Tab 1

ACADEMIC SENATE

MEETING DATE: Tuesday, **January 28, 2025**, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom

APPROVED MINUTES

Senators Present: Alina Engleman, Amy June Rowley, Andrew Kelly, Andrew Yunker, Cathy Sandeen, Christina Chin-Newman, Christopher Palmore, Claire Valderama-Wallace, Dana Rucker, Dawna Komorosky, Donna Wiley, Duke Austin, Erica Baranski, Gretchen Reevy, Hongmin Li, Ian Pollock, Jennifer Sherwood, Jenny O, Jerome Narvaez, Jessica Santone, Jiyoun Myung, John Tan, Joshua Kerr, Kate Bell, Kathleen Wong(Lau), Kaumudi Misra, Kim Greer, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Lan Wang, Levent Ertaul, Mary Fortune, Maureen Scharberg, Mia Livaudais, Meiling Wu, Michael Lee, Michael Rowley, Michelle Gravier, Michelle Rippy, Michelle St. George, Monika Eckfield,Murray Horne, Paul Carpenter, Roya Nasimi, Ryan Heryford, Sara McDaniel, Sarah Taylor, Shubha Kashinath, Stephanie Alexander, Tammie Mosley, Terry Buttchen, Tristan Garcia, Vibha Puri, Vish Hegde, ASI CSCI Sai Lokesh Gayam, ASI CBE Nidhi Sharma, ASI CLASS Joe Trujillo
Guests: Mark Robinson,
Senators Absent:

1. **Land acknowledgment (short version)**
    a. Long version will be read today (1/28) per Senate rules
    b. Senators, please rename yourself to include your group affiliation before your name (e.g., [college acronym], LIB, LEC, SSP, ALUM, STAFF, etc.)

2. **Approval of the agenda**
    a. Austin motioned to table 24-25 FUFM 2. Shared comments: “This decision comes from a place of reflection and a sincere desire to realign our efforts in a way that fosters collaboration and unity. For the authors and supporters of FUFM 2, this has never been about opposing the College of Health or our faculty colleagues who wish to establish it. Rather, it stems from concern for our colleagues in education and other departments who are uncertain about their future—and, even more importantly, from a commitment to holding the administration accountable for its poor management practices, which jeopardize the financial health and future of our university. While the College of Health will undoubtedly bring benefits, we remain concerned about how it will address the reported financial crisis affecting our institution. By continuing to push FUFM 2, we risk alienating potential allies and inadvertently positioning ourselves as antagonists to those who support the College of Health. That is not the role we believe we should play. Instead, we should focus on what comes next—how we, as a united faculty, can address the underlying administrative issues, protect our faculty and all our disciplines, and work together to prevent our university from suffering the fate of institutions like Sonoma State. Tabling FUFM 2 is a gesture of goodwill toward our colleagues who wish to move forward with the College of Health. It is also a step toward reclaiming our focus on the bigger picture: saving our university from poor

administration and ensuring a brighter future for all of us. Therefore, I move to table FUFM 2. Thank you.". Seconded AJ Rowley. Chair O asked for any opposition. None. Any abstentions? None.
b. Trujillo motioned to move 24-25 GASG 1 to top of business items. Seconded M Rowley. No opposition, no abstentions.
c. Alexander motioned to refer 24-25 CAPR 1 back to CAPR. Seconded Rippy. No opposition or abstentions.
d. Reevy clarified that 24-25 FAC 2 will be left on the table.
e. Garcia motioned to approve agenda. Seconded Yunker. No opposition or abstentions.

3. **Approval of 12/3/24 minutes**
   a. Motion to approve. Seconded Yunker. No edits or revisions. No opposition or abstentions.

