report it and to have these open dialogue conversations. She could point something out to her faculty member or someone

can point out something that was not right, and they're able to become educated on that topic. She was able to do that in the beginning of the semester and resolved it with her faculty member. He was able to speak in front of the class and explain why what he said was wrong, and he acknowledged what happened. She thought that needs to be the goal in a lot of these situations because we need to be understanding one another. We also need to hold each other accountable and find mechanisms to do so.

A member said she was curious about the drive-in movie nights, the outdoors screenings; are they still happening? C. Gomez said that's an event that AS puts on through ASP, and they have one coming up, so we are still doing it, but we haven't done one yet this semester.

The Statewide Senator said hearing the student rep mentioning the DEI issues, he remembered to add to his report. The CSU is considering establishing a standing committee on DEI-related issues throughout the CSU. He said if C. Gomez has input on that from the student's perspective, he could carry those to the meetings and would be interested to do so. If anyone else has input, especially in light of what has happened with former Chancellor Castro, or on how we're going to be dealing structurally with some of these issues and whether a standing committee seems to be what we need to do, he would appreciate knowing.

The Chair said there is a place on one of our websites like DHR to report things, but she didn't know what is set up to handle micro aggressions or things that don't rise to the level of violation or Title V or Title IX. That's a good thing for us to think about. Whether it would be an Ombuds person as the right person, she had no idea, but it seems she does hear this from students. As we're thinking forward with the Statewide Senate, we have the need for things to happen on the ground, not big lofty ideas, but what people are experiencing in their lives.

### **Report from Academic Affairs Budget Working Group**

The Chair said she put the Academic Affairs Budget Working Group report on the agenda since when she and E. Acosta Lewis were talking earlier about sharing information with the Senate.

E. Acosta Lewis said we are not there yet. We are working on the report. Mike Ogg and herself have been working on a draft of the recommendations to share with the Provost. That would publicly available early April is her guess, right after spring break.

C. Gomez said there is one other thing that she forgot to mention regarding IRA. The IRA committee is meeting. We have a meeting tomorrow and we started reviewing all the applications, and they want to emphasize that it's going to be looked at with a very critical eye this year, especially regarding all the misuse of the funds that has been historically happening. We are trying to convey that we are not doing it because we don't think that these programs are valuable or that these aren't important. It is about what the fund is supposed to be used for and there is legislation and guidelines, and we need to follow those guidelines, regardless of the content of what is being offered. If something is not funded, there is a reason that they are below the line programming, because that funding is not guaranteed every year, so we are trying to convey that message to people.

**Refer: FSAC authorize policy about faculty associate dean's position, description of faculty associate deans**

The Chair said one of the things that has come up in conversations with URTP is the Faculty Associate Dean position, and Richard Whitkus and Letha Ch'ien from Structure and Functions said they thought a good way to proceed was for us to refer to FSAC figuring out the Faculty Associate Dean position guidelines and what they should be involved in. There was concern about Faculty Associate Deans being on URTP because, in some way, it feels for some candidates like there's a second bite at the apple. We might in the future be able to deal with it through policy which could say we think once someone leaves an administrator position, they should sit out, but technically the Associate Deans are not administrators, they are faculty. One of the recommendations that came in the letter to her from Letha Ch'ien and Richard Whitkus was perhaps making the fact that Associate Deans are MPPs. In any case is Ex Com okay with kicking this to FSAC to parse it out.

R. Whitkus said hold on. There were three recommendations in the letter that came from Letha and himself. Referring it was the second least objectionable. The first least objectionable would be to do what is done on other campuses and say Associate Deans are MPPs and all these issues go away. The other thing we can do is we don't need every school to have an Associate Dean. Some schools are not big enough to have Associate Deans, that is just one option. The second option, which is the most objectionable option is once someone becomes a Faculty Associate Dean, they lose their rights as faculty and then we will have grievances. That would lead to the second least objectionable option which is sending it to FSAC, but if it goes to FSAC, we on our own cannot do a policy. We must do it in association with Academic Affairs. Faculty Associate Deans serve at the pleasure of Deans. Therefore, we would

have to do this in conjunction with Academic Affairs. The Provost would have to agree to this as well.

