EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, January 24, 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, K. Janousek, E. Klink, P. Soni, D. Hamm, A. Russo, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

Absent: A. Nayak, K. Scissum Gunn, I. Olvera

Additional Guests: A. Mircea-Trotz, D. Montoya, K. Johnson, C. Goldpaint, L. Brown

1.   Call to Order – 2:01pm

2.   Approval of Agenda – Moved by MA, seconded and approved as amended.

3.   Approval of Minutes: Meeting of January 17, 2023 – Moved by MA, seconded and approved.

4.   Special Orders
        4.1.   Report: Provost Scissum Gunn - presented by Jody Cormack
    -    JC reports on the discussion on PS 20-02. She asks if there is anything to be presented to the Dean's council.
    -    The new LB mayor (Richardson) visited campus recently and brought forth some ideas about community connections, employment strategies, and programs for education at our campus and neighboring campuses. This was his initial meeting with the University, and he is very focused on education and helping the residents of Long Beach through the LB Promise. Degree completion will be a focus as well. The mayor met with students on campus as well as the ASI board.
    -    AVP for FA search updates include community members on the search committee - Nancy Torres accepted a role on the committee.
    -    The College Corps at the Beach 23-24 cohort begins soon. Paid internships are part of this program. These internships benefit marginalized students and are HIPS. Over 9200 hours of work so far, and each student does 450 hours minimum. Students mention positive outcomes from this program.
    -    QUESTIONS:
         o   NS asks how students are solicited for this program. PFH provides a link for this.
         o   NMA asks SA for construction updates regarding the blocking of parking spots in lots. SA will follow up on this.

5. New Business
    5.1. One Faculty member to serve on the Search Committee of Executive Director of Athletics
    - SA provided position description, PFH asks EC for a volunteer. NS asks if President Conoley has decided on the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR). SA states no. NS suggests the FAR be on the search committee. EC decides to give this recommendation to President Conoley.
    5.2. [Time Certain 3:00 pm] No Barriers Campaign Updates
        Guests: Alina Mircea-Trotz, AVP, Leadership & Legacies; Dan Montoya, Vice President for University Relations and Development
    - DM and AMT present on this campaign. Trying to develop a culture of philanthropy through their programs to foster student success. The No Barriers campaign is having a roadshow to campus leadership to explain the program. This campaign is a fundraising program to cover capital and non-capital gifts. Part of the funding for CSULB comes from the state but does not cover everything. The priorities come from Beach 2030. There are three pillars of this campaign: 1) Boost Student Achievement; 2) Shape California's Workforce; and 3) Elevate Our Community. The end of this campaign is June 2025, with a goal of raising $275M.
    - Funds raised will: ensure students have access to high-caliber and high impact learning experiences, keep students financially unencumbered with minimal student debt, develop programs and best practices to address the growing number of challenges – including food/housing insecurity, medical/mental health crises faced by students and communities. Success will depend on creating donor stewardships, participate in donor relationship building, as well as working with leaders to build relationships on the institution's behalf. Ways to spread the word include zoom backgrounds, logo on Teams, social media posts, newsletters, and email signatures.
    - Questions and discussion ensue regarding: any "strings attached;" long-term plans beyond 2025; contradiction between the "No Barriers" title and access to material for blind, deaf, and non-English speaking individuals; perceptions of the campaign among faculty; and importance of highlighting community benefits.
    5.3. [Time Certain 3:30 pm] GWAR Placement Examination (GPE) Requirements
        Guests: Jody Cormack, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, Dean of Graduate Studies; Kerry Johnson, AVP, Undergraduate Studies; Christina Goldpaint, Data and Program Analyst for Undergraduate Studies; Lori Brown, GWAR Coordinator
        - JC, KJ, LB and CG report on the GWAR placement examination. GPE was suspended during COVID because of size of testing requirements and lack of online testing options. As a result, many students went directly into writing intensive courses without taking the GPE. They wanted to compare the success of individuals who took the GPE versus those who did not. Is the GPE something we still need? Are there better options?

