Tuesday, February 21, 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, D. Hamm, A. Russo, J. Hamilton, J. Cormack, K. Scissum Gunn, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: S. Kim, J. Wang

Absent: P. Soni, I. Olvera, S. Apel

1. Call to Order – 2:01pm

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

3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of February 14, 2023 – Moved by MA, seconded and approved.

4. Special Orders
   4.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
   - KSG reports on 23-24 sabbaticals and DIPs. There are 56 awards from 94 applications for sabbaticals, and 1 award from 4 applications for DIPs.
   - SPOT email went out to all lecturer faculty. All 906 undergoing evaluations were emailed separately with the information they needed. Lack of clarity in message and problems with information were among the feedback received regarding the message. There may be a grievance from CFA regarding work needed to compile the information needed. Matt M told lecturer faculty February 27 will be when materials are due. The communication process was examined in a consultative manner. DH feels there are still significant gaps in the communication in this process. Interfolio sent an incorrect message stating "nothing is required" when in fact information is required. Moving forward these processes will need to be updated. An FA retreat will be forthcoming. NS asks if alternate ways of doing this process (interfolio) were being considered. MA asks about evaluator deadlines being extended. AR mentions that staff have been left out of the training process when changes happen. If staff had been properly trained this may have alleviated this problem.
   - KSG also reports on the CFC situation, a campus email was sent out recently providing information to the campus community and the position that the campus has explored all its options. NS asks KSG if feedback from this communication can be presented to the Office of the Provost. Feedback will be received, and how to move forward will be up to the President.
   - The next graduation initiative will have a more involved part for faculty. As GI 2025 sunsets, new ideas are being considered. Ideas about how faculty members can

be more involved in student success will be considered. MA feels student success is tied to enrollment management, and that faculty input is not considered in this process. Meeting the "target" is the goal of enrollment management, which may not contribute to student success. DH feels that lecturer faculty are intentionally not included in the consideration of student success via teaching. Lecturer faculty teach more than TT faculty and should be consulted in this conversation. Discussion ensues about the need to clearly define "student success," the focus and funding of GI 2025, the importance of faculty "liking" and "understanding" their students, and the connection between lack of faculty & staff compensation and "checking out."

5. New Business
    5.1. WTUs for department chairs' service, term limits, cultural taxation
    - PFH says there is interest in reopening the Policy on Chairs. MA says colleges calculate service time differently. There are no clear guidelines for chairs in terms of research, service, and teaching, as well as the connection between these and salary calculations. JC says what MA is asking may not be addressed when opening this policy. NS agrees these issues are not in the policy. MA states that guidelines for chairs including teaching units, compensation, and service should be addressed by faculty affairs. KJ shares an example of a "Chairs' Duties" document from CSU East Bay as a potential example of such guidelines. AC notes that there would need to be some specific clarity about what needs to be added/changes in the policy if this request were to go to FPPC. EK notes that it might be time for a new chair's task force to review this issue. She will look for some of her old notes to help share information about how the discussion went last time.
    5.2. [Time Certain 3:00 pm] Develop guidelines for implementing gender-inclusive language
        Guest: Shae Miller, Chair, LGBTQIA+ Campus Climate Committee
    - SM does a lot work around equity and the focus within policies around campus. Says the LGBTQIA+ committee is working on guidelines and will bring some language back to us in about a month. SM is also here to share some resources for EC. Shares examples of websites for Trans Advocacy coalition (TAC) and LGBTQIA+, and the information they contain.
    - EC discusses and it is determined that guidelines are needed for implementing the already passed resolution. NS asks where specifically this language will be used. NS asks if this is for items already created or moving forward for new documents, also who will oversee this? Who will do the work, OED, Communications, LGBTQIA committee? SM says this will be for new policies and re-opened policies. Trans Advocacy Coalition (TAC) will be involved in this process as well as OED and OTP. EK says ASCSU is currently working on this issue, and a resolution from the CO will be forthcoming. She believes the CO will include implementation language with their resolution. NS notes the importance of getting other groups (those who might not be supportive) on board.
    5.3. [Time Certain 3:20 pm] IRB Self-Study and Other IRB-Related Processes
        Guests: Simon Kim, AVP, Research and Sponsored Programs and Jason Wang, Director, Research Integrity & Compliance

- SK and JW present on IRB self-study, specifically improving the IRB operations. All human subject research must be examined and approved by the IRB before conducting research. There have been some complaints about how slow the process was. A focus group was formed to research the process. To streamline the process an MOU was created and signed off on 2-6-23. A Self-Study Action Plan was developed along with a timeline.
- JW goes over the action items that were created. Seven recommendations: 1) re-examine the role of the Research Integrity and Compliance Director; 2) streamline the IRB process; 3) Address issues of accessibility and outfacing communication; 4) examine staff retention strategies; 5) fastrack technological solutions to immediately address inefficiencies; 6) expand IRB board liaisons within college; and 7) Expectations, roles & training for IRB board members.
- Re: #5 (technological solutions) – JW lists the subcommittee members, vendors (e.g. IRBNet), and other sister campuses who use similar technology. Cayuse and IRB manager are being considered as the platform to be used going forward instead of IRBNet. The platform will need to be "built" after the selection takes place.
- SK says all IRB proposals submitted prior to Feb. 3rd have been processed, approved and waiting for PI approval. There is no backlog at this time. PFH notes that part of the bottleneck was that proposals were not issued to reviewers in a timely manner. SK says 'yes,' there were proposals that were sitting on someone's desk. SK says there are also issues where the bottleneck occurs because reviewed proposals are sitting on PI's desks waiting to be resubmitted. KSG says an idea that might help is having more transparency about where each protocol is in the IRB process.

6.   Old Business
    6.1.   White paper for Academic Senate Retreat

7.   Announcements and Information
    7.1   Updates on the concern related to Academic Centers
    7.2.   Photos (CSU Trustee Maria Linares' Visit)
    EXTRA: NS asks about how to handle new amendments that are only slightly different than previous ones made by the same individual. Brief discussion ensues about ways to handle such issues according to Robert's Rules.

8.   Reminders
    8.1.   Next Academic Senate Meeting: 2/23/2023, 2-4 pm

9.   Adjournment – 4:05pm