

## **Executive Committee Minutes**

*Tuesday, October 29, 2024, 3:00 pm,*

*Approved: November 5, 2024*

### **Roll Call:**

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

**Call to Order:** 3:00 pm

### **Open Forum:**

- **The storing and access to faculty WPAF files:** There was a past Workgroup that looked at different methods including software for online faculty WPAF files for evaluation and retention. Ultimately the Senate chose not to recommend a new system, and the University stayed with using SharePoint. A request was made to revisit the decision due to hearing inconsistency in college and department processes. A request was made to add the topic to the agenda as a discussion item.

**Approval of the Agenda:** The agenda was amended to add item 12 To review the online RTP Process and Evaluation System. The amended agenda was approved.

### **Minutes:**

- **October 22, 2024:** The minutes were amended at line 24 to read: During the approval of the agenda a motion was made to reorder the agenda to move the Provost Search agenda item to be after information from the Chair/Provost/President. This motion was due to the prevention of an open forum item on a Letter of Concern regarding the Provost Search because the item was on the agenda. The minutes as amended were approved.
- **October 24, 2024:** Approved as published.

## From the Chair:

- CSU Future Strategic Plan Task Force Townhalls: The Chair shared the schedule for the Townhalls and asked members to attend at least one Townhall.
- Executive Committee and Faculty Senate Agendas/Minutes Archives: The Chair shared that in the near future, the past two years of agenda and minutes will be posted on the Senate homepage as requested by members of the faculty. This request is only temporary due to the Senate Office complying with current accessibility requirements. In future, requests will need to be made to the Senate Office for archived Senate materials not published on the website.
- Extension cords in 275 Sac Hall. The Senate Office is looking into approval of extension cords used in the meeting room. Facilities must approve the use and purchase of extension cords.

**November 7 Senate Agenda Draft Agenda:** The agenda was approved. The Chair requested flexibility to adjust the number of agenda items for the Senate meeting to prevent the agenda from feeling overloaded. Exec was fine with the request.

## Priority Registration Policy

Main Points from the Discussion:

- Question raised: Did APC consider adding Hornet Launch to the policy? APC Chair shared that the committee considers Horner Launch a tool for managing enrollment and not a policy.
- It was noted: A definition is not provided of what an Honors College is.
- Question raised: If a program meets the conditions listed, are they automatically granted priority?
- Question raised: Policy is not clear on if it pertains to regular or intersession. APC Chair shared that they spoke with CCE and intersessions do not have priority registration.
- Feedback provided: Line 54, Switch freshmen and sophomores. This would make Hornet Launch be in compliance.
- Feedback provided: 3<sup>rd</sup> priority seems problematic. Clarify the 3<sup>rd</sup> priority. Is 3<sup>rd</sup> priority listed on any website? APC Chair replied no, it would fall under Student Affairs.
- Feedback provided: Change out all the acronyms "APC".
- Question raised: Did APC consider whether it incorporated other policies? The APC Chair shared that additional groups of students were added to legislative changes..

**Motion:** Refer the policy back to APC and all individuals with concerns, questions or recommendations for the policy are asked to email them to the Senate Chair and Analyst for inclusion to the referral. *Carried.*

**Discussion: Upcoming proposal to amend the Senate Standing Rules and Bylaws:** The Chair shared that a proposal to amend the Senate Standing Rules and Bylaws will be coming forward. The proposal will focus on changes to:

- Voting: Clarity how the Senate votes: by secret ballot and in meetings, if meetings continue to be hybrid.
- Parliamentarian appointment process to the Faculty Senate.
- Adding flexibility to items discussed in President's Executive Sessions.
- Term limits to Senate subcommittees and Executive Committee At-Large members.
- Permanent meeting modality language for the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate including how guests will attend and guest presentations.

**Presentation: Sacramento State Mission Statement Amendment** – Chief of Staff Tudor and Professor Peigahi presented a PowerPoint spoke about the work of the Strategic Planning Committee and additional amendments to the statement.

Main Points from the Discussion:

- The Chair asked for a motion to move the item to the Faculty Senate for endorsement and the expanded mission statement be amended to come in-alignment with current processes.
- Feedback provided: Question was raised about correcting the AANAPI designation. It should align with the Federal designation.
- Question raised: Do we want to have an expanded mission statement with a campus definition? An extended mission statement may be confusing to the external community but suggest a preamble is added.
- Question raised: Was shared governance part of the process after amending the mission statement? Chief of Staff Tudor replied that the committee make-up is a shared governance process with faculty representatives and who voted on the amendment. Members were appointed for a three-year term. Additional work is needed and the President will use the shared governance in this process.
- Placement on a Senate agenda was discussed – the Senate will only endorse or not endorse. The Senate can recommend changes to the administration.

**Motion:** Place the item on an upcoming Senate agenda for endorsement. *Carried.*

**Undergraduate Requirement for Graduation Application Policy:** Clarifies the process for undergraduate applications and the number of units requirements.

Main Points from the Discussion:

- Question raised: Why is this graduation application policy language not a part of the existing Graduation Requirements policy? The APC Chair replied that in discussion with advisors, they felt there was a for clarification of what type of requirements are needed before acceptance of the graduation application.
- Feedback provided: The policy clarifies some things but feels it would be better suited as a subsection in the Graduation Requirements policy.
- Feedback provided: Second Bachelor's degrees are always major only. Clarify information under the 2<sup>nd</sup> BA and how many units are needed. Change graduate advisor to academic advisor. Clarify Second Bachelor requirements and who they are meeting with.
- Question raised: What is meant by meeting with a graduate advisor? The APC Chair replied, the Registrar's Office requirements and some classes may not be eligible, such as a policy that expired for classes taken year ago.
- Feedback provided: Graduation application is an evaluation and is perceived as an application to graduate. The policy does not address this. The policy needs to explain what the graduate application is and that it is part of the graduation requirement.
- Question raised: Should there also be a section on unit maximums?
- Feedback provided: Provide a definition of the actual function of what a graduation application is.
- Feedback provided: Enrollment section: Change calendar year to academic year. Calendar year requires that students have to reenroll in January.
- Feedback provided: Also review the policy, "Students Not Applying for Graduation Who Have Completed Baccalaureate Degree" for duplication and referral.

**Motion:** Referred back to APC to address the above concerns raised (and the emailed follow-up questions/concerns) and how it interacts with the existing policy on Graduation Requirements and if it should be integrated into the Graduation Policy. *Carried.*

### **Review of Online ARTP Process and Evaluation System:**

Main Points from the Discussion:

- It was shared: A College of Education faculty member has had to reupload their WPAF files each year in full rather than adding to the file. Their files have been erased at the end of each review.
- It was shared: There is no policy or guidance provided for WPAF online procedures using SharePoint. Some faculty have year-round access to their files while others may only access their files for a limited period of time.
- It was noted: Year-round access for electronic files is regulated by ARTP policy. UARTP policy addresses paper vs electronic. It requires a custodian and is process-driven. Whether or not colleges, departments, and faculty are following policy is another matter.
- Vice Provost Cameron shared that currently, there are no Academic Affairs-level procedures/guidelines. OFA and the Vice Provost have offered to develop procedures.
- Vice Provost Cameron cautioned that if the Senate takes this issue over how WPAF files are managed online up again and recommends a software program, we will need to ensure that the software is affordable to the university. She also cautioned that the Senate should understand that the workload and experiences of others (particularly staff) need to be considered when looking into this issue.
- It was noted: Not too long ago, A&L had concerns about the use of Share Point for storing WPAF files and requested it be examined. That proposal didn't go forward but it is important. It should be university wide and not college by college and it is time to look at it again.

**Adjourned:** 4:48 pm