

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes

Tuesday, September 06, 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, A. Colburn, N. Meyer-Adams, A. Nayak, K. Janousek,
E. Klink, P. Soni, D. Hamm, A. Russo, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, J. Cormack, D. Yong, A. Kinsey

Absent: M. Aliasgari, K. Scissum Gunn, I. Julian

1. Call to Order – 2:01pm by PFH
2. Approval of Agenda – Moved by N. Schurer. Seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of August 30, 2022 – Moved by N. Schurer. Seconded and approved.
4. Announcements and Information
 - 4.1. Academic Senate Representation on President's Equity & Change Commission (PECC)
 - PFH states that representation is needed on PECC. They will meet tomorrow and will share the qualifications/requirements to PFH (either a Senate Exec member or a voted faculty member).
 - 4.2. Review Committee for Associate Vice President for Academic Technology Services (ATS)
 - PFH discusses an upcoming review committee with the email going out soon to form the review committee.
 - 4.3. Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Services
 - There is a change of title for Donna Green from Assistant Vice President. Will now be Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Services. NS asks why this title was changed. JC says it was changed to bring this position into alignment with other CSU's.
 - 4.4. Incentives for Senate Retreat Facilitators
 - The plan is to invite 12 high school teachers to help facilitate the discussion. PFH asks EC what an appropriate compensation for the high school teachers would be. PFH asks EC is \$200 per person is appropriate. DH states this is appropriate. RF suggests perhaps \$400 per person. AN suggests inviting teachers who are currently teaching rather than those in the district offices. PFH reminds EC that the focus will be on having high school teachers assist in the discussion about what our incoming students will be like in a post-COVID world.
5. Reminders
 - 5.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 9/15/2022, 2-4 pm
 - DH suggests finding a native person to deliver the land acknowledgement at Senate.

6. Special Orders

6.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn- Vice Provost Jody Cormack to present report

- JC reports that WASC is revising their standards for review. She feels that our University is in alignment with these revised standards currently. The standards will go into effect in November 2024. CSULB's next review is 2030.
- Enrollments were slightly down with transfers down 20%, but freshman numbers are up. Will need more sections to focus on transfers, as well as flexibility for courses with multiple sections. Online sections fill up first and fast.
- SA reports on rolling blackouts. Our feed is similar to that of a hospital, meaning that the academic side of the campus is unlikely to experience one, but the residential and non-academic buildings are more likely to experience one. We have not had one yet, and we are hoping to ride out this heat wave. SA feels that we are prepared. We have key systems prepared with generator backup (e.g. freezers, etc.), but we could not power the full campus via generator.
 - NS asks if the internet on campus will be a top priority. SA replies that the server room is on backup, but Wi-Fi would go down.
 - NS notes that the city of Long Beach has asked people to stop watering. What about us? SA responds that athletic fields and certain areas are exempt from the shutdown. Some other areas use only reclaimed water. Overall, we have reduced watering, and we'll have signs across campus explaining why we'll have dead spots.
- JC provides an update on EO1071. There is a 7-year window for compliance on this. Fifty percent compliance is required, and JC anticipates compliance by the deadline.
- NS inquires about online classes: Students sign up for those first, but research says that online classes during the first year are not conducive to success and retention. JC is looking at data about that. The sections that require strong GPA numbers will not be asked to increase online sections. NS also mentions the importance of the first-year experience 'on campus.' JC agrees and notes that the courses with the highest demand, especially GE courses (~18 courses) will be part of the pool where the best ways to expand sections will be investigated.
- KJ asks a question for SA. She has noticed that students are sheltering in grassy areas in the shade. What will happen once the grass dies? The library is already packed. SA says there are a variety of places to send students, but looking to expand offerings.
- EK opines about enrollment numbers and our approach going forward. Her community college partners are sharing that enrollments are way beyond anything expected, while other areas are lower. This had led to a frantic hiring of lecturers. If that is true, we will be seeing a huge increase in transfers over the next two years. She worries that a lot of new hires will have to be let go if we don't need more courses like 'freshman comp.' Also, if we're expecting surges in enrollment, we will need to be aware and plan for that. JC responds that we are looking at that, and we need to communicate to students that they shouldn't panic if they can't get all of their courses the first Fall semester. They can take those courses in Spring.
- AR asks about parking on campus. Especially the lot where the Amazon pickup is located. People are idling, driving over curbs, etc. SA says he will have a meeting with the individuals (parking, UPD) who are responsible for patrolling those lots.

