

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, August, 09, 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, S. Apel, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: K. Johnson, D. Paskin, S. Sayegh, T. Travis, P. Kreysa, D. Perrone

Absent: P. Soni, J. Hamilton

1. Call to Order - 2:01pm
2. Approval of Agenda - motion by MA, seconded and approved as amended.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of August 02, 2022 - motion by NS, seconded and approved.
4. Announcements and Information
 - 4.1. Recruit two FEAs to review drafted PD of AVPFA
 - Margaret Merryfield and Anna Ortiz responded and since AO is currently acting Dean of CED, PFH wanted to ask EC if this was acceptable. RF stated this was acceptable to him, as did NMA who stated her excellent qualifications. NS moves to approve AO and MM, RF seconds. EC votes to approve.
 - PFH asks what the deadline should be. RF asks EC if we should send them a “cleaned up” document or send as is. NMA suggests sending the final draft to the FEA’s. EC discusses when the final draft will be determined.
 - 4.2. Optional COVID Syllabus Statement
 - JC goes over the amended statement with changes noted in the current environment. A change is that we will not be requiring weekly testing of those who are non-vaccinated. Reporting requirements have changed – no more daily check in. There is a new chicklet “sicklet” to report those who test positive. For faculty, temporary request for AMI is now part of the “sicklet” (temporary means two weeks or less).
 - IJ asks about unvaccinated students, the requirement is that they mask indoors and outdoors.
 - This will be sent to all faculty as part of a “tool kit” for faculty. This is a voluntary syllabus statement; it is not required. NS agrees to review the statement and send revisions to AK shortly after meeting.
 - AR asks how the material will be shared with staff.

5. Reminders

- 5.1. Next EC meeting - PFH asks EC if we should meet next week. Consensus is to decide at end of meeting. EC decides to meet next week to finalize some issues discussed at this meeting.

6. Special Orders

6.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn

- KSG reports on NCUR. CSULB has been selected as location for 2024 conference, which will include 3500 – 4000 students. Preparations for hosting conference are beginning now.
- 2022-23 Sally Casanova pre-doctoral scholars have been announced, and 13 of 76 were granted from CSULB. They receive travel support, fee reductions, and internships. There will be a first ever reception for these scholars in October.
- New assessment management system: As we are transitioning from BB to Canvas, a team is working on a program that will integrate with Canvas. *Nuventive* is the name of the program. Trying to get onboard quickly so that faculty making the transition can align their course material sooner. May alleviate some work for faculty.

7. New Business

7.1. [TIME CERTAIN 2:35] Plans for gathering AB 928 Feedback

- PFH asks EC to discuss plans for gathering feedback. CO has launched another feedback portal with a deadline of December 1, 2022. How will the feedback be gathered and put forward?
- KJ says it is important that our campus present feedback.
- MA says many faculty members in his college are not familiar with AB 928, and therefore faculty need to be educated on what AB 928 contains.
- EK states that 928 and 927 must be looked at concurrently.
- NS asks what the procedure will be for disseminating information.
- AN says roadshows may not be effective.
- RF states perhaps avoid a roadshow and have EC share summary of information with AS, and then ask senators to share the information with faculty councils. Faculty councils can then distributed information to faculty, obtain feedback, and return information to AS.

7.2. [TIME CERTAIN 3:00] General Education and Assessment

Guests: Kerry Johnson (AVP Undergraduate Studies), Danny Paskin (Chair, CEPC), Sharlene Sayegh (Director, Institutional Assessment), Tiffini Travis (former Chair of GEGC), Peter Kreysa (former Chair of GEGC)

- DP, PK, SS, TT and KJ join EC to discuss GE assessment.
- KJ presents GE assessment slideshow to EC. Talks about their experience at the AAC&U Institute during June 7-10 of this year, with a focus on improving

the design and assessment of GE programs. They came up with recommendations and goals for GEEC in the Fall, with consideration about how to make this as painless as possible and creating a streamlined automated process aligned with our goals. Goals include developing a sustainable multi-year assessment plan (as required by EO 1100) aligned with institutional outcomes and Beach 2030 strategic action plans.

