



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
DECEMBER 12, 2023**

Approved 1-30-24

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

MH-141

Present: Bruschke, Garcia, Jarvis, Kanel, Milligan, Self, Shepard, Swarat, Valdez, Walsh

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jarvis called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Swarat) February 7th is the reveal of the Strategic Plan, a save the date will go out with meeting information.
- (Walsh) The Cozen committee is hung up on space, a few committee members who are insisting complaints should not go to a webpage, people should have a person they talk to, and it should be a place on campus where they go. Right now, the issue is they don't know where that space is.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 EC Minutes 12-5-23 (draft) - *forthcoming*

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

- Met with President Alva regarding Kristin Beal's Senate question. She showed me the response she sent Kristin. I will follow up with Kristin Beals.

Q: (Shepard) Can you give us a summary of what President Alva's response was?

A: (Jarvis) It was very short on the questions themselves. She stated she looked into it and can assure that all the processes were followed. It doesn't respond question by question.

Q: (Self) Your response was more specific, question by question?

A: (Jarvis) Yes.

Q: (Shepard) You are not intending to send them?

A: (Jarvis) I was intending to just forward the President's response, but she showed it to me, she did not forward it to me. So now my response would be either a): the President answered you already, if you do not like it, take it up with the President, or b): the longer version which we all contributed on. I am kind of leaning towards the longer one.

- (Shepard) In thinking about this more, this idea about the Academic Senate questions, has not, in anyone institutional memory been raised before. I understand people have legitimate reasons to ask questions of people put in position of authority and power, so I don't want to dismiss that. On the other hand, these are very much like personnel related questions.

So, if we set the precedent that any member of our community can ask about personnel related questions and we then consider them Academic Senate questions under our policy that we then go and investigate, that is of concern to me.

- (Bruschke) It seems to me the confusion people can't get through their head is we have a clear process for which you get retreat rights when you are hired, we do not have a process for when you get retreat rights after you already served as an MPP.

So, I agree with Jason, if we don't like that, we take it out of our Constitution or Bylaws, wherever it is. But in this situation say it's not just any personal matter, it's the Provost and we are not asking for private information, we are describing the process that was already followed. The answer "I already looked into it everything is fine, don't worry about it" is not going to fly. The answer here is all the details, we considered it carefully, all the public information has already answered the question is the right way to handle it.

- (Valdez) I agree with that because as I mentioned, there is a rumor that it was just granted last year under President Virjee under some shady way. So, I think giving the longer response that was created would clarify and hopefully ease the weird distrust of the Provost.
- (Swarat) I think this is a personnel issue and it should be addressed by the appropriate supervisor. We are not the Provost supervisor or a group that oversees personnel matters. We can advise the President, that we think it would be better that you provide more detail and here is what we prepared for you. I think it needs to go out from her if she is willing to do so, because she has already responded to her.

It seems like we are undermining the President. The President has given you answers, they are not good enough, so let the Senate give you a different answer. It seems like we are in competition with each other instead of collaboration. I'm not against providing the details, I do think it is helpful, but I think the person who provides that should be the President.

- (Walsh) Another way to look at it would be we are just providing information about the process; the President is providing information about the personnel side of things. I don't see any harm in us saying here is the process that we believed was used.

➤ I will create a google document, so we can create a resolution for Dean Bonney.

VI. PROVOST REPORT - 12:30 PM

- I know that the processing of stipends has been slow, this is all because of CHRS. We finally were given access last week to put the stipends in. CHRS still has some major issues, I am getting so many emails every day.

Q: (Shepard) I had a faculty lunch Friday and one of my junior faculty member who is getting beat down by the bureaucracy has been waiting. She took students on a trip that was grant funded in May and is praying that 2024 will be the year she gets reimbursed. She was given a p-card to pay for it, it didn't work because it was Canada and they forgot about the international issues, so she put it all on her card and has been waiting since May. So, this is one of the many examples. Is Admin & Finance in trouble or struggling?

A: (Provost) I think there are areas that we are struggling. Area by area, staffing has been hard to replace across the board. Our office has been working with Concur a lot, we have a new feature that is going to be rolled out. The feature is you can amend a requisite without going through all the approval steps. This is a huge change, because right now every time you make a change, you have to go through entire the approval process.

