

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, September 20, 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, I. Julian, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, D. Yong, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: S. Kim, M. Ordonez, A. Wrynn

Absent: P. Soni

1. Call to Order – 2:00pm
2. Approval of Agenda – PFH added/revised 7.3 and 7.4. Created time certain for Gift Card policy. NS moved approval, seconded and approved as amended.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of September 13, 2022 – MA moved approval, seconded and approved.
4. Special Orders
 - 4.1. Report: Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate Studies Jody Cormack (for Provost Scissum Gunn)
 - JC reports on the GI 2025 equity priorities and progress made. Five priorities:
 1. Re-enrollment of 2020 cohort that were in good standing. Efforts led to 7% success rate in bringing back students from that cohort. Focused on students in good academic standing. Still looking at numbers and potential approaches as we move forward. Examining the lack of senior returns phenomenon. AN showed how she has investigated that in her department; some have moved away and others have obtained full-time jobs. Other CSUs also found it was a lot of effort for not much yield.
 2. Expanding credit opportunities for summer. Efforts have already focused on seniors. Now also looking at category 3 & 4 students. Efforts have been moderately successful – 20 students took up the offer. The plan is to re-offer it to that group, as well as the incoming students. IJ asks how this was communicated. JC says it probably came from Beach Academy.

3. Ensuring equitable access to roadmaps; changing and looking at holds for non-payment.
4. Administrative barriers.
5. Promoting equitable learning practices and lowering DFW rates.

5. New Business

- 5.1. Setting the agenda for the Academic Senate meeting, September 29, 2022
 - EC discusses the agenda for 9-29-22. Three Consent calendar items discussed and approved by EC. DH offers her place on special orders to KJ and the ASCSU report. NS suggests a time certain for AC's report on the progress on RTP policy.
- 5.2. Changes to Gift Card Policy, Impact on Human Subjects & Sponsored Research-TIME CERTAIN 2:30 Simon Kim and Milton Ordonez guests.
 - SK asks for questions, because the material has already been shared with EC.
 - NS asks why CSULB interprets 34 CFR & Title V differently than other CSU's and UC's. MO states we are interpreting them correctly.
 - MO reviews 34 CFR and what we consider as a benefit to the student. MO says that if there is a "fair market value" for the item, it must be reported, but it may or may not impact their financial aid.
 - JC raises issue about whether or not the student status matters. MO says that even if the research call is open for individuals in the community ("open call"), CSULB students will report.
 - SA notes that this is not exclusive to research, but can include any gift cards.
 - MO clarifies "financial benefit" by noting that someone may get a car, bitcoin, etc. that has fair market value. If so, we need to report it.
 - The IRS \$600 per calendar year threshold and the reporting requirements surrounding that threshold are discussed.
 - NS says this is destroying faculty research agendas and harming our students. He asks if there is any way we can fulfill the letter of the law and still benefit our faculty and students. SK says the proposed approach is what other campuses are doing, and that they are hearing this information directly from the CO's office.
 - NMA shares that students will be turned off to research opportunities if they hear it may impact their financial aid. SK says he agrees, but there are certain rules that we must do and comply. SK understands that having to add even one sentence about potential impact of financial aid may impact student interest.
 - SK shares some information about the two studies being conducted by a CSULB faculty member that are at the center of this discussion. The second study includes CSU campuses and students, and it will be impacted, thus requiring the reporting of information.
 - MO says the university will report both student and community members if they go over the \$600 amount. If they do not go over that amount, their

information won't be reported unless there is an audit. MO feels that once the process is applied, everyone will understand it as long as there is transparency up front.

