

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, August 30, 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, I. Julian, S. Apel, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, D. Yong, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: D. Perrone, S. McKeever, C. Swarat

1. Call to Order- 2:00
2. Approval of Agenda- moved by MA, seconded and approved as amended.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of August 23, 2022- moved by MA, seconded and approved as amended.
4. Announcements and Information
 - PFH announces that the CBA 20.37 awards announcement has gone out recently. This year we will have 24 awards.
 - The AVPFA search committee solicitation has also gone out.
 - Coming soon: 1) COVID RTP guidelines possible revision; and 2). Two articles in the OneDrive mentioned to EC members to be read, “The Dawning Age of the Metaverse” and “Why Cal State struggles to graduate Black students.”
 - The policy on Export Controls (currently at URC) needs to be approved in a timely manner, as it needs to be sent to the BOT by October. SA states this date change is due to an audit.
 - CACC election for EC member coming soon.
 - 4.1. Welcome Dr. Darryl Yong, ACE Fellow
 - PFH welcomes Dr. Yong to the University. Professor of Mathematics, currently an administrator on sabbatical and now an ACE fellow.
 - 4.2. SPOT concerns

NS says faculty members are concerned by very low response rates and how those are used to hire and fire lecturer faculty. NS wants us to get a gauge on response rates and how the scores are being used. Requests that we ask Malcolm Finney to provide responses rates over the past 8 years (pre & post-COVID).
 - KSG asks if this in an opportunity for a broader examination of the SPOT and its effectiveness.

- AC says on the revised RTP policy, there is an effort to downplay and minimize the role of SPOT. He supports a discussion about SPOT, and notes that previous feedback from students has identified conflicts between what students want versus what faculty desire. Also notes that lecturer evaluation is a concern with SPOT.
- KSG says student conversations involving equity in the classroom may need to be examined in a possible examination of SPOT.
- NS agrees with an examination of SPOT, as it historically disadvantages women and people of color.
- IJ supports examination of SPOT and notes that students find it ineffective, because the questions do not allow them to evaluate the professor accurately.
- NMA notes that the Spring response rate was very low, and students are sometimes misreading and entering incorrect feedback (e.g. evaluating wrong professor)
- EK says the average response from a class of 25 is 8. She states this is not reliable data, and that there has been a drop in scores for most faculty.
- AC says that the technology exists which would allow professors to select a pool of questions that are most appropriate for their classes.

5. Reminders

- 5.1. F22 1st Senate Meeting: 9/01/2022, 2-4 pm

6. Special Orders

6.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn

- KSG reports on data regarding CBA 20.37 and awards for exceptional service. This year the allocations across the system were converted from dollars to WTU's. There are 900 available WTUs across all CSUs, and CSULB received 73.1 WTU's, which is 24 awards. We received the largest allocation in the system. This has been an increase compared to previous years.
- KSG had a conversation with PFH about equity, and the insertion of EDI was included in the award email.
- KSG discussed the OC summit on Antisemitism and Hate ("Driving Out Darkness"), which took place today at UC Irvine. Some key points shared include:
 - Testimony from a former hate group member who admits his affiliation was wrong; importance of addressing antisemitism as a part of EDI; the goal of seeking mutual understanding; and the importance of engagement by all of us.
- The AVPFA search process has begun, and there are several nuances:
 - EC may weigh in on the appointment of the administrator to be on the committee. A CSU wide search is under consideration for this position. KSG asks if perhaps an administrator from another CSU would be

considered. NMA supports having an inside administrator, and the majority of meeting attendees agree.

- The community at large nominee was mentioned as well.
- KSG raises an issue about Section 4.1 “convening the search committee.” The first meeting will go over housekeeping matters. The PD will be forwarded in section 4.1.1, and KSG asks about this step given the potential for conflicts of interest.
- The potential use of a search firm is part of the policy. KSG describes several benefits of a firm and recommends a limited engagement with an outside search firm. NS asks about the cost and the role of a search firm in evaluating the candidates. NS suggests the possibility of providing chair of search committee with three units of release time instead. KSG notes that a search firm would be able to identify limitations in the PD and work to help clarify the language to attract the best pool of candidates. Some search firms also have an established relationship with our campus. MA asks what a “limited scope” for a search firm is. KSG says we can decide that. MA suggests trying a different search firm. KSG notes that this depends on many factors (e.g. track record, quality of consultants, standing relationship with CSULB). MA states the search should be nation-wide and not just CSU. KSG says that a CSU candidate would be familiar with the needs of our campus.
- EC agrees to put the issues raised above on a future agenda.

7. New Business

7.1. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30 pm] Creation of a AS UPD Advisory Committee. Guest: Shawna McKeever, University Counsel

- SM reports on the interest in the creation of a police accountability board. Creating this council is something that the University cannot lawfully do. CSU is constrained by two legal regimes:
 - HEERA (Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act) – HEERA establishes employee and union rights including the right of unions to bargain and represent employees (e.g. SUPA with law enforcement officers). It is unfair labor practice for the university to consult with an advisory group on a matter that is within the scope of representation. This legal landscape creates an impediment to the University to create this council. The review of police complaints and advising on policy are under the union purview not those of an advisory committee. This would be an unfair labor practice under HEERA, and SUPA would not consent to this.
 - POBR (California Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act) – POBR is important and provides procedural guidelines for officers. Punitive action is anything that “may” lead to dismissal, reprimand, or transfer. If a campus board received and reviewed complaints or conducted inquiries regarding incidents, those activities would trigger

POBR restrictions. Complying with POBR would be difficult for a board and could trigger financial penalties for the University.