4. **Business Items:**
   a. 2024-25 GASG 1: Resolution on Student Representation on University Search and Review Committees *(first reading)*
      i. Chair O summarized.
      ii. Eckfield asked for clarification about the changes from the current version.
         1. Calara clarified that some searches like Deans, VP, Advancement should have a student representative, but others should have input from ASI. Directed us to the link under "Relevant documents" with "proposed changes" in the title.
         2. Chair O summarized differences/changes.
         3. Trujillo added that we wanted to add more student representatives (i.e. ASI members) rather than just students.
         4. Calara added that for a lot of the positions, we have a student in ASI who reflects that position. So that is the person we would send to that committee. The language also leaves open the possibility that ASI can appoint a non-ASI student.
      iii. Garcia added that she supports this idea. Great to have students learn these professional skills. Good that it is ASI, which students have backed as representing them to the administration
   b. 24-25 CAPR 1: Revision of "Formation, Dissolution, Merger, or Name Change of Academic Units Policy" (revision of 22-23 CAPR 28) (second reading) ***[postponed on 10/29; 11/12; 12/3 until Spring; 1/28 referred back to CAPR]***
   c. 24-25 FAC 2: Temporary Faculty Assigned Time Service Award (first reading) ***[postponed until 12/3; tabled on 12/3]***
   d. 24-25 CAPR 5/CIC 10: Resumption of the Suspended Music MA Program *(second reading)*
      i. Chair O summarized history - Ex Com referred this back to CAPR and CIC, who got responses from Music Department. The document then came to Senate last semester. Chair O summarized Music Department responses.
      ii. Trujillo advocated 'yes' on this motion. A step in the right direction to repair the music program and build back our masters. People have put in a lot of work to make sure this program can come back. Limits music dept have put in place are to address the current budget situation.
      iii. Chair O called for more discussion. None.
      iv. 37 Yes, 1 No, 3 Abstentions. Motion passes.
   e. 24-25 FUFM 2: Resolution to Suspend CoH Implementation ***[postponed on 11/12; 1/28 tabled]****(second reading)*
   f. 24-25 FAC 3: Constitution and Bylaws Amendments Amendment regarding MPPs in Elected Positions *(first reading)*

        i. Chair O summarized history of 23-24 FAC 12, 23-24 FAC 13. Current document - 24-25 FAC 3 - formalizes the stipulation that MPPs cannot hold elected positions representing faculty, but retains their voting rights.
        ii. Austin summarized the same point. We are advancing the point Sandeen agreed with from last year.

g. 24-25 FDEC 3 (formerly 24-25 BEC 4): Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Framework for Developing and Evaluating Senate Policies (Revision to 23-24 FDEC 3) *(first reading)*
    i. Chair O summarized history of 24-25 FDEC 3.
    ii. Fenno-Smith clarified the history and that the changes here were just the suggestions from Officers to manage workload and the change to make more accessible.
    iii. M Rowley motioned to waive first reading. Seconded Fenno-Smith. No opposition. No abstentions.
    iv. Chair O asked for any opposition to approving. No objections or abstentions.

h. 24-25 CIC 20: Curricular Timeline *(first reading)*
    i. Chair O summarized. Key points - move up Senate approval deadline to Feb 1. Changing process such that any CIC approvals of 2/3rd or greater will bypass ExCom and Senate.
    ii. AJ Rowley will be asking Senate to waive approvals for regular approvals. All new course or program approvals will still come through Senate. We need everything ready by Feb 1 for fall semester.
    iii. M Rowley asked committee to consider changing “Feb 1” to “second Senate meeting of the Spring semester”.
        1. AJ Rowley clarified this deadline is more for the President signature and approval and not about the items that go through Senate.
    iv. Provost Greer asked for a definition of “minimal opposition”.
        1. AJ Rowley clarified the language in the statement doesn’t use “minimal” but there is a clearer wording in the statement.
        2. Eckfield pulled the language from the statement: “If things are approved unanimously or with less than enough opposition to warrant triggering the ⅔ cap, then things should progress…”
        3. Garcia added that the language in the statement is: “**Senate approval required ONLY if ⅔ or less of people on the chain do not pass the proposal.”
    v. Reevy conveyed that the document is dense with a lot of information. Requested for second reading that everything that is changing be indicated specifically. Could we see an example process for each type of approval. Believe that all items regarding moving from stateside to self-support should go through Senate.
        1. AJ Rowley clarified that this is focusing on Curricular timeline. State support is a CAPR issue and is not related to curriculum itself. We are only asking to bypassing from CIC only, not anything that came from CIC and CAPR.
    vi. Santone reported that as we talk about timeline we have dates that are close to the beginning of our duty days with no access or ability to do this work before our duty days. For example - Sept 1 deadlines. In certain years that is less than 10 working days after beginning of duty days. Could CIC include anything in the timeline document about access to forms for preparation in the preceding year that would allow us to complete the work by these due dates in the timeline.
        1. AJ Rowley reported that we should be able to open up Curriculog in July. If we can get things done by Feb 1, however, it could be opened earlier.

i. 24-25 BEC 6: Standing Rules Senate midyear revisions *(first reading)*
    i. Chair O summarized origin of these changes - Officers brought to Ex Com. Ex Com brought to Senate.
    ii. M Rowley summarized proposed revisions in Standing Rules.

iii. Lee commented that the end of #3 is ambiguous and chat should be required to come at the time the name is called during the roll call vote. Believe it is important that votes do not occur until a name is called. We require people to be present to vote. We shouldn't be able to jump the queue because we have to leave.
    1. M Rowley responded noting disagreement. The purpose of a roll call vote is to be confident in the number of yays and nays. Last semester, when roll call votes were held, it was because the number of green checks and red x's were fluctuating and we weren't sure everyone who was voting was eligible. So we did a roll call vote to be confident about the count. I believe allowing votes in the chat at any time during the voting still accomplishes this goal and makes voting more accessible. Second, Robert's Rules allows anyone to state "Pass" during a roll call vote, and then it circles back to them at the end. So, voting out of order doesn't seem to be an issue here, at least would not violate the purpose of a roll call vote or the process of a roll call vote per Robert's Rules.

