

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, September 13, 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Academic Senate Conference Room (AS 125)

Or on Zoom: <https://csulb.zoom.us/j/87997222094> (Meeting ID: 879 9722 2094)

P. Hung, N. Schürer, R. Fischer, M. Aliasgari, A. Colburn, N. Meyer-Adams, A. Nayak, K. Janousek, E. Klink, P. Soni, D. Hamm, A. Russo, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, D. Yong, A. Kinsey.

Additional Guests: A. Torres

Absent: I. Julian

1. Call to Order – 2: 01pm
2. Approval of Agenda – PFH noted change on item 7.4, guest cannot make it today. Will replace with revision to Grade Appeal Policy. AC moves that items 4 & 5 be moved to the end. PFH suggests trying at this meeting. MS moves approval as amended, seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of September 06, 2022 – Motion by NS, seconded and approved.
4. Announcements and Information
 - 4.1. WLC AB 928 Letter
 - 4.2. New information related to previous grade appeal cases
5. Reminders
 - 5.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 9/15/2022, 2-4 pm
6. Special Orders
 - 6.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
 - KSG presents some updates regarding enrollment for fall. Some of our anomalies are tied to our transfer students and changes in their behavior. Numbers for new students are down 242, and FTES are down by 143. Transfers headcount down 492 students, and FTES are down 406. Continuing students are down by 689 – these are mostly transfers.
 - Overall, total student count is 38,504, which is down by 981. FTES is at 32,388, which is down by 948. We recognize that some changes are related to a desire to join the job market instead. One strategy in spring will be to increase transfers, usually at 13,000, but will target 16,000.

- These numbers raise the question of whether we need to change our course delivery to entice more students. Can we find ways to encourage students to both work and go to school? This may be a trend not just a one-time phenomenon. One of the challenges will be the applicant pool is down by 9%. Will need to work with colleges on admission targets.
- DH says she was at the CO's office, and they were required to wear masks. Wants to know if faculty can require masks in their classrooms given the President's new requirements. JC notes that faculty can follow the "accommodation request route." Is it a reasonable accommodation for compromised faculty members? KSG understands the complexity of the situation, but cannot provide a direct answer. KSG wants to know if we should articulate the accommodation route in a communication to faculty. RF says we should get some feedback from whoever is in the "accommodation" request office to see if this is viable. AC notes that students may also want to follow this same route in requesting the accommodation. KJ describes the difficulties they had in mandating masks in the library, and the short answer is that it wasn't possible. SA notes that we have moved beyond an external locus of control where authority can mandate masks, to an internal locus of control (personal responsibility) where people need to make the best decisions for themselves and others. KSG appreciates this way of framing the current status of the issue. KSG would still like us to consider a way to communicate options to faculty in order assist them in making decisions.
- AR notes the lack of communication about the purpose and use of the sicklet for staff members. JC clarifies the purpose and ways to use the sicklet. EK notes the issues within the high schools where they have been face-to-face for a while.

7. New Business

7.1. Academic Senate Retreat topic

- PFH thanks KSG for support for teacher facilitators. PFH asks EC for suggestions on title of retreat. EC discusses many possible titles. Many suggestions are offered. EC decides upon: **Shifting Tides: Preparing for Tomorrow's Students.**

7.2. CBA 20.37 Award Review Criteria

- PFH says UMGSS committee has questions regarding reviewing the applications for the CBA awards. She also asks where we need to change the committee charge, because they awards are not currently included within the charge.
- NS notes that the original charge came directly from the CBA, and the current CBA language now includes "cultural taxation." He argues that we should include this language and clarify the weighting of the various criteria. JC suggests adding the changes to the Consent Agenda.
- PFH notes that the UMGSS committee appears to be looking for a rubric from us, because there has been disagreement in the past among committee members about how to rank criteria. NS notes the importance of EC doing this.

- AC asks if the reference to cultural taxation focuses primarily on “student focused work.” There is agreement.
- PFH notes the tight timeline from the call for proposals to the selection of recipients and application of assigned time. Will need to look more closely at this going forward.
- PFH will add our responses to the Consent Calendar.

7.3. Questions related to “Associate Vice President & Dean, International, Continuing & Professional Education (or designee)” on committee charge

- PFH notes that the titles “Associate Vice President” and “Dean” are often referred to in a manner as if there is no separation between “International Education and Global Engagement” and “CPaCE.” With the division that now exists, how should we clarify the language on committee charges?
- Charges that need to be changed: CEPC; ACSEM; FACT
- Discussion ensues to clarify the appropriate representative to serve on each committee
 - For CEPC, we will be opening the policy anyway.
 - For the other two, we will put the changes on Consent Calendar.

7.4. Requested Revision to Grade Appeal Policy

- Timeline changes presented by JC to make the process faster for students to not delay their academic progress. An ideal timeframe would be one semester. Discussion ensues.
- NS expresses concern about legal counsel telling us what to do, rather than working to assist us.
- AN, MA, & NMA share examples that have led to the current length of time to handle cases, including: convening the committee, aligning schedules to set up meetings, and writing up reports after committee level decisions have been made.
- AC asks why we need three separate grade appeals committees.
- RF would like to hear from legal counsel about the specific legal foundations for the argument to shorten the timeline.
- JC reminds EC that the interests of the students should be paramount, as the current process can hold up students for over a year.
- EK shares examples of how her department handles the grade appeals cases.
- AC asks if ASI does a good job of assisting students with this process. JC says they have improved a lot and now have multiple resources to assist students.
- PFH says we will reach out to legal counsel to see if they can help us.

8. Old Business

8.1. Questions related to AVPFA Search Committee

- PFH asks KSG if the response from EC was complete, or if she has more questions. KSG notes an issue with search firm versus assigned time. Issues: There are sometimes co-chairs, and these searches often take more than one semester. It is about \$35k for search firm, and 6 WTUs of assigned time for a full professor can be about the same amount. If it is a cost consideration, what are

the pros and cons? There is also a major difficulty in convening such a committee. KSG would like something more definitive from EC to assist her in making some final decisions to get this search moving forward.

- Discussion ensues about the pros and cons of search firms.
 - PROs – they can review the PD, cull applicants, help guide the committee, and identify the most diverse and qualified pool of candidates.
- NS suggests moving forward with a search firm for this search, and requests that KSG keep EC informed about the prompts given to the search firm, while also asking the search committee to provide some feedback about the process once this search is done.
- MA suggests collecting data from most recent search that used a search firm, so that we can start compiling data about the effectiveness of the process.

8.2. Additional consideration related to COVID RTP Guidelines

- More questions have come forward regarding these guidelines, such as how long these guidelines will be sent out to evaluators. A question is raised about the extension in the current guidelines. Does it apply to faculty hired this year? PFH says the extension expired spring '22.
- PFH asks if she can send EC the questions via email
- NS – asks if EC agrees that we are sharing feedback on guidelines, but not the final report. EC agrees.

EXTRA NOTE Re: AB 928: there is a deadline of October 24th for feedback. PFH will put that on the agenda for next week.

9. Adjournment – 4:03pm