Q: (Kanel) How soon are you going to reimburse the requests that are in Concur?

A: (Provost) Those are not in my office; they are sitting in Concur. We are trying to implement features in Concur that they did not implement, that would solve our problem.

I think what happened was they did Concur on the faculty side, then they pushed it down our necks on the academic side without looking at what issues would come with that. I think Admin & Finance is frustrated with it and we are frustrated with it. So, the ones you are talking about, if you send them to me, I will track them and get them processed. If you give me the travel number, I can follow up on them.

Concur was not designed for the academic side of the house, it was designed for administrative side of the house. I am trying to solve some of these administrative things.

Q: (Jarvis) Is there any chance of helping the trains be on the same gauge by getting the Auxiliary

Services to also go to Concur? They are still doing paper forms for student travel.

A: (Provost) We are doing thing with Auxiliary Services. Binod is hiring someone for Post-Award, that is just going to help faculty on Post-Awards.

Right now, the Office of Sponsored Programs reports to Auxiliary Services, we are going to change that and have them report to Binod. So, we are doing some structural things to solve some problems.

The Executive Committee went into Executive Session.

VII. STAFF REPORT

- Yesterday, I was contacted by the President's office and on January 23rd, there are four trustees coming to campus and they want Exec to meet with them. They would like to know if the Exec meeting could start 30 minutes early and you all can either meet with the Trustees from 11:00 am - 11:45 am or 11:15 am - 12:00 pm.

They have a room on the 6th floor in the Library reserved where they will be having meeting that day. But if Exec prefers, they could bring the trustees to MH-141 for your meeting with them.

Q: (Walsh) Do they know who the four trustees are?

A: Yes. Chair Wenda Fong, Trustee Mark Ghilarducci, Trustee Leslie Gilbert-Lurie, and Trustee Jack McGrory.

Exec agreed to start the meeting 30 minutes early and meet with the trustees from 11:00 am - 11:45 am and meet in MH-141.

- (Kanel) Nicholas Nikolaidis chair of the Faculty Research Policy Committee wanted me to mention that he did not get a notice from Senate office that Guadalupe Diaz-Lara (HHD) was added to the committee, so he did not send her the meeting materials.
 - (Staff) Nicholas was sent an email with an updated committee list and informed to add her to his distribution list. We will resend him the email with that information.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 Faculty Development Center Board [Valdez], F, 12-8-23, 9:30 - 11:00 AM, PLS-299

FDC Director gave updates on programming. Committee approved the call for FEID last meeting, this time the reviewed and voted to approve rubric and template.

8.2 Library Committee [Milligan], M, 12-11-23, 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM, PLS-256

- Meeting was led by new committee chair Megan Graewingholt.
- Meeting was on Zoom and in-person, quorum was met.
- Minutes were approved.
- A new Dean for the library was hired. The library has hired three new staff members. Two of the new hires are LSS staff.
- Discussed, reviewed, and approved UPS 500.150 and UPS 508.000

8.3 Extension and International Programs Committee [Shepard], M, 12-11-23, 3:00 – 4:00 PM, THall 1424

- The EIP Committee met with all members attending via Zoom and staff attending in person in a conference room.
- Deirdre Thomas, associate dean for professional education and strategic initiatives, gave an update on three items.
 - There was a pause on 7 positions that we were trying to hire for; charged to look at professional education unit to develop a plan to make us financial sustainable.

- EIP created plan for provost which is under review, has 4 key categories: 1) infrastructure with evaluating our prof education unit and student services unit with an operational efficiency; 2) fees, identify if we can provide incentives to alumni and community members with offering discounts for programs; 3) expansion of our current programs and how we utilize them to expand sections, new subject matter experts to teach sections; 4) new program development, working with business community in doing customized training or identifying opportunities to utilized funds EDD to train their workers internally.
- CPaCE accelerator grants: from chancellor's office: CO has grants for new program development, there's \$50,000-\$400,000 possible. Must meet a business or marketing need within a community. Applications due January 31. Information was sent to deans. Campus can only submit 2 proposals per campus, so internal deadline mid-January. Committee will be asked to review for viability on what to submit.
- No new business was introduced.
- Minutes from prior meeting were approved.