5. **Default One-Reading Business Items (BUNDLE):**
    a. 24-25 CIC 24: Action Items from GEOC (11/14/24)
    b. 24-25 CIC 26: Action Items from WS (11/13/24)
    c. 24-25 CIC 28: EESC 360 Revised Course, new prefix
    d. 24-25 CIC 29: Action Items from WS to CIC (11/18/24)
    e. 24-25 CIC 30: Action Items from GEOC (11/20/24)
    f. 24-25 CIC 31: Discontinuances
    g. 24-25 CAPR 12/CIC 32: Temporary Suspensions
    h. 24-25 CIC 33: History, Kinesiology and Psychology Program Revisions
    i. Chair O summarized each item.
    j. AJ Rowley shared that the committee has done a lot of work to complete all of these in time for this meeting so that we can move things forward for the university's deadlines.
    k. Trujillo agreed that we should push this forward and vote to approve this bundle.
    l. Chair O asked for objections or abstentions. None. Bundle approved.

6. **Information Items:**
    a. 24-25 FAC 4: New Course Evaluation Tool
        i. Chair O summarized the item.
        ii. Lee noted that there have been some issues persisting into the Spring. Entity handling this is not aware that some types of classes do not get evaluated (e.g. community experiential learning courses).
            1. Austin noted that Senator Lee is correct, but he has been working with this entity to get these courses removed.
        iii. Chair O called the vote through unanimous consent.. No objections or abstentions.
    b. 24-25 CIC 25: Information Items from GEOC (11/14/24)
        i. Chair O summarized.
        ii. Chair O called the vote through unanimous consent.. No objections or abstentions.
    c. 24-25 BEC 7: Spring 2025 Senator election process related to reorganization
        i. Vice Chair Scharberg summarized. No changes to university-wide elections. College elections we have to sensitive to the Apr 15 deadline in the Bylaws. Sandeen has been informed that final decision or reorg has to be done by Feb 28 for us to meet this deadline. College Senators who are in departments that are moving to a new college will need to resign their terms at the end of 24-25 AY. Rebalancing will then occur based on reorg college sizes. Some Senators will need to be

elected to one-year terms to achieve the alternation pattern for half of College Senators. Senate Coordinator will oversee elections for colleges that are not yet formed.

ii. Chair O flagged that this is one-time structure because of the reorg. No changes to the Constitution or Bylaws.

iii. No questions or comments.

iv. Chair O called the vote through unanimous consent. No objections. 1 abstention.

7. **Discussion**

a. **Open discussion (start ~1:50p or sooner; 25 min cap)**: College reorganization models pros, cons, and other thoughts about the remaining eight models

i. Goal: Gather feedback to inform Senators' voting choices on February 11 (to determine which model(s) the Senate will endorse to the President).

ii. College Reorganization Data document prepared by Rafael Hernandez, Deputy Provost

iii. University-wide Forum - Fri 1/31, 3-4p, https://csueb.zoom.us/j/87121614297

1. While community members are encouraged to participate in one of the Senate discussion opportunities outlined above, individual comments may also be submitted through this form. Comments submitted through the form will be shared in full, including the identity of the speaker, with Senators prior to February 11.

iv. Lee expressed disappointment in data set in terms of what it tells us and what it doesn't tell us. Gives us a snapshot of how the university would look with our current enrollment, faculty, etc. It isn't the kind of information that was asked for by Senate and COBRA. Requested that we give feedback to AA about providing us with data that gives us a sense of the fiscal realities of the university, the costs of the different reorganizations. As opposed to how our various buckets would be reapportioned under the various models.

v. Eckfield asked for a walkthrough regarding some of the terms.

vi. Kelly expressed agreement with Lee that the data is not responsive to BEC 5 and COBRA 3 in terms of what was asked for from Senate. Including more detail on allocation like compliance costs, rebranding, space, etc. Was hoping to get more information from administration after BEC 5 was passed. Is AA planning to provide more information?

vii. Chair O added that we will be forwarding comments and concerns and notes of missing data to AA. Please continue to share any.

viii. Horne expressed that the data is somewhat useful. It gives confidence that we have thought about the reallocation of funds. Biggest concern and question is how much money will be spent on growing programs? These may be unknowns, but this makes our decision hard. We may be guessing. We should thank Rafael for putting this together.

