

Senate Executive Committee Meeting (11/10/2022)

Attendees: Elizabeth McNie (Chair), Matthew Fairbanks (Secretary), Frank Yip, Wil Tsai, Christine Isakson, Ariel Setniker, and Provost Lori Schroeder

Absent: Sarah Senk. She is traveling for a presentation.

Minutes Review and Approval

- *Minutes from 11/3/2022 were reviewed and approved by unanimous consent. Tsai and Isakson abstained.*

Provost's Report

- Provost Schroeder mentioned that the possibility of an interim Library Dean from another CSU is looking a little trickier than initially thought. Updates will be forthcoming.

ARC Policy Review

- McNie said that the amendments to the policy are rather small (presence of the administrator in the meeting, and the removal of the reflection statement by the administrator), and thus she's hoping for a first reading waiver in the Senate meeting.
- Tsai said he thought we were doing more (modifying evaluation questions, etc.), so with

- It should be that the Chair is supervising and the members of the Committee should be doing a significant portion of this work.
- The Chair should have the time to stay abreast of issues like AB 928 and other larger, structural issues with the GE program.
- He noted that the GE program is meant to be a University-wide issue of importance and it is sometimes not afforded that status.
- His proposal is that each School should have a stake, perhaps 1 WTU, so that the GE Chair would at least have a single course release.
- Dewey outlined some of the work that still has yet to be done – reviewing current course offerings, making sure they are compliant with appropriate learning outcomes, etc.
- Isakson – I'm not opposed to this release time proposal. Is it necessary for Schools to give up a WTU? Or can we simply add this to the S&M and C&C budgets?
- Dewey – that's another idea, though I've been a Chair for many years and still have no idea how these budgets are constructed

she has been at include it within that program. Dewey agreed with the idea, though currently the FYE program is not part of the GE program.

- McNie will reach out to Sarah Senk (GE Chair) to start the process of a job responsibilities document. Should there be a resolution affirming the importance of the GE program? And who will write it?

- Yip showed an organizational chart for Athletics in which there are 4 new MPP positions, which he suggests may be a big reason for the increase in salary budget.
- Isakson noted the relatively dilapidated state of classroom tech and yet we see these new positions, the new car in Athletics, etc, etc.
- Yip shared a visual aid for everyone who hadn't seen the car, which seems inadequate for transporting teams to athletic events, which raises questions regarding its use.
- McNie – if we raise these questions, we may be told that these are different pots of money. That is an often repeated response to these inquiries. Also, does this help with recruitment? How do we compare to similar institutions? There are lots of questions to answer to contextualize this. Lastly,

people that want it and better equipped for people who want that – but we don't have specifics in front of us at this meeting.

- Setniker – the resolution would be to support Teoh's solution as is? Tsai – not exactly, but we want to support the need for an overhaul and that faculty feedback will be incorporated (feedback, consultation).