Additional liaison report:

- (Kanel) I sent out a first draft of a resolution from the Faculty Research Policy Committee. The FRPC asked that the Senate create a resolution on workload, and research and scholarly activities stating we will develop a policy on this campus. Right not it's in the hands of the deans and it's not the same for everybody. Some people get compensated, and some don't.

They also want to create a policy on export control. There was an audit done and we are not in compliance of collaborating with other people, artifacts, data, and sharing with people outside of campus.

- Q: (Bruschke) The lecturers are excited about the changes to the lecturer evaluation process. Have those documents come forward yet?

A: (Jarvis) Those documents have not come forward.

- (Bruschke) Maybe we can get the AS chair to follow up on that?

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 9.1 Academic Budgeting - (Discussion item)
(tabled until next meeting with Provost)
- 9.2 Cultural Taxation Guidelines - (Discussion item)
 - 1. Email for Cultural Taxation

The Executive Committee agreed this document is ready to go out to campus in a joint email from the Provost and AS chair.

X. NEW BUSINESS

- 10.1 Faculty Committee Assignment for Standing Committee

- Elections Committee - SOC SCI
- Planning, Resource, and Budget Committee - EDUC
- Library Committee - SOC SCI

Exec discussed the vacancies. An email will be sent out to faculty asking them to serve. Once we receive an acceptance, the faculty member's name will be added to the consent calendar for the next Academic Senate meeting.

- The Executive Committee discussed the issues that arose during the last election regarding the electronic petition process.
 - (Kanel) The Election's committee wants to do a change on the petition process.
 - (Staff) Currently once the candidate gets the acquires the number of signatures, they are instructed to send an email to the Senate office acknowledging they have the signatures and confirming they want to proceed in the election process. Even with the reminder emails that were sent out, this year there has been issues with people circling back and sending a confirmation email and they have been left off the ballot because we are unsure if they wanted to continue in the process. If the Exec and Election committee wants us to move ahead all petitions without a follow up email, we will.

- (Jarvis) I think it's fine to move everyone along in the election process who took out a petition and have the required signatures. If someone later determines they don't want the job, they can run a petition informing people not to vote for them.

How does everyone feel on this? At deadline we just look at signatures or at deadline we need to have received an email from them.

Q: (Milligan) What does the Senate staff think?

A: (Staff) We can do it either way. We will send no reminders and when the election closes, whoever has the number of required signatures, we put them on the ballot. Or we can keep it as it is currently, they need to send their confirmation email acknowledging the signatures and they want to move forward in the process.

- (Kanel) Some people are new to running, so the question becomes do we want to go a bit out of our way in helping new people who don't understand things, holding their hands and guiding them through it so they can run or are we going to just say no you missed the deadline, you're out.
- (Walsh) If they can't read the instructions and follow instructions, I don't want them on a committee. I have been on committees with people who don't do their homework and don't read stuff and it's a pain.
- (Valdez) I get being new to elections, but we are not new to email.
- (Kanel) Some of the newer generation are new to email, they don't operation on email like we do, they operate on Instagram and things like that.

Q: (Self) Do they know they need to email back to you, is that process explained?

A: (Staff) Yes. The email goes out with the link to the petition. We state in the email when you have the required signatures, email us back acknowledging you have the petition complete to move forward in the process.

- (Shepard) To get a read of the room I would like to make a motion.
- M/S/P (Shepard/Walsh) Motion to maintain the deadlines and disqualify people who do not submit by the deadline.

10.2 Targeted harassment of professors - (Discussion item)

10.3 Project UpGrads - (Discussion item).

- (Jarvis) Volker Janssen from History works with Project UpGrads and wants to come and make a presentation to the Senate to share some of the work they have done with our U.S. Dept. of Education Grant on behalf of Black and Hispanic grad students these past four years. He would also like to talk about some of the ways in which he hopes activities will become permanent practices on our campus once the grant ends in October 2024.

Suggestion:

- (Kanel) He should ask the Council of Chairs and present it to the chairs, then they will know about it.
- (Shepard) Maybe he can do the presentation to the GE Committee.
 - (Jarvis) He has already done the presentation to the GE Committee.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Garcia/Shepard) Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.