

Executive Committee Minutes*Tuesday, April 23, 2024, 3:00 pm**Approved: April 30, 2024***Executive Session:** 3:03 pm – 3:23 pm**Regular meeting Call to Order:** 3:01 pm**Roll Call:**

Adam Rechs, Aleta Baldwin, Sharon Furtak, Amber Gonzalez, Andrea Terry, Bertha Vegas Castellanos, David Moore, Jeff Wilson, Matthew Krauel, Monicka Tutschka, Raul Tadle, Tracy Dawn Hamilton

Open Forum:

Administrative Organizational Chart: A updated org. chart was requested from the President to be shared with the Senate.

Interim Policies: The interim status for the following policies is expiring: Policy on Re-Organization or Moving of Academic Units and Credit for Prior Learning. A request was made to extend the interim status until the Fall to allow for the Senate committees to complete their work. The Chair will send a memo to the President requesting the interim status be extended.

Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was amended to remove Item 12 Appreciation of Chair Rechs at the request of the Senate Chair. The agenda as amended was approved.

Minutes – April 16, 2024 Approved

From the Chair: On the April 25 Senate agenda are two policies: Policy on Re-Organization or Moving of Academic Units and Programs and the UARTP Section 5.05E Competent Teaching Performance. The Chair stated that the administration has some concerns about the amendments and asked what, if anything, should be done with the items should (e.g., pulled to allow the committees to work with the administration; have the administration share the concern with the Senate during deliberations, or not change plans). It was decided that the items would remain on the agenda. The President will meet with Professor Gonzalez regarding minor amendments to the UARTP Section 5.05E Competent Teaching Performance amendments.

From the Provost: The Provost is working with the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee and the deans regarding the budget changes. More information will follow in the next few weeks. It was requested that Administration and Business Affairs provide a broader overview of budget for a campus-wide forum and also for one to be connected to the Faculty Senate.

Program Proposal: BA in History (Law and Social Justice) The item had previously been returned to the Curriculum Subcommittee Chair for consultation verification, which has been addressed. The item will be placed on the May 2 Senate agenda on Consent Action.

Guidelines for Filling Senate Committee Vacancies:

A guest stated that the proposed guidelines and form, as written, would apply to the committees on the Senate Preference Poll reviewed by the Committee on Committees (COCO) and the Executive Committee. However, the proposed guidelines and form now seem incompatible with use for committees filled from the Preference Poll. What is being discussed and what is being proposed are fundamentally different. The guidelines should pertain to search committees, etc.

The Chair expressed that he thought not all of the information being proposed to be asked for should be used. Outside of name, rank, college, department, and an optional statement of interest, whether there is a conflict of interest is not addressed by the Senate (it would be the administration/HR who would address that); since nominees need to commit to being available for all meetings, asking about availability isn't needed; interest level may not be a good metric for search committees because some people with exceptionally appropriate skills/knowledge may indicate "some interest" because they realize it will take a lot of work and time (vs. just someone indicating "high interest" because they just want to an opportunity to serve on a university-level committee). He also stated that things can (and have) gone wrong with using forms. With an email response (unlike a form), it is clear who the faculty member is who is making the nomination.

It was shared that forms can be used without issue to nominate someone else simply by having a field for the nominator and a field for the nominee. It was also stated that software issue can happen to any piece of software, including email.

It was stated that the discussion seemed incongruous with the first lines of the guideline proposal (applying to search committees instead of committees populated through the Preference Poll).

A motion was made to refer the item back to the workgroup to clarify for which committees the proposal is supposed to be used for (and any additional changes). Carried.

April 25 Senate Agenda: No changes were recommended.

R2 Doctoral University Designation how Faculty are Being Evaluated

This discussion item was added to the agenda during the April 9th Executive Committee meeting when it was shared that some faculty had concerns regarding boilerplate language used by the Provost in faculty periodic review letters. The concern centered on the sentence: "In light of our anticipated designation as an R2 Doctoral University – High Research Activity, research, scholarship, and creative activity will become even more integral to Sacramento State's mission."

The Chair noted that the Provost was not present and suggested that the discussion be delayed until the Provost can be present or those with concerns could contact the Provost directly.

It was expressed that the language in the sentence in question is rather changeling, with concern being voiced, not just about the R2 designation, but that the designation was referenced seemingly as the reason why faculty should go for publications.

It was suggested that the Executive Committee write a resolution for consideration by the Senate that would express the concerns. The Chair stated that such a plan would require the Executive Committee to review the resolution and vote on it – which would not be until next meeting and, therefore, would take too long to get on a Senate agenda – but that an individual senator may bring such a resolution to the Senate this week from the floor. Amber Gonzalez stated that she would write the resolution.

Adjournment: 5:10 pm