The Provost said when faculty Associate Dean positions were created, we did not have the funding for Associate Deans as MPPs, and there was considerable concern about adding to the MPPs on our campus. We are now, of course, in the position where we're implementing pretty extreme budget cuts. Not all schools may want or need Associate Deans, and so it may be in the places where that is warranted, for example, because of the size or scope of the school, that that we could afford to do that in certain schools and not in others. In the meantime, a couple of the schools are thinking of different ways to get administrative support through faculty release time that is not an Associate Dean kind of position. The second thing is that Academic Affairs would be more than happy if the Ex Com is going to refer it to FSAC to work with FSAC on this issue. Why did Sonoma State create those positions in the first place? Two reasons. One, there is a real need for administrators to be in the school in order to deal with some of the issues that that come to the Dean's office. The second reason was that faculty were asking for opportunities for leadership development and there were there were no opportunities for faculty to gain administrative experience that could lead full time administrative positions. The Faculty Associate Deans and Faculty Fellows, being part time was an affordable way to give faculty administrative experience. They have done a great deal of good work over the last four or five years, and perhaps we need to be clear about the kind of work that that those positions have been doing and that gets to the other issue, which is that we do need to clarify the position descriptions. It is not an uncommon structure. It does help a school or college function better.

A member said in regards to referring it to FSAC to work with Academic Affairs seems appropriate. FSAC has a representative from Academic Affairs structurally as a regular member anyway and for this very reason it could be a coordinated effort. For a long time, we didn't really have the Associate Deans as a good way of some professional development for faculty who might be considering moving up. We have a lot of people complaining that we have all these people that go off and get professional degrees in Education Administration and they don't get it by coming through as faculty who've been tenured. If we want more of those kinds of candidates to be out there, we need to provide the experience for them to get that. Associate Deans can serve well as that kind of a function. Even if those Associate Deans don't go further because they might realize that isn't what they want and then they may go back into the faculty. Others who start as Chair, then they become Associate Deans and start realizing they have a knack for this or an interest, it gives

them a pathway, especially staying within the CSU and then we don't lose those quite valuable people.

**There was no objection to referring the matter of Associate Deans to FSAC to work in conjunction with Academic Affairs.**

#### **Release time for Faculty Governance '22-'23 - L. Morimoto**

L. Morimoto said the proposed redistribution of release time for faculty governance was included in the agenda packet. She said she kept it within the limit of 20 courses because that's our limit. We're doing it by course, not by units anymore.

A member asked, are we suggesting units for the Secretary? L. Morimoto said the Secretary hasn't historically gotten release, but we're asking the Secretary to do more. She's been part of the leadership team on a regular basis. Plus, what we did is that people listed the different positions and which committee meetings they need to attend and to estimate the time commitment. The Secretary does go to Ex Com and the Senate, meets with the Vice Chair and herself when we meet with the Provost and President often. When we were looking, that is one of the metrics by which we were deciding.

The GE subcommittee was funded this year by the Provost office. S&F thought it was important. GE is going to be a busy committee for a while and to not give that person release time didn't make sense to us. We have to live within our means. We can't ask for more units. This is not the best environment to do that. We laid it out by the committee and how many hours of obligation makes difference. APARC has way more commitments. This distribution is based from this year. It's an increase of one course because we are only allowed to 20 course releases. There isn't anything for the lecturer senators. She didn't know if that's appropriate. Scholarly Activities was changed to three to four. People in S&F thought they should be at zero.

A member asked, are the affected people cool with this? L. Morimoto said it hasn't been approved, so it hasn't been sent out yet. The member said have they been consulted?

L. Morimoto said we've consulted with the request for data asking people who are currently chairs. Also, she didn't think consulting with the current people is the best path. There are units that need to be changed, and some people might lose them. If we want to give GE some units, somebody has to lose some. We can make a decision that we don't think that GE should get the units and that's fine. We can decide that. There could be an argument that URTP should only have one course



release, however, others who spoke to it have said it's become a full-time committee. They are chairs running a lot of interference, dealing with a lot of different faculty who are happy, unhappy, confused. Again, this wasn't her choice, this was a committee of three and then it went to S&F where we discuss it again.

