

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, August, 16, 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, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: D. Perrone

Absent: P. Soni, I. Julian, J. Hamilton, S. Apel

1. Call to Order- 2:03
2. Approval of Agenda- moved by NS, seconded and approved as amended
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of August 09, 2022, moved by NS, seconded and approved
4. Announcements and Information
 - 4.1. Campus mask mandates
 - PFH discusses the mandate for Fall 22 issued by President Conoley. PFH asks if there will be exemptions, and JC says there will be no exceptions for faculty and staff. Certain programs will have exceptions as necessary (e.g. performing arts), but those will require frequent testing.
 - 4.2. EE Department Chair and PS 11-06
 - PFH discusses the interim department chair appointment and concerns that it violates PS 11-06. A letter was sent forward to EC that states this appointment goes against policy.
 - KSG suggests there is a misalignment between sections 8 and 12 of the policy, regarding the consultation requirements and procedural order (e.g. consultation between dean, provost, and faculty). These sections discuss what to do in the matter of an impasse. KSG states that section 8.2 discusses what to do in the event of an impasse, and the Dean feels she followed the policy. The department election results came about when faculty were off contract, and there was no clear consensus of the faculty vote for a candidate.
 - MA gives background from the College of Engineering. He states Dean Rhee (JR) has studied the policy, and this department had internal disputes including scheduling and decreased enrollment. Faculty invited JR to the department and told faculty of this upcoming external search. Another meeting was called where the search was announced, and faculty stated this was too late. Very few candidates came forward. Three candidates were brought in and the search failed. JR did not feel that any current faculty of EE were qualified to be chair.
 - JR selected Dr. Gupta from SDSU as the interim chair. Dr. Gupta was hired here as a lecturer faculty in order to be appointed interim chair. He will be a 0.8

Chair, and he will have a 0.2 teaching load. Current lecturer faculty are concerned with this and feel he will receive priority in teaching assignments. Faculty concerns were that the policy was not followed and there will be low confidence in his appointment.

- RF says he does not see a misalignment within the policy, as a 'declaration' of an impasse per Section 8.2 leads directly to Section 12.2 where the protocol for the 'designation' of an interim appointment is provided. The key factor that appears to have been skipped is "after consultation with... the department faculty."
- EK states that precedence would have an associate or assistant chair be appointment. In this case there was none.
- KJ raises the issue of his retirement status. If he is in FERP status, he can only work 50% in accordance with CalPERS.
- KSG responds to previous comments stating that Faculty Affairs was consulted. The lack of an open tenure track line hiring within the department is what drove the Dean to appoint a lecturer.
- AC notes that if this was brought to EC as purely an informational issue, and not with a request for interpretation of policy, then EC should move on from the matter.
- NS comments: 1) there may be an inconsistency in the policy, but the Dean should have consulted the Academic Senate first for clarification rather than immediately moving forward with a hiring; 2) 'consultation' has not occurred and that is the spirit of this policy; and 3) the hiring violates the eligibility requirements for a chair according to the policy, and once again, this is where the Dean should have consulted with the Academic Senate.
- MA raises a question about the 'teeth' of policies when their interpretation is unclear.
- KSG comments that the faculty would meet on August 24 to either accept or decline this appointment. She says there was an amount of agreement with the faculty regarding this situation.
- MA suggests that EC make a decision as to whether the policy was followed by JR.
- NS suggests EC make a statement that the policy was not followed by JR and that FA needs to look into the retirement issue. NS motions, RF seconds. Prior to a vote, AC states we should not move forward on this at this time due to time being past 4 pm. JC says she feels the Dean should be able to present her side. AN suggests revisiting next Tuesday. NS withdraws motion.

5. Reminders

- 5.1. Convocation: 8/19/2022, 8-8:45 am (Reception); 9-10:30 (Program)
- 5.2. New Senator Orientation: 8/25/2022, 2-4 pm
- 5.3. F22 1st Senate Meeting: 9/01/2022, 2-4 pm
 - PFH notes that the first meeting will be Zoom, and we will vote on the format of future meetings (either in person or via Zoom)

6. Special Orders

- 6.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
 - KSG reports on INCUR from Simon Kim, stating that there will not a significant

workload for faculty. The event will take place April 8-10, 2024, in downtown Long Beach.

- The ASI senator retreat is tomorrow, and each division will be asked how to engage students. The AA's prompt for discussion relates to 'diversity is our strength and is the core of student success.' We anticipate our student body will continue to be diverse. Therefore, how can faculty create inclusive classrooms and how can students be involved in this? This connects to our shifting landscape of students; most of our students now identify as underrepresented. This same messaging will be included in the upcoming convocation.
- QUESTIONS:
 - NS – Can KSG and IJ please report back on the findings from the ASI retreat? - KSG agrees, and thinks the best feedback will come from IJ.
 - AC appreciates KSG communicating with our students, but would also like to see us (our campus) doing more to communicate with K-12 students, as they will be our next batch of students. Given COVID, how are they doing, and what can we do to assist, support, and prepare them for college?