- SS discusses institutional outcomes. She presents a pyramid with steps in the process. Part of institutional assessment is to include GE learning outcomes aligned with institutional outcomes. Core values of the University are also included in the pyramid. Standard best practices in higher education are part of this model.
 - KJ lists the stakeholders, including AS, key faculty and staff, GE course coordinators, IT, Faculty center, GEEC, college level IA. Spreading the work will include formal presentations to various stakeholders. Workshops will be provided as well as a web presence with documentation and progress. Data collection will include already collected data, artifacts, course data, LMS data, Institutional data, IT support. Rubrics will be created for faculty as well as ensuring faculty understand the purpose of GE. Potential roadblocks are addressed. GEEC multi year plan presented to EC. The plan projects out to five years and beyond.
 - SS states that the new program *Nuventive* does some of the assessment work automatically. Data collected will be only relevant to the outcome put into the system. Targeted assessment is possible with this system with regards to the mastery of a specific GE category. Longitudinal data will be created with this system. What the GE cycle will be will need to be determined; 5 yr. 7 yr. cycles considered. AAC&U resources presented to EC.
 - NS states that faculty workload is not the issue, but they want to know what the payoff will be for them and their students. He would like to see the payoffs (i.e. importance, benefits) and the additional workload requirements for faculty specified in the presentation.
 - NS asks if there is a privacy issue. SS says no data will be used in faculty action.
 - AC says qualitative data is important also, not just quantitative.
 - DH inquires about faculty who will not be on Canvas. KJ and SS respond: For those faculty who choose not to use Canvas, there will be letters distributed to department chairs and faculty about how to do assessment on courses not taught through Canvas.
- 7.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30] Guideline for Double-Numbered Courses
Guests: Dina Perrone (AD, Graduate Studies)
- DP notes that she also is the Chair of the GSAC and presents to EC on double numbered courses.

- These are courses offered at both the graduate and undergraduate level. These courses have unique SCO's and corresponding syllabi for each course.
- DP notes that the GSAC committee created guidelines last year about these courses and would like these guidelines attached to the Master's Policy as an addendum.
- NS notes his concern about how to clearly differentiate the requirements for undergraduates versus graduates in these courses.
- JC is concerned with the number of double numbered courses and what makes the higher-level course a true "masters" level course. Ensuring distinct learning outcomes for both levels of students is suggested.
- KSG and MA discuss the difficulty of teaching both undergraduates and graduates in the same classroom and how to differentiate student expectations. JC notes that while the classroom experience might be similar, the extra rigor and expectations for graduate students will occur in their assigned work beyond the classroom.
- MA asks if colleges were asked to not create new double numbered courses. Additionally, he asks if the undergrad students are wasting time during the time in course when graduate learning outcomes are addressed.
- DP states that graduate students "elevate" the course for the undergraduate students with their participation. She states that this is one of the reasons for putting forward these guidelines. All faculty need to understand the difference between the two levels of the course.
- EC continues to discuss the "clear separation of levels" issue in detail.
- NS presents some specific recommendations for the guidelines to DP.
- DP will meet with EC next week to continue this discussion.

8. Old Business

8.1. [TIME CERTAIN 2:50] Proposed Revisions of CEPC Charge

- PFH asks EC about revisions to the CEPC charge to include staff members serving on CEPC. No consensus was reached in Spring 2022.
- AR speaks on this issue. This mostly affects staff advisors who are tasked with giving information to students, because being informed about upcoming policy changes and the process in general would be helpful to advisors.
- Four options were considered by CEPC: 1) two general staff members; 2) one curriculum-aligned staff member and one staff advisor; 3) one staff advisor and the Director of Academic Programs; or 4) one curriculum-aligned staff member, one staff advisor, and the Director of Academic Programs. There was no consensus, but Option 4 received the most support. Option 1 received the least support. This information was supplied by CEPC chair, D. Paskin.

- NS says staff will be involved in curriculum if they become voting members of the council. NS asks if staff could be non-voting members. AR says this was not discussed, but there may be a feeling among staff that being “non-voting” would be wasting their time.

8.2. Academic Senate and Data Fellows

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

9. Adjournment- 4:02pm