- CG presents data on students who went into writing intensive courses without taking the GPE. 92.5% of students passed the writing intensive course without the GPE first. Compared to those who took the GPE Fall 2018 to Fall 2021 and scored 11 or higher – their pass rates was 92.6%. Those who scored 8-10 had a 93.6% passing rate. Those who scored 7 or lower had a 88.9 % passing rate. The limitations of unbalanced samples sizes and lack of simultaneous comparison groups were noted. Statistical analyses revealed no significant differences between groups.
- RF and AC comment on the tests conducted – Chi-Square or a similar non-parametric test would be more appropriate than an Independent Samples T-test. RF also asks for data focusing on a different categorization of 'passing' (e.g. focusing on A & B students instead of A, B, & C all clumped together).
- KJ's Takeaway – does it make sense to continue with the GPE? Should we consider suspending the GPE until the new GWAR proposal is in place? This would reduce the testing requirements of students and allow them to proceed into writing intensive courses without hindering their advancement.
- DH sees a piece that is missing from the analysis --- the impact on faculty. Do we have data about the impact on faculty? Are they spending more time tutoring, grading, and helping students?
- NS is concerned about the limitations mentioned. He believes the GPE is effective, and there are some hints of its effectiveness in the data.
- MA – asks if we should wait until we hear from the CO's office, because there have been conversations about revised writing tests.
- KJ wraps up with – we need to make a decision about the GPE --- continue or suspend --- soon. The deadline for registering is January 27th, and the test will take place in early February.
- EC believes we should go ahead with this round, because it is so close and there are ~1,300 students already signed up.

6. Old Business
    6.1. PS 20-01 Interpretive Memo
    - PFH presents a draft of the interpretive memo for this policy. The phrase "essentially all" is imprecise and needs to be more precise.
    - EC previously drafted a response that included: 1) we recognize the imprecise nature of the language; 2) Deans can interpret the language as necessary for their college; and 3) interpretations should be done in consultation with chairs and faculty councils
    - Three concerns are brought forth to EC including:
        - 1. Can the AS Executive Committee issue such as an interpretive memo?
        - 2. Should the Senate open the interpretation for discussion and clarification?
        - 3. What are the ramifications when Faculty Council or department chairs are not in agreement with the Deans?

- RESPONSES:
  o NS says 'yes,' EC can issue an interpretative memo. If multiple issues 'bubble up,' we can consider opening the policy. Other EC members share their agreement with this viewpoint.
  o RF suggests that the interpretive memo needs to be posted on the Academic Senate website with other interpretive memos.
  o Discussion about how to monitor the policy in practice ensues.
  o NS moves that EC accept the current memo as written, with some minor grammatical corrections (made by NS), publish it on the AS website, and distribute it to Deans and Faculty Councils. NMA seconds. No further discussion. VOTE: Motion passes with only one objection.

    6.2. White paper draft for AY 22-23 AS Retreat discussion
- NS motions to share RF's draft with the K-12 retreat participants, and to give them one week to respond. Seconded by EK. AC's draft will then be sent to the Provost for dissemination. Vote on motion; motion passes.

7. Announcements and Information
- KJ states ASCSU is recommending a certain font that is ADA compliant. The name is Atkinson Hyperlegible and needs to be downloaded to use.
- NMA shares displeasure about ATS SPOT webinar and the poor quality of the webinar.

    7.1. [Faculty Online Readiness Program](#) is scheduled to start with two cohorts (February 6 and March 13)
- This program was brought to EC previously, and the training dates are provided on the website. Digital badges are available to those who complete the program.
- Brief discussion ensues about the quality of the FORP website and the statement that "some college (sic) and departments may choose to make this an internal requirement." – It is clarified that this program is recommended but not required for faculty.

    7.2. The CSU Enrollment Target and Budget Reallocation Plan

    7.3. No Barriers Campaign Total Giving Trend to Goal

8. Reminders
    8.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 1/26/2023, 2-4 pm

9. Adjournment – 4:03pm