E. Clark said as the outgoing Secretary after this semester, she did not get a course release, and can speak freely because she won't benefit from the course release next year. She definitely thought that the Secretary position probably would benefit from the course release for the longer term for the future, because it was a pretty active year. She sat on the Ex Com and also attended some planning meetings and helped plan the Faculty retreat. She had some other meetings with constituents on campus and from the administration. Her perspective is that it was definitely enough work to merit a course release.

The Provost said she would address the lecturers. It doesn't look like there is a change to the lecturers. One unit was given in the past to the lecturers, but there is no course. They are just the WTUs, so she was trying to clarify the lecturer situation. L. Morimoto said that is correct. The Provost said she will also clarify what the situation is with Mike Ogg with regard to the GE subcommittee. That position is one of the most time consuming governance roles on campus, and that's why we funded it. It's a hell of a lot of work.

A member said he knows right now we have a budget crisis and we are trimming left and right and it's the absolute worst time to be saying that we actually need more units in governance. But when he looks at the cycles of GE, there have been these unfunded mandates that have been coming down and clobbering the faculty, there have been many hundreds of hours of work going into this stuff and then it only lasts for a year or two till the next round. Part of the reason that Emily Clark has been working so hard as Secretary is that that we've been getting the Secretary to fill some of the vacuum that we've had from not having Past Chairs available, and this has been actually recurring again and again. We aren't having somebody who had recently been Chair in the loop. One way or another, with the cuts that we are doing in Academic Affairs, we are not going to solve this effectively, but what we have to do is what is the least, worst situation we can go with and thinking of it in those terms. He advocated that we do have some units for the GE chair. This whole AB 928 is part of that. We will be shooting ourselves in the foot if we have people burn out and walk away from the table, because they can't handle it.

**Motion to approve release time for AY 22-23. Second. Vote - Yes = 8, No = 0  
Approved.**

## **Follow-up on the Senate's Harassment of Faculty by Online Groups resolution of October 2020 - S. Brannen**

S. Brannen said he talked with the Provost about this briefly offline and asked the chairs indulgence to talk about the United in Kindness resolution revision that he proposed. He thought it would be in very bad taste for the Senate to make changes to this author's document on the Senate floor next week. He stated that the author is clearly not a native speaker of English, and everyone has been kind not correcting his grammar. This is going to be a Senate document that will be on our website and sent out to the world and as it's written he would quite frankly be embarrassed. He didn't intend to change it on the Senate floor. He talked to a former chair who said it's not unusual at all for the Ex Com to make grammatical and clarity changes to documents before the second reading and bring them as the second reading. Any Senator could object and stating this is not the original document, and we need to substitute this and we could do that at the time or it was suggested we could put both documents in the packet and say that the Ex Com is suggesting that the Senate considered this revised document for the second reading instead. He suggested that we do one of those things rather than bring the original document in the Senate packet.

A member said it's absolutely typical after a first reading for whoever brought it before to say, based on input here is our new version. It is not even a substitution. It is why we have a first reading. That is the smoothest and best face-saving way of doing it all. He would encourage us to do that, because even putting the two up in front of the Senate and saying: "can we swap?" surfaces the awkwardness. Let's just say based on input, here is the version that is now coming for a second reading.

The Senate Analyst said she worked extensively with Robert Eyler on getting the resolution into our format. Her experience with the Executive Committee is if there are grammatical issues, they're minor. This is a major grammatical change from what she saw. If a resolution is sent back, all we can do is send it back to the proposer and say this is what we saw, is it alright if we change this and bring this to the Senate? It's owned by the Senate now. The Senate can make the changes. She understood what's going on, but the document is owned by the Senate now.

There was further discussion of process and support voiced to send the amended document to the Senate.

**Motion to extend meeting by ten minutes. Second. Approved.**

Process discussion continued.

Motion to send the amended document as a second reading to the Senate and ask for approval. Second. Approved

## Senate Agenda

**Consent:** From EPC: GEP Minor - <https://sonoma.curriculog.com/proposal:3006/form>

### **Business:**

1. Resolution re: United in Kindness - Second Reading - M. Jabbari, P. Coleman TC 4:00

Adjourned.

*Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes*