

## **Executive Committee Minutes**

*Tuesday, April 16, 2024, 3:00 pm*

*Approved: April 23, 2024*

**Call to Order:** 3:01 pm

**Roll Call:**

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

**Open Forum:**

- **Division of Inclusive Excellence reorganization under the President's Office:** Professor Cardenas-Dow stated that several affinity groups on campus are concerned about the announced restructuring of administrative units, specifically, shifting the Division of Inclusive Excellence into the Division of University Affairs, as well as the announced leaving of the current VP of Inclusive Excellence. What effect will this have on the campus and for the affinity centers? Chief of Staff Tudor stated the President's Office has been looking at efficiency as well as the budget cuts and will be bringing Inclusive Excellence over to the President's Office. They do not anticipate changes in functionality given the realignment that the President's Office is looking at. Faculty are welcome to share feedback with the Chief of Staff or during open forum. Once final plans are done, the President's Office will send out information to the campus. The Chief of Staff offered to meet with any campus groups for feedback.

It was asked where or when a conversation with the Faculty Senate occurred. The Senate Chair stated the President spoke about the reorganization of administrative units in an Executive Committee meeting and at the Senate.

In the past when a VP is stepping down, the President would share information and the plan for moving forward during an Executive Session. The Senate Chair stated that, after conversations with the administration, he believes there will be an Executive Session next week.

- **24/25 Faculty Senate Organizational Meetings.** There seems to be some confusion as to who is to be at the in-person Organizational meetings and asked about the choice that was made to change the meeting modality mid-semester and if there would be a quorum at the meetings. The item was added to the agenda.
- **ASI Students:** Professor Tutschka stated that there are a lot of faculty with ASI students working for them and is concerned about their academic performance because of the workload of ASI students. ASI representative Castellanos stated the best way to share information would be with the ASI Board. Their next meeting will be on April 17 at 2 pm.

**Approval of the Agenda:** The agenda was amended to add: A discussion of the modality of the 2024/25 2<sup>nd</sup> Organizational meeting of the Faculty Senate (following #8) and a resolution of appreciation of Chair Rechs (placed at the end of the agenda). The agenda as amended was approved.

**Approval of the Minutes – April 9, 2024** Approved.

**From the Chair:** Nothing to report.

**From the Provost:** Nothing to report.

**Presentation Request: Turf Renovation on IM Fields:** The Chair stated that he was told by VP Bowman that the renovation is only impacting Kinesiology. The Kinesiology department chair and Associate Dean Shaw have been integrally involved and providing feedback on the project from the beginning. It was stated that the chair of Kinesiology is on leave and so the question was asked as to whether someone from Kinesiology is still involved in the construction feedback. The Senate Chair will reach out to Associate Dean Shaw and VP Bowman to see if consultation is still going on. The Provost stated that a presentation can be scheduled for the broader community if there is enough interest.

**2024/25 Faculty Senate 2<sup>nd</sup> Organizational Meeting Modality:** Why was the meeting not hybrid? The Senate Chair stated that the decision to have the meetings in-person was his as the convener of those meetings and that past organizational meetings have been in person except for during the pandemic. It was pointed out that the previous organizational meetings were not in-person, but hybrid. It was shared that a hybrid modality allows for greater accessibility, with a variety of reasons being given. A guest shared that there is an inherent challenge in changing the modality for Senate meetings given that faculty volunteer to serve as senators based on the current modality, even though the modality of the next year is for the next Senate to decide.

A discussion took place during which the challenges and benefits of online and in person modalities were expressed.

The Chair stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Organizational meeting for the 2024/2025 Senate will be made hybrid so people can attend via zoom, if needed. However, it will be purview of the 2024/2025 Senate as to the modality of the Senate meetings for that academic year.

**Standing Rules: FPC and FPC Subcommittees:** The FPC Chair stated there was a lack of oversight and reporting relationship with FPC subcommittees. FPC reviewed the standing rules for FPC and its subcommittees to discuss strengthening the relationships and efficient ways to obtain the information needed. Most of the changes are in the role of the committee chair. Additionally, a proposed change is for FPC committee chairs to write letters of acknowledgement for members to promote a campus culture of gratitude.

The Senate Chair stated that the Senate has made an effort to standardize Senate committee charges and he recommended the any changes that are made be made for all standing policies and subcommittees.

Concern was expressed about the rigidity of proposed language stating the appointment of liaisons shall happen during the first meeting. Similar concern was expressed about the rigidity of the committee chair reaching out to subcommittee chairs with information about liaisons after the first meeting.

