

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, September 27, 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, J. Hamilton, S. Apel, J. Cormack, D. Yong, A. Kinsey

Guests: A. Torres, C. Bennett, S. Ahmed

Absent: K. Scissum Gunn, I. Julian

1. Call to Order – 2:01 pm
2. Approval of Agenda – Moved by MA, seconded and approved as amended.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of September 20, 2022 – Moved by MA, seconded and approved as amended.
4. Special Orders
 - 4.1. Report: Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate Studies Jody Cormack for Provost Scissum Gunn
 - JC has no report today.
 - MA asks about complaint regarding the land acknowledgement, as he finds that to be very concerning and xenophobic. He finds this to be an example of non-inclusivity. Discussion ensues. NS & JC suggest putting this discussion on the agenda for next week to consider potential actions EC can take.
5. New Business
 - 5.1. Academic Senate Retreat Agenda
 - SA asks for clarification about the budget. AK will let him know about raffles, prizes, etc.
 - PFH presents the preliminary agenda and asks for feedback. The goals include: 1) Understanding the impact of COVID on future students; 2) Producing a technical white paper from the event; and 3) Strategizing for students nearing admission to CSULB.
 - AC provides update on recruitment of secondary school teachers as guests. These guests will be at each of the 12 tables and will help lead the small group discussions. AK is planning to have EC members at the tables to assist in notetaking, which will then provide the basis for the white paper.

- Discussion ensues about timeline and discussion topics/questions. Questions should be broad based about how students have changed and their current experiences regarding communication abilities, use of technology, mental & physical health, ability to learn, and how teachers have addressed these issues. Suggestion is made to share topics/questions with teacher guests at least one week in advance.
 - The publication “Reimagining the Student Experience” is presented as a possible starting point for questions.
- 5.2. [TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm] Proposed a Fast-Track Change to [PS 20-01 Policy on Online/Hybrid Instruction](#). Guest: Curt Bennett (Dean, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics)
- CB presents on his proposed change to PS 20-01. He would like to change “essentially all” to “at least 75% of.” The main rationales for the change include: 1) This would bring us closer to national standards; 2) The current policy is overly restrictive for face-to-face and overly broad for hybrid; 3) If we can make a minimal change, we may not have to open up the entire policy; and 4) There are certain things that are done better online (e.g. inviting speakers who can’t come to campus and meeting the requirement of having the instructor and students in one place that may not have great audio-visual capabilities doesn’t make sense).
 - EC discusses. MA asks about the basis for the 75% number. CB says the value is in line with the national standard and that providing a numeric value makes the language clearer and provides a specific guideline. AK notes that a draft from 10.24.19 listed a suggested value of 80%. NS notes that under Robert’s Rules we cannot open a policy for a single change without opening the entire policy to scrutiny. JC shares examples where instructors are unsure about the type of formal permission they need to miss a very small number of classes. CB notes that the intention of the proposed changes is provide more flexibility for instructors rather than constraining them. MA suggests creating an interpretive memo to explain the term “essentially all” to faculty members and chairs. JC suggests a “clarification memo” instead of opening the entire policy.
 - PFH asks if we should: 1) go the route of the interpretive memo; 2) send this to committee for review; or 3) put on Consent Calendar.
 - Ran out of time for this topic. EC will continue to discuss.
- 5.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30 pm] Pathway to Teach Online. Guest: Shariq Ahmed (AVP Academic Technology Services)
- SA summarizes the rationale for this pathway as we return to primarily FTF after AMI. He notes the questions and concerns from chairs about how to assign someone to an online course vs. face-to-face. The pandemic created an emergency situation where everyone (students and faculty) had to jump to online as an ‘alternative’ mode. Now as we look to intentionally offering courses online, we need to consider competing against other online offerings

and make sure we are offering the best possible delivery of instruction as possible.

- SA briefly describes the various modules and the role of staff to help faculty learn and become comfortable with online education. The estimated timeline is about 8 weeks to work through the modules.
- Questions/Comments: MA asks if this is a cohort program or not – These modules will be available in synchronous and asynchronous models. DH asks if this will be a requirement – No, but it may be used when determining who is assigned to online teaching. AC warns about calling this an ‘online teaching certificate’ and the potential for it being confused with other recognized certificate programs. AC asks about the qualifications of the workshop instructors – They are qualified instructional designers, but not subject specific experts. NS shares concerns about the effectiveness of the program without the use of subject-focused experts. NS also asks why this is coming from ATS, rather than the faculty center – SA notes that there is collaboration between ATS and the faculty center.
- SA says feedback is very important and changes will be made based on feedback.

5.4. Honorary Degree Committee

- URD has a few honorary degree recipient proposals to be reviewed. One of the members of the committee has an expired term, and a new member with full professor status needs to be selected. A call will go out to all-faculty for this.

6. Old Business

6.1. Townhall meeting for AB 928 and California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC)

- PFH announces that at the next senate meeting there will be an information sharing presentation to explain this and to solicit feedback from faculty members. After that, a townhall meeting will be held to discuss further on October 6th.
- MA suggests asking senators to go back to their colleges to get feedback prior to the senate meeting on the 13th.
- KJ will be presenting the information sharing presentation on the 29th and would like to send some documents out to senators in advance.
- KJ says several campuses are already putting together documents with some suggestions.
- MA asks for clarification about the timeline: September 29th – a presentation at senate; October 6th – townhall meeting; October 13th - do we formalize our response (suggestions or resolution) at the senate meeting?
- AC reminds that suggestions and feedback should be in writing.

- NS notes that our response will not be a “resolution,” because that requires two readings. Rather, it will be “feedback.”

7. Announcements and Information

7.1. CSULA Academic Senate Resolution in Support of [AB 2464 Paid Parental Leave of Absence](#)

- PFH shows a resolution from CSULA and CFA has been asked to support this resolution. The deadline is this Friday, so EC decides there is not enough time to formally support this resolution.
- DH suggests writing individually to support, if you do support it.

8. Reminders

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

9. Adjournment – 4:01pm