- NMA notes that there are programs that rely on transfer students, and the balance between admission of freshman vs. transfers should be looked at.

7. New Business

7.1. COVID Equity in Faculty Evaluations Task Force: Tenured and Tenure-Track Guidelines for Candidates and Evaluators

- PFH shows EC the current guidelines the committee created. PFH asks EC if they need to be revised. The year-end report from the Task force is also presented to EC.
- KJ notes that open access is not mentioned, even though many of these journals have blind peer review and quick turnaround times. It is frustrating that some departments will not count open access journals. PFH asks where this would go. KJ notes that the area about timelines would be appropriate, because a big impact on faculty is the turnaround time for publication. KJ would like to see language along the lines of “quality open access journals should be recognized as acceptable.” PFH will make a note of this and share it with the review task force.
- NS asks if there is any evidence that RTP committees are not being understanding to COVID. He feels we have understanding faculty.
- NA advocates against adding an FEA to RTP committees. AC says FPPC will be discussing this point.
- AC asks if it is appropriate to edit this document.
- PFH will speak to the task force about possible revisions.

7.2. Setting the agenda for the Academic Senate meeting, September 15, 2022

- PFH presents draft agenda to EC for discussion. The timing of the meeting discussion is reviewed by EC. JC suggests streamlining the curriculum process. Discussion ensues.

7.3. Questions related to AVPFA Search Committee

- The Provost posed several questions for EC about this last week. PFH shared the questions will us. The responses include:
 - Convening & current AVPFA’s Role – Issue with conflict of interest. The final PD and process should be forwarded to the Provost
 - EC wants an internal CSULB administrator
 - Community-at-large rep – Perhaps Mark Wiley. KJ suggests another individual who might be a good choice. AC asks which community members or groups the AVPFA would work with most often, as that may be a good place to look. NS notes that because this is an appointment by the President, the President should make the decision. RF agrees.
 - Search Firm – Discussion ensues about the best response from EC (e.g. scope of hire, role of search firm, the pool of applicants).
 - NS moves “if this is a search limited to the CSUs, then we do not support a search firm.” Seconded and approved.

7.4. Campus Academic Calendar Committee (CACC)

- EC solicits a volunteer. NMA volunteers, and she is elected.

7.5. CBA 20.37 Award Review Criteria – Tabled until next week.

7.6. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30 pm] Forwarding the partially amended PS 09-10 RTP Policy to Senate. Presenter: Alan Colburn (Chair, Faculty Personnel Policies Council)

- AC reports on work done by FPPC. Half of the document has been reviewed and

revised. He asks if we can suspend Senate rules temporarily by sending sections 1 & 2 (1 - guiding principles; 2 - teaching, RSCA, service requirements) to the Senate for approval before the whole policy is revised by FPPC.

- AC states that some faculty members feel that there is inequity in RTP committees. One approach is having some type of FEA to be a non-voting member of the committee.
- AC brings forth several questions to EC on how to move forward. Discussion ensues on how to move forward.
- NS moves and is seconded that this be put on a future senate agenda as a 'progress report' that will include five to ten minutes of presentation with a discussion period to follow. There is no opposition from EC about this approach.

8. Old Business

8.1. Questions about [PS 11-06 Policies and Procedures for the Appointment and Review of Department Chairs](#)

- PFH presents questions brought forward by EE faculty, along with Dean Rhee's responses.
- NS suggests that we need to explain to Dean Rhee what consultation means. AC suggests keeping the Dean's comments as is, but perhaps clarifying our response about a lack of consultation with the "Senate Exec" response section.
- NS is unclear what the Dean meant by "cleared this with Faculty Affairs."
- AC suggests we remove the underlined "department faculty" in our response.
- AC suggests removing part of the last paragraph of our response.
- NS suggests integrating the comments from PFH into the text.
- Motion made by NS: "Remove underlined 'department faculty,' integrate comments from PFH, and leave last two sentences as is." This should be sent to EE faculty and cc the Dean and Provost. Vote on motion: Yes = 5, and the motion passes.

9. Adjournment – 4:09pm