- PFH asks if gift card logs will only include name and student ID#. MO agrees.
 - JC thanks the guests and notes that after reviewing it for three weeks she realizes that there is "no work around." She further asks if language is being prepared to make the process very clear. SK says "yes."
 - DH notes that she has heard the term "confidentiality" a lot in this discussion, and she finds the lack of focus on that within the IRB report very disconcerting.
 - IJ asks how we can work to maintain student participation. SK says "education, education, education." MO reminds EC that this has been in place since January.
 - MO says he will share the email with the reporting language with PFH.
- 5.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm] AB 928 and California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC). Guest: Dr. Alison M. Wrynn (Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development)
- AW reports on AB 928 via a PowerPoint presentation. She notes that she wants faculty to become educated about the bill in order to help in the decision making process.
 - AW notes that AB 928 has three key parts: 1) AD for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee (ADT IIC); 2) Single GE pathway (Cal-GETC) for lower division GE; and 3) ADT's for CCC students.
 - How does a law become CSU policy? Starts with legislation (AB 928), then education code (66749.8), then Title V (Trustees), the CSU Policy (EO), then Campus-based policy.
 - Timeline for this is Jan-May 2024 in order to revise CSU GE policy to conform to new single GE pattern. ICAS deadline was 5-31-22. By 8-1-24 must place students on ADT.
 - Who supported this bill? The bill passed with zero no votes. Opposed by faculty association of CCC, intersegmental committees of Academic senates, UC, ASCSU.
 - What are campuses being asked to do by 10-24-22? 1) Support the ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal; 2) Recommend specific changes that satisfy the requirements of AB 928 with rationale; or 3) Unable to come to a consensus.
 - Discussion ensues about how to incorporate American History (Title V, 40404) outside of lower division GE pattern and ensure its completion in ADT's.
 - Questions raised and discussion ensues about "critical thinking and composition," potential wiggle room in campus decisions, the loss of six units and addition of one unit, bidding wars for GE requirements (e.g. oral communication), differences between UC's and CSU's (e.g. oral communication vs. foreign language), and the best approaches for either providing specific suggestions or opposing the mandated changes.

5.4. Chancellor's Resolution Packet about AB 928

- PFH presents on AB 928 and Cal-GETC and the plan for a singular lower division GE pathway. The essence of the proposal is:
 - We have to maintain 34 units of GE,
 - A reduction of 5 units (mandated by AB 928),
 - Loss of 3 of the 9 units of Area C,
 - Loss of loss of 3 units of Area E,
 - 1 unit of science lab is required (Area B3) instead of 0/1
 - Defining critical thinking to be writing intensive
 - Defining oral communication in a manner that focuses on content (vs. skill development)
- PF asks EC if this should be put on the 9-29-22 agenda as an information session, and perhaps have a vote at the next AS meeting.
- DH asks if we should make a presentation similar to the chart summarizing the GE changes. AC supports.
- MA argues for looking for creative solutions as opposed to writing a letter of non-consensus.
- KJ says the statewide senate has been looking at this for a long time, and there is no consensus there either.
- RF asks if we are willing to put our decisions (options 2 or 3) to a vote before the senate. JC says she doesn't like the vote. Rather, we should look toward solutions within the framework (e.g. broadening the categories to allow for more courses to be included)

6. Old Business

6.1. Revised COVID RTP Guidelines

- Will be posted on Senate website and faculty affairs website
- PFH proposes posting the original versions of the guidelines rather than sharing the task force report, because the ideas haven't been vetted.

7. Announcements and Information

7.1. WLC AB928 Response Letter

- Letter is in the EC shared folder

7.2. New information related to previous academic integrity cases

- Jody's team is working on amendments for by AI and Grade Appeals, and those will be coming to EC

7.3. PTAC advisory committee

- PFH asks EC if anyone would volunteer. We will send a call out to all faculty.

7.4. Other concerns, including BMAC and Intellectual Property

- Complaints have arisen from faculty about the growing list of accommodations, and the extra work required by faculty to accommodate the students. A suggestion is to have someone come to EC to share more information and ideas.

- Questions have been raised about intellectual property. Is it time to re-open this policy?

8. Reminders

8.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 9/29/2022, 2-4 pm

9. Adjournment – 4:03pm