A discussion was had about the proposed change that would require the FPC chair to write letters of acknowledging each committee member's service. What about members who are not often present? Writing letters would increase the workload of a chair. The Chair of FPC stated there is no criteria specified to be put in a letter - it is up to the chair. It can be as time consuming or as simple

as the chair wants. FPC's conversation was on a culture of gratitude on campus and wants to be a part of institutionalizing the acknowledgement of our service. Faculty may request additional language for their service.

The following amendments were passed to the proposed revisions to the standing rules of FPC:

- Line 62: Change "his/her" to "their"
- Line 66: Replace "After the first meeting of the year" with "Upon appointment of the liaison"
- Lines 92 and 99: Add the word "Normally," at the start of the sentence (i.e., before "During")

The amendments for FPC and the FPC subcommittees standing rules will be placed on the next Senate agenda at First Reading. The Senate Chair stated that, if approved, a motion may be made to carry forward the language amendments to the standing rules of all Senate standing committees.

**Guidelines for Filling Senate committee vacancies:** A discussion took place about modifying the Committee Vacancy Guidelines.

It was shared that the standing rules of the Senate cover how selection will be made for Senate standing committees and that the election should be diverse. Should the guidelines being discussed be incorporated into the Senate standing rules instead of being a separate document?

An opinion was shared that Line 11 of the Guidelines should read "...diverse, when possible and when appropriate..." since it might be the case that the committee would benefit from a membership that was more narrowly focused (e.g., a Women in STEM Campus Workgroup or a taskforce centered on providing support for an affinity group). Ensuring diversity of rank for the Provost search necessarily means junior faculty will serve who will be reviewed by the selected Provost. It was also shared that the term "diverse" could be problematic unless there are specific definitions for it.

Lines 22-24 were discussed for the remainder of the discussion. It was shared that there is not currently a committee for which a statement of interest is required and that there is not currently an available form that can count words (characters only).

A motion was made and seconded to change the words "is required" to "may be provided" on line 22.

It was shared that this change would not affect the selection of faculty for Senate committees based on the annual Preference Poll, but would require that a nomination form would be needed for all other committee vacancies for which the Executive Committee makes a recommendation since it is standard practice to invite (but not require) nominees to submit a statement of interest. The Chair expressed concern about the Executive Committee or Senate making decisions about the operation and function of the Senate Office and stated that he thought it better if the Executive Committee or Senate simply decide what information is needed and leave it to the Senate Office to decide how best to acquire that information.

It was expressed that the use of forms would provide a level of standardization (which might be needed) and would make the collection process easier. The Chair disagreed that it would make the collection process easier and shared the current practice of how nominations requests are handled through email responses.

An opinion was shared that it feels problematic that a form with a character count would be used for everything, which is a problem because everything would have to be changed to conform to that. Professor Baldwin shared that the workgroup was imaging Qualtrics being used when drafting the proposal. An opinion was expressed that, if a form is used, it should be one that the campus already has. Another opinion expressed was that it isn't appropriate to mandate what form is used, but that

using a form would create standardization. It was shared that a character count limit can be used to approximate a word count limit.

Several people spoke about the dangers of writing procedures into policy and cautioned against it. An opinion was shared that even if line 24 is struck, it is still the Senate Chair's responsibility to determine the best way of acquiring information from prospective faculty nominees, and that the Senate Chair and Senate Analyst would know best what procedures would be easier or harder.

A committee member expressed that the intent is to get consistent information from applicant and build more integrity in the information. Another committee member expressed that the standard information for all is needed.

It was asked whether the problem that is trying to be solve by the proposed changes is to prevent statements of interest from being longer than 100 words; reduce the workload for the Senate Office; or to make all nomination requests standard (i.e., using a standardized form)?

Concern was expressed about trying to make one form for all of the different types of situations in which a faculty representative would need to be selected. It was further recommended that, if this proposal goes before the Senate for consideration, it would be best to divide it into three different agenda items: the guidelines, the use of a form, and the use of a rubric (all considered separately).

The Chair thanked ad hoc workgroup for all their work.

At the time of adjournment, the Guidelines for filling Senate committee vacancies was being discussed and will be placed on the next Exec agenda. The discussion about R2 Doctoral University Designation and how Faculty are being Evaluated as well as a resolution in appreciation of Chair Rechs had not been taken up and will be placed on the next Exec agenda.

**Adjournment:** 5:10 pm