7. New Business

- 7.1. [TIME CERTAIN 2:30 pm] Drafted PD of AVPFA
 - NS moves and AN seconds that EC accept the PD with the minor amendment suggested by MA (re: proper name of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Office).
 - NS suggests EC vote on this. The vote is approved unanimously. The draft will now be sent to FEA's MM and AO. An email to staff the search committee will go out soon from AS.
- 7.2. [TIME CERTAIN 2:45 pm] Planning Academic Senate Retreat: 10/20/2022
 - PFH asks EC for ideas for the theme of this year's retreat. The retreat will once again be at the Japanese Garden.
 - NS suggests looking at our Beach 2030 goals. Reimagining the new student body, non-traditional, more equitable classroom are ideas.
 - JC suggests that AC's idea of examining how our future students will be different and how we can be prepared for them would be a good idea.
 - RF supports this and suggests connecting with current K-12 teachers. Multiple other attendees support this approach and theme.
 - NMA also supports and reminds EC that the impetus for Beach 2030 was to prepare the children who were kindergartners at the initiation of Beach 2030 would be joining our campus in 2030.
 - AR suggests incorporating "belonging at the beach" which is the convocation theme.
 - AC suggest using alumni in the retreat.
 - NS suggests asking for funding to K-12 teachers to attend.
 - AK will start moving forward on getting funding for presenters.
- 7.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:15 pm] Blended Program. Guest: Dina Perrone (AD, Graduate Studies)
 - DP begins presentation with a look at the guidelines for double numbered courses.

- NS asks for clarification about the phrase “graduate student evaluated work.” Notes that the term ‘accomplishments’ should be replaced with something like ‘outcomes.’
- NS asks if double numbered courses will require two syllabi. DP states that some programs have two different syllabi to clarify links between SCOs and PLOs. NS says he does not do this. Different SCO’s are needed for double numbered courses. JC suggests that the language for both levels can be incorporated into one syllabus.
- The guidelines are approved by EC with minor suggestions/amendments.
- DP continues her presentation with a focus on blended programs. Across the CSU, Deans of Grad studies have been working on these guidelines for some time. There has been a push across the CSU for more “blended” or “4+1” programs. These types of programs have been in place across the US for a long time. This approach would benefit the Master’s programs across the CSU. Would help draw more students, more diverse students, and more current students. But, this would require a change of Title V. The CO finally voted to approve ‘this’ in July 2022 (‘this’ refers to double counting 12 units. Example: The total $120 + 30 = 150$ units, minus 12 is 138 units required for a “blended program.” The 12 units must be 500/600 level courses.). We need to hop on this before the other CSUs get a head start. We want to have this ready for the next curriculum cycle. DP mentions that a lot of the language in the shared document is from language provided by the CO’s office.
- PFH asks if any programs are currently being piloted for this?
- AN makes some comments about the potential applicability of these programs in the humanities and languages.
- MA asks will there be financial aid implications? JC states that more of their degree can be in undergraduate standing which is more affordable.
- JC says some programs may not finish masters in one year; thus, naming it “blended” instead of 4+1.
- DP says another benefit is students do not have to apply through CSU Apply, saving \$70 application fee, students will apply through individual departments and their grad advisor.
- NS says universities and programs are not “required” to offer blended programs. NS feels that you cannot reach the same level of education with 138 units as with 150 units, and he is opposed to the logic fundamentally and pedagogically. He feels this is a “shortcut MA,” and that it will not increase diversity.
- MA worries about a growing push within the CSU to produce as many degrees as possible (‘like a factory’). He also asks how the students will be counted in official student head counts? DP responds that Enrollment Services and grad advisors would take most of the responsibility for responding to this issue. JC notes that students will count as undergraduates until they hit 120 units.
- DH asks if the requirement of “complete 12 discipline-specific units in

residence” will impact students transferring from community colleges. DH would like the language to clarify that as long as students spend their first year at CSULB taking upper division courses, there shouldn't be a negative impact.

- AC thinks interdisciplinary degrees may be a good idea.
- EC is asked to send notes to DP.
- NEXT STEP: JC states that the blended program is going forward. These will not be new degrees, and therefore shouldn't need to go through the CO's office. The focus will be on what counts for the 12 units. JC suggests that EC might want to send this to the curriculum committee.

8. Old Business

8.1. [TIME CERTAIN 2:55 pm] Proposed Revisions of CEPC Charge

- PFH reiterated the four options shared last meeting and asked for further discussion.
- NS raises concern about staff being involved with curriculum, noting that curriculum design has historically been the purview of faculty. AC states many staff on campus interact with students and can be involved.
- MA says most CEPC items are policy related and not all curricular. The inclusion of staff will send a signal that the Beach is inclusive and include all constituents in decision making.
- AR says staff would agree with two members.
- NS makes a motion for EC to recommend adding two staff advisors to the membership of CEPC, which will be elected by the full body of advisors. Seconded by MA & AN. EC votes to send this to the senate, to open the CEPC charge.

8.2. Academic Senate and Data Fellows

8.3. Potential resolution related to academic freedom and academic freedom in pedagogy and curriculum

9. Adjournment- 4:11