

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Minutes**

Tuesday, October 04, 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, D. Hamm, A. Russo, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey, I. Olvera Escoto, D. Yong

Absent: E. Klink, P. Soni

Additional Guests: M. Nguyen, J. Klaus

1. Call to Order – 2:00pm
  - Welcome to Ingrid Olvera, new ASI representative for EC.
2. Approval of Agenda – NS moved, seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of September 27, 2022 – MA moved, seconded and approved.
4. Special Orders
  - 4.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
    - AVPFA search update. Dean Bennett has agreed to serve as the administrative appointee. Mark Wiley is providing logistical support. Larisa Hamada is also assisting. Will use a search firm for a limited regional search beyond the CSU system. The search firm will help with recruitment only, and we will conduct some research on the effectiveness of the search firm afterwards.
    - There is a new funded program that has some importance for EC and RTP. The program is focused on embedding equity and diversity. “Innovating faculty workloads through an equity lens” is funded by the National Science Foundation, and recognizes disparate workloads among faculty, especially among underrepresented female faculty. Currently, it will focus on STEM departments. The faculty members initially will be Sabrina Alimahomed-Wilson, Margie Merryfield, and Sergio Mendez. Faculty will engage in discussions focused on workload, especially the “invisible workloads.” CSULB was attractive as a funded site, because of our diverse student environment that coincides with a lack of faculty diversity. We are also a unionized workforce, and information can be shared throughout the CSU. It is designed as a three-year program.
    - Nancy Torres has come out of retirement to work with faculty affairs.
    - QUESTIONS:

- KJ – Are we going to be using the term “cultural taxation” in the study? KSG – Yes, absolutely.
- AC – 1) Was the grant funded? KSG – Yes. 2) Is it your intention to make the equity advocates permanently funded? KSG – The pilot program was evaluated, and she supports the ongoing support of them (as of October 4<sup>th</sup>).
- NS – Appreciates the innovating program, but wants to make sure that it doesn’t end up increasing workloads for those involved. Asks if opportunities for other departments beyond STEM programs will be made available. KSG notes that this is a pilot program, and we’ll see what findings this initial study reveals. PFH – offers some context: This has been discussed among FEAs.
- MA – Given that the FPPC is already working on the RTP policy, by the time results come out of this study, will there be some alignment with the production of work and results? KSG – With regards to the campus RTP policy, she sees it as the umbrella policy for the campus and as departments and colleges revise their policies, some of the results of the study may be able to be incorporated at those levels.

## 5. New Business

- 5.1. Setting the agenda for the Academic Senate meeting, October 13, 2022
  - Consent calendar has become massive. New item has been added – name change for Dietetics & Food Administration. This is in order to keep current with national standards.
  - Should we also add the Department of Geological Sciences name change to the consent calendar? JC says this was a non-controversial change in the lower committee. NS moves to move it to the consent calendar, NMA seconds.
  - DH raises issue about lecturer contracts that list the current department names. JC says there is a policy statement that will come out to reflect and identify the change.
  - Doctoral degree in nursing practice (DNP). This will be an independent program, rather than our current consortium program which is combined with other campuses. The policy is currently in URC, but there is a push to get it moving forward quickly. We may add this to New Business.
  - Item 7.1 – NS asks for revision of the language to more accurately show that this will be ‘feedback’ – “Draft feedback memorandum” to ASCSU.
  - TIME Certain for 6.3 – AC’s RTP report – 2:30pm
  - NS raises question about the purpose and goal of 7.1 (discussion of draft memorandum...). Are we planning to discuss the issue, are we voting on one of our three options, or something else?
  - 8.1 (Export Control), time certain 3:50pm
- 5.2. Planning for Senate Retreat - Discussion topics
  - EC discusses possible retreat questions for the facilitators.

- 5.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm] Questions and concerns related to student accommodations. Guest: Mary Nguyen, Director, Bob Murphy Access Center (BMAC) and Jeff Klaus, AVP for Student Affairs
  - MN and JK report on accommodation concerns brought forth by faculty members. BMAC receives confidential disability information from students and cannot disclose some information.
  - NS asks about the tone of the letter and that BMAC is “telling” faculty what to do. He feels BMAC often states what “must” be done but do not consider what happens in a class. DH feels that BMAC has made positive steps in changing their approach to faculty. NMA says the letter that faculty receive sounds like “this is what you must do.” MN says certain things must be stated in the letter legally. There have been around 15,000 accommodation letters sent out.
  - NS asks who decides what is “reasonable” for accommodations. MN says BMAC decides what is reasonable. BMAC meets regularly with experts as to what is reasonable. NS requests that faculty be more involved in the consultation about reasonable accommodations, since they are experts about the class structure and subject matter.
  - Proposed changes to the faculty letter language are put forward by JC.
- 5.4. Review Guidelines for Lecturer Faculty Evaluation and the length of guidelines
  - PFH asks if the COVID RTP taskforce may come to EC regarding what is the length of time these guidelines will apply.
- 5.5. Civility statement
  - EC discusses the possibility of presenting a civility statement to Academic Senate attendees due to recent comments and statements, specifically those made about the land acknowledgement. MA agrees with this and would like to read the statement at the next AS statement. NS believes that civility statements generally exclude people. DH believes that a statement/reminder may be helpful to present to Senate.
6. Old Business
  - 6.1. Plan for AB 928 and Cal-GETC Townhall Meeting on October 6, 2022
    - EC discusses how to take notes on feedback.
  - 6.2. Dean Curt Bennett’s proposal of a Fast-Track Change to [PS 20-01 Policy on Online/Hybrid Instruction](#).
7. Announcements and Information
  - 7.1. Governor Newsom vetoes AB 2464 (paid parental leave of absence) and SB 410 (staff merit salary system)
8. Reminders
  - 8.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 10/13/2022, 2-4 pm

9. Adjournment – 4:03pm