

Executive Committee Minutes

*Tuesday, February 25, 2025, 3:00 pm,
Approved: March 11, 2025*

Roll Call: 3:09 pm

Martin Boston, Sharon Furtak, Hogan Hayes, Carolyn Gibbs, Amber Gonzalez, Sheree Meyer , Pat Oberle, Adam Rechts, Andrea Terry, Matthew Krauel, Raul Tadle

Open Forum:

US Department of Education Office for Civil Rights letter: A CFA member read a letter on behalf of the CFA regarding the United States Department of Education Office for Civil Rights letter.

Sabbaticals for the 2025/26 academic year: How is Academic Affairs budgeting for sabbaticals and how will those funds will be distributed for next year? The Provost replied as of now, Academic Affairs is moving forward to support them and the number is unknown.

GE Moratorium:

- Why was the March 21 deadline for GE chosen and is it a deadline for just Curriculum Workflow or in general? GEGRPC Chair Meyer shared that the date is due to a software change that is happening. Any GE proposals that don't meet the March 21 deadline will be rolled back to the author.
- If a faculty member has a grant or course release specific to working on GE courses by the end of the academic year? It was shared that the faculty who were granted the course release should check to see if the course release is contingent on the proposal getting through workflow.

Students Rights and Responsibilities Policy: The Academic Affairs Student Issues Coordinator spoke about the grievances process that need to be updated. A referral will be sent to APC.

Approval of the Agenda: Approved as published.

Minutes: February 4 and February 11, 2025: Approved as published.

From the Chair

- The CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU) is hosting a conference on Saturday, March 15 Faculty Experiences and Perspectives in the CSU – A Call to Action

- The CSUAS will have 3 lecture senators to represent all lecturers in the CSU. A call for nominations has been sent out with a deadline is March 13 @ 12 noon.
- Policy on Reorganization or Moving of Academic Units and Programs: Appreciation was expressed to the Chair of FPC and the FPC committee workgroup for providing recommendations to this policy when they were not on contract, in response to the President's requests.
- It was shared that the Chair has received several emails from the College of Business (COB) faculty seeking clarification on what a college Academic Council means in regard to the current COB reorganization proposal. The Business proposal is progressing through the process using the current policy. It appears that the questions arising are directly or indirectly addressing the issue of policy confidence and the process it guides. In the Chair's opinion, one of the most crucial functions a policy of this nature can serve is to instill confidence in both the policy and the process it governs. Especially when decisions are delegated to others. For example, Academic Council meetings are typically closed meetings. Discussions and votes on items that affect the college are not public. This might be an issue for this particular policy and the Chair thought this issue could use further discussion.

From the Provost: Sabbaticals are contractually required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Academic Affairs is following the contract. On the Budget: All VP division leaders will present to Cabinet to address their respective deficit.

March 6 Senate Preliminary Agenda: The Chair stated an item will be added to the Information Items: CSU Systemwide Human Resources: Other Conduct of Concern: Systemwide Guidance.

Academic Information Technology Committee Work: The Chair shared the Academic Information Technology Committee (AITC) has asked if there is anything the Executive Committee would like AITC to take up.

Main Points of the Discussion

- A discussion about AITC taking up technology solutions and best practices/strategies for instruction took place. Concern was expressed about AITC taking this topic up.
- Feedback provided: Maybe AITC only focuses on the technology aspect. Is there technology that helps with the best practices?
- Feedback provided: For CHATGPT, if introducing new technologies who will pay people to use the technology in a sound way? Learning to use the technology requires training and time.
- Feedback provided: The textbook adoption process is complicated. Could AITC look into a more automated process?

The Chair will forward the feedback to AITC.

Discussion: Faculty Senate and Future Budget Conversations:

Main Points of the Discussion:

- Concern was expressed about this item for the Senate to discuss. Allow time for the Senate to complete their work in reviewing policy. Have a Budget Town Hall instead of during Senate meetings. It takes up a lot of time.
- The Senate's time is better spent on policy, proposals, etc. A Townhall is better for faculty and staff. Some people don't understand the problem and so they don't understand why we are coming up with the solutions.
- Move the conversation out of the Senate to another space.

- Request the President explain the gravity of the budget situation and how the proposal he is presenting will help save money. Many faculty do not understand what that means. We operate in WTU budgets not dollar budgets.
- The greater concern is the Academic Affairs budget.
- Feedback Given: Have Academic Affairs Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) make their work visible. The President's Budget Advisory Council (PBAC) was established to make budget decisions available to the larger community. Have them connect with faculty for a joint effort.
- Feedback Given: More transparency the better. Have the budget details available and post the information. A FAQ page with definitions and how things take place. A list of deliverables / goals to meet and what has already been identified and set. A calendar addressing deadlines when decisions need to be made. The Chair will check on the information being provided.

Discussion on Strategies the Faculty Senate can use to come up with a plan to address college reorganization that is unified. How to go about coming up with an effective plan/timeline for reorganizing the colleges – one in which all the departments have a seat at the table.

Main Points of the Discussion:

- Question raised: Should the campus be reorganizing colleges at all? How specifically will reorganizing colleges save the university money if the deans retreat back to the faculty with nearly the same pay and benefits?
- Question raised: We don't have answers to question which causes more harm than good. How much does this save?
- Question raised: Faculty conversations: What do you want to talk about, how do you want to undertake it? What is the process? Faculty need for the Senate to have conversations. Without some sense of an answer to the Why question it is hard to figure out how to evaluate.
- Feedback provided: A strategy is needed. There is a lot of variety of how departments are responding. People deciding for other departments what is best. Figuring how best to manage that and worry about getting competing proposals and how it will be negotiated?
- Feedback provided: Department chairs need to be able to have a conversation with the Provost without their dean's present.

The conversation will continue at the next Exec meeting. The Chair asked members to think about how to figure out the why, what the problem is, our goals, what criteria we might use, and strategies for how do the faculty come together to create a proposal?

Adjourned: 5:00 pm