ix. Seitz (Guest) - Concerns about the lack of information. In particular costs that weren't included. Seconded comments from Lee and Kelly. In keeping up with summary documents from Senate, these are the questions - (1) Have we gotten input from admin staff involved in these changes? (2) Have we consulted WASC liaison regarding concerns or feedback regarding concerns for accreditation moving forward?

x. Chair O noted that staff and admin have had opportunity to give this feedback and input in multiple university- and college- wide forums, including one on Friday and the feedback form. Unsure if WASC liaison has been consulted.

xi. Hayes (Guest) - Would love to see more information about what is going to support efficiency, recruitment, and our students. Internal budget delineations and where budget goes should then be predicated on that. Reminded Senators that Education departments have unanimously agreed to go with a College of Health and Education. Education departments got $40 million in grants in the last five years. And potential for growth with hundreds of applicants that we have not been able to admit.

xii. Eckfield motioned to extend the meeting 10m. Seconded Trujillo. 23 Approve. 8 Oppose. 6

Abstain.

xiii. Deputy Provost Hernandez walked through document. This data took the models and basically organizes the data as it exists, picking representative time periods and then producing the results. I'll point to the last tab which, as I read the models, could help to understand the models by letter and the K model. When I read through it there were a bunch of different configurations. So that's why there's -1 through -4 for Model K. S&W is salaries and wages. O&E is operating expense expenditures. So the bigger picture is when I present data like this, really, we're talking about three categories of costs. There are earnings. That's where people are. We pay out someone's salary their benefits. That's the benefits pool and everything else. Everything else is the O&E. And I do this primarily, because our largest category of cost by far is personnel, which would be salaries and wages and benefits. Benefits are here because they are part of the complete picture. But at this university they're managed centrally. That's not something we budget for within the divisions.

xiv. M Rowley noted we are all kind of wrestling with how to look at these data. One thing I started looking at was like in which models would student enrollment, faculty numbers, and overall finance be the most evenly distributed among colleges? I don't know if that's a good way to look at it. Being in one of the smaller colleges right now, I do have some insight into how that affects us when we're talking about university organization. So that's one thing I was looking at. I'm curious other ways people are looking at these data.

xv. Eckfield reiterated that Education would like to move, and would like to move together to Health and Education. HRT has also expressed their interest in being part of College of Health. As people look through these tabs and options, looking at A which has the five original health plus HRT and plus Ed; Model C which has five original health plus HRT; Model D puts HRT into CLASS and all Ed go into Health. Would recommend removing the ones that split up Education Departments. Recommend focusing on A, C, D, F. Ending with a reminder about the preferences from those departments - helping me to whittle down options.

xvi. Newcomb (Guest) - Interested in revenue streams and the promise of the College of Health. Difficult for us to imagine relative to expenses but is an important consideration. Would like an analysis of enhancements and growth and revenue relative to a College of Health.

xvii. Chair O - next Ex Com and following Senate meeting, plus the forum on Friday, plus the GoogleForm are opportunities to submit thoughts and reactions to data.

xviii. Chin-Newman - In CoH Implementation Task Force report, it was recommended that AA develop a baseline model of funding for all colleges. Any progress on this? On the radar?

xix. Chair O asked for any additional comments or questions. None.

8. Reports:

a. Report of the Chair
   i. Spring '25 appointments
   ii. Chair O instructed us to read her written report.

b. Report of the President
   i. Traveling for Board of Trustees meeting.

c. Report of the Provost
   i. Federal funding pause. We know for certain right now that Pell Grants and Student Aid will not be impacted. Everything else is in a state of flux as we wait to learn more information. Federal grants, for instance. CA Attorney General is working with several other states to consider a possible injunction.
      1. Chief of Staff Aitken shared in chat - "A federal judge blocked the funding freeze about 20 minutes ago; there is an administrative stay until Monday of next week."
   ii. Directed us to President Sandeen's budget update via email a few minutes before the meeting.

d. Report of the University Diversity Officer
    i. Highlighted emails with resources for undocumented, immigrant, international, and LGBTQ+ students.
    ii. Difficult Dialogue Facilitator training is beginning this Friday - 18 participants.
e. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
    i. Heryford and Carpenter directed Senators to read written report. Noted that Board of Trustees is meeting tomorrow (1/29) and finance committee may be of interest.
f. Report of Student Government
    i. None.
g. Report of the CFA
    i. Newcomb shared that CFA statewide has organized an immigration task force. Also submitted to FAC a resolution in support of Sonoma State and acknowledgment that we are in solidarity with them. Hoping the resolution is in Senate by next month. There is also a petition you can sign individually.

9. Roundtable

10. Adjournment