- QUESTIONS:
 - NS asks if EC could get this in writing so that we can communicate this information with those who have had negative interaction with UPD. SM says she will “take this under advisement” and further states, “there is no secrecy about these issues.” They are publicly available information.
 - NS asks if University Counsel can suggest what we “can” do in this type of situation. SA says he can answer that and says a complaint can be filed against UPD at any point. SA states that he has “fired four cops” during his tenure, and that his office works to hold people accountable. SA suggests having the police chief come to EC to discuss. SA says our police are different from metropolitan police as they are tasked with improving campus life for the positive. There is an active push to change negative perceptions of the police, and President Conoley and other members of campus are working toward that goal.
 - In reference to the fact that the Academic Senate is a policy making body, JC asks if there are there ways for campus members to have some say or provide feedback about policies impacting members of the campus, because the police response is usually “we’re following policy.”
 - SA says that cannot happen for some policies (e.g. those involving use of force), but the current advisory board can generally address these issues.
 - SM adds that the perception that police are not limited by the same policies (e.g. non-discrimination policies) that impact other campus members is not true. The police are constrained by those policies too. The complainant and respondent are both provided due process rights (e.g. presentation of evidence, review of documentation, etc.)
 - SA says police policies are all online.
 - DH feels that some faculty feel unsafe on campus and are told they cannot complain which makes them feel powerless.
 - SM says any employee with a concern should bring forward their concern.

8. Old Business

- 8.1. Questions about [PS 11-06 Policies and Procedures for the Appointment and Review of Department Chairs](#)
 - Tabled
- 8.2. [TIME CERTAIN 2:45 pm] Proposed Blended Program Processes and Guideline
 - DP presents Blended Program edited document. DP states the minimum GPA requirement of 3.0 was changed to 2.5. DP explains that the original language was to make sure students did not fall into academic probation as a graduate student, but after looking at the percentage of eligible students

on our campus, a GPA of 3.0 leads to 49%, but a 2.5 GPA increases the eligibility to 70%.

- PFH suggest voting on these guidelines.
- AC asks what our vote would mean.
- AC asks if JC wants people coming to her office to ask all the nuances required for programs interested. JC responds, “yes.”
- DP states that these guidelines provides guidance and flexibility for various programs to select the approach that works best for them.
- JC notes how the blended program concept is just an extension of a previous order from the CO.
- NS reiterates that this is something that is our decision as a campus. He does not support it in its current form. He wants the Senate as a whole to examine it, not just 14 people in the room at this time. NS proposes a vote where a ‘yes’ vote would mean referring the guidelines to CEPC, as this would provide “a whole new set of eyes.”
- AN asks if these guidelines would go into the catalog if they are not an actual policy. JS says it would go into the catalog. DP notes that there are several non-policies in the catalog.
- DP reiterates that curriculum, departments, and colleges would have to approve any proposed program. In other words, it will still go through reviewing and acceptance.
- VOTE: Do we want to accept guidelines as they currently stand?
 - Yes: 4 votes
 - No: 3 votes
 - Guidelines Pass
- AC moves that we refer the guidelines to CEPC for further advice, consultation, and feedback. VOTE:
 - Yes: 7 votes
 - No: 0 votes

8.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm] CPaCE AD and CPaCE Advisory Committee. Guest: Chris Swarat (Dean, College of Professional and Continuing Education)

- CS presents revisions to PD for AD.
- CS states this is very important as all colleges have AD’s. Maintaining campus partnerships concerning academic programs is something the AD could assist with. Maintaining existing programs will also be the purview of the AD. Thinks the position is important to have another individual (besides himself) to work with committees across campus to keep CPaCE part of larger campus conversations.
- CS described why the qualifications included a minimum of a Master’s degree but not a Ph. D (a Ph.D. will be a “preferred” qualification).

- QUESTIONS:
 - MA asks if this will be a nationwide search. CS says he wants to move forward expeditiously, would be open to different approaches. At a minimum, he would like it to be system wide, and a nationwide search may be too time intensive. CS also notes that focusing on a system wide search will recruit people who are already familiar with the CSU, and it can serve as a potential advancement opportunity for someone within the system.
 - MA asks if a search firm will be used. CS says he does not feel a search firm is necessary at this point, but he is open for feedback. PFH comments that AD positions typically are internal searches and do not involve a search firm.
 - NS presents his suggested changes to the document (re: grammar, mention of Beach 2030, coordination between state-support and self-support, financial accessibility, positive relationships with students, experience with collective bargaining environment). CS accepts all comments as “friendly.”
 - CS asks what next steps will be. The revised PD will be reviewed by two FEAs for their feedback.
- Charge of Advisory Board:
 - Advisory board charge edits have been made and are presented to EC.
 - AR notes that staff council will select the staff member.
 - DH asks who will nominate the alumni member. JC notes that URD should be able to assist with identifying alumni.
 - DH asks if the term “faculty” needs to be clarified to clarify the range of eligible faculty. PFH believes the current language is broad enough to refer to both lecturers and tenure-track faculty.
 - IJ provides language to clarify the eligible student members.
 - AC moves for approval. Charge of CPaCE Advisory Committee is approved with unanimous consent.

9. Adjournment- 4:10