

Executive Committee Minutes*Tuesday, March 25, 2025, 3:00 pm**Approved: April 15, 2025***Call to Order:** 3:00 pm**Roll Call:** Martin Boston, Sharon Furtak, Hogan Hayes (absent), Carolyn Gibbs, Amber Gonzalez, Sheree Meyer (absent), Pat Oberle, Adam Rechs, Andrea Terry, Matthew Krauel, Raul Tadle**Open Forum:**

- Policy on Administrative Appointments and the University Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, Section 5.05E Competent Teaching Performance: The status of the two items were requested.

Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was amended to move item 14 after item 9. The amended agenda was approved.**Minutes:** March 11, 2025 Approved as published.**From the Chair:**

- The Chair met recently with VP Hendrick to discuss the Zoom bombing as well as the audio problems in the Union meeting room.
- Additional resolutions from Sonoma State will be shared with the Executive Committee.
- A campus member inquired with the Senate Chair regarding the inconsistency of permitting two community members to address the lack of interpreter services at the Outstanding Faculty Awards during Open Forum. According to the rules, agenda items cannot be discussed in this forum. The Chair noted her consistent adherence to the rules, yet for this particular instance, they were temporarily waived due to the nature of a recent event.

From the President: No items**From the Provost:** WASC reaffirmation is scheduled for Spring 2027. The Taskforce members will be announced soon. The search process for the Vice Provost for Faculty Success will begin soon and a request will be made for faculty representatives to serve. The Spring Symposium Award Ceremony was amazing.

Preliminary Senate Agendas

- 24/25 Senate – April 10: *Approved*
- 25/26 Senate – April 10 1st Organizational Meeting *Approved*

Faculty Senate Standing Rules amendment:

A motion for an amendment was made: The Faculty Senate Office shall be responsible for ensuring that the Faculty Senate meetings and events are accessible and inclusive, utilizing campus accommodations procedures and practices.

Main Points of the Discussion:

- It was noted that the maker of the original amendment shared the draft language with faculty in Deaf Studies.
- Question raised: There are other members of the campus community who have other disabilities. Should the amendment be more general?
- It was noted: Our campus has a disability campus policy that can be used for all events. Does this language need to be repeated in the Senate Standing Rules?
- The Chair stated it is a significant substantial change from what was brought forward. If the two authors cannot come to a resolution, then the amendment should be introduced as a substitute amendment.
- The Chair advised a couple of pathways forward: 1) Accept either the amendment or the original amendment. 2) the two makers of the amendments meet to find a resolution between the two amendments. In terms of the language, the original amendment does have language about “is responsible” vs “shall develop”.
- Chief of Staff Tudor shared that she is working with the deaf studies faculty, the Lead Staff American Sign/English Interpreter, and Inclusive Excellence regarding interpreters. The substitute amendment may be sufficient because of what the campus is doing to make all events accessible.
- Feedback: The substitute amendment is shorter and more inclusive; it covers more actualities.
- It was noted: The recent resolution that Senate passed states resolved clauses to amend the Standing Rules. The Senate needs to focus on the Senate’s responsibilities; not the campus responsibilities.
- The Provost asked that her title be corrected in the original amendment, the word Senior is missing. It should read, Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs. The Provost shared that the language around budgeting be changed.

Motion: Table the discussion to the next Executive Committee meeting. *Carried.*

Discussion: Open Forum Suggestions for Combatting Recent Racist Actions Against Black Administrators:

Discussion/Questions addressed to Michael Nguyen, Interim Chief Diversity Officer and Tom Carroll, Assistant Dean of Students and Student Conduct Administrator:

- Students, faculty, and staff could be accountable for actions depending on the action.
- Question: Are the only consequences those that matter to policy? The Assistant Dean of Students shared an example: if trespassing, non-Sac State person can be removed from the campus for 14 days. The Interim Chief Diversity Officer shared the specificity of the context would determine actions.
- Question raised: There is frustration around what level has to happen before action can be taken. Is there a way for action to be taken sooner?
- Question raised: What actually would prevent someone from doing something similar on social media?

- The Assistant Dean of Students shared that if the Instagram account last week that targeted President Wood and others was connected to a student group it would fall under the Office of Equal Opportunity. The Interim Chief Diversity Officer offered to invite Skip Bishop, the Executive Director for Equal Opportunity, to attend to help advise on these situations.
- Question raised: Do we have a process when there is harassment? What is that process? The Interim Chief Diversity Officer shared the process online and the operational process of handling bias reporting.
- Question raised? Does the university have a definition for unprotected speech? There are rules to free speech. Inciting violence does not fall under free speech. The Interim Chief Diversity Officer was not aware of a university-adopted definition.
- It was noted: Stanford has a policy if there is interest in developing a policy.
- It was noted: It would be good to invite someone from Equal Opportunity. There is a lot of fragmented pieces, TPM policy more information is needed on who you can contact.

Motion: To have CODE develop a report on the unproductive speech policy by end of Spring 2025. Research outside of the university what the policies are and a list of those policies.
Carried.

Policy Amendments Recommendations to CSUA ADM-0140 to Include Broader Student Representation in the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) Composition:

A student contacted the Senate Chair to ask the Faculty Senate to take up a recommendation to have a broader representation of students to the Student Fee Advisory Committee in the number and manner students are being chose.

Main Points of the Discussion:

- It was noted: The current structure of committee is: At-large member, Faculty Senate chair, staff member, the majority are students.
- It was noted: The request is for a broader selection of students. Currently, students are appointed by the ASI Board of Directors.
- It was noted: Last year the majority of the student representatives were ASI leadership. The committee needs a broader representation of the students on campus.
- Question raised: We delegate a large number of students to student governance. Should this request fall under ASI instead of Senate? The Senate Chair replied, the Senate may make a recommendation. Exec should decide if this item should be moved on to the Senate for a recommendation.
- Feedback provided: Not in favor of moving this onto the Senate. The student representatives should be appointed by the Student Governance.

No action was taken for this item.

Continued Discussion: Facilitating Change, Faculty Sente Leadership in Initiating and Navigating Academic College Reorganization.

Main Points of the Discussion:

- Vice Chair stated because it is not mandated it was clear the administration would like the faculty to explore this. As a related note there are several proposals coming forward of moving to other colleges not a college reorganization. If there are 6-7 of these that are interrelated, how are they dealt with? Discuss how to deal with multiple proposals that come forward at the same time.
- The sense of immediate needs has diminished and that the budget is not good. There is not a strategic plan at a campus level, feels we need some sort of plan on how to evaluate, how to be

sustainable in the future. There are other models in the CSU Systems to look at. Ultimately the budget is bad and expect cuts to sections and an issue managing enrollments. Nervous that the continued conversation is not happening.

- Call for strategic plan committees established to develop a plan and looking at the next 10 years.
- Provost Cameron shared that she would look at this as an opportunity to partner with leadership. An opportunity to have an academic road map. Maybe a recommendation from the Senate to create a taskforce and have these conversations.
- Question: When will a detailed AA budget be shared?
- For the discussion of forming a taskforce with the Provost, Is the taskforce to define an Academic Affairs strategic plan or specifically college / schools or a broader specific plan?

Motion: the Executive Committee requests the Provost to convene a taskforce to put together a strategic plan for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Executive Committee for membership and the taskforce charge. *Carried*

The following item was not taken up and will be placed on a future agenda of the Executive Committee.

- Online Senate Meeting Protocols to Deter Unwanted Disruptions and Zoom Bombing

Adjourned: 4:58 pm.