

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, October 11, 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, I. Escoto, S. Apel, K. Scissum Gunn, J. Cormack, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: J. Rhee, E. Berquist, S. Alimahomed

Absent: A. Russo, J. Hamilton

1. Call to Order – 2:01pm
2. Approval of Agenda – Motion by AC, seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of October 04, 2022 – Motion by NS, seconded and approved.
4. Special Orders
 - 4.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
 - KSG reports on NACADA (National Academic Advising Association). They are a consultative group on campus currently. They are a leader in designing and perfecting academic advising. Kerry Johnson and Paul Henderson are meeting with this organization. They will be meeting with deans, advising groups, and students to work on aligning our campus practices with “nine conditions of excellence.” The campus will get a report after the visit with recommendations on ways to improve our advising and encourage more “transformational” rather than “transactional” interactions between students and advisors.
 - QUESTIONS:
 - NS asks if they will be meeting with faculty advisors. KSG says she believes so. NS says this is the first he is hearing about it, and he is a faculty advisor.
 - AC asks what is meant by “looking at advising and assessment.” KSG offers examples of areas that can be assessed, including self-efficacy and self-determination approaches that students can focus on, as well as better approaches for selecting courses.
5. New Business

- 5.1. Draft feedback memorandum on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Cal-GETC Proposal to ASCSU
- PFH shares the draft memorandum prepared in response to the townhall meeting.
 - PFH will have to complete a survey by October 24th, and she will have to clearly identify which of the three options we are pursuing. We need to decide which single option we are going with.
 - Discussion ensues about content and organization of the memorandum.
 - NS notes that in drafting the memorandum, he was attempting to capture all the views suggested at the townhall. He also suggests taking a straw poll at the next AS meeting to see the breakdown of support for the various options.
 - RF asks about the “teeth and impact” of the memorandum once it is shared with ASCSU.
 - PFH asks KJ, EK, and PS if they have any ideas about what ASCSU plans to do with the resolutions / memos. KJ says she believes the ASCSU will look for consistencies in the resolutions and then try to synthesize the common themes and share those. EK reminds the EC about the importance of the fiscal nature of this bill and how a primary focus will revolve around fiscal issues (e.g. housing, enrollment increases, & deficits in enrollment on some campuses).
 - NS summarizes the approach for sharing and voting on the memorandum at the next AS meeting. The document will be shared in advance with a reminder that it contains a summary of proposals and views from the townhall meeting. A straw vote will be held on each of the three proposals, and the results will be included in the memorandum. A fourth vote will be for support/opposition to the overall memorandum.
- 5.2. Planning for Senate Retreat- Discussion topics
- PFH shares the proposed plan for the retreat. Minor adjustments are made, and the EC finalizes the questions to be discussed at the retreat.
- 5.3. [TIME CERTAIN 3:00 pm] proposal of changes to [PS 11-09 Grade Appeals Policy](#) and [PS 21-01 Academic Integrity Policy](#)
Guest: Jinny Rhee (Dean, College of Engineering)
- JR presents her recommendation to the grade appeal and academic integrity policies. She summarizes her reasons for coming to EC with her recommendations, including potential legal issues and student safety.
 - For the academic integrity policy, JR suggests updating the policy or drafting an interpretive memo to accompany the existing policy. Her suggestions include: 1) Assignments should be constructed such that conditions leading to cheating are not inadvertently fostered; 2) Penalties for cheating should be commensurate with the seriousness of the offense; 3) Restorative justice should be employed where appropriate; and 4) The faculty should present reasonable evidence of the cheating.

- RF asks if the departments within the School of Engineering already have specific bylaws or other policies to clarify responses to cheating beyond the University policy. JR says that she and the faculty council are working on this issue and that the college currently has a “zero tolerance” approach.
- NS notes that the intentions of these suggestions are already in place or available in current policies and practices.
- JC says that we are at an institution where the focus is on learning. Therefore, having a gradient of faculty responses to student misconduct is appropriate. She is currently working on the preparation of guidelines related to this issue in response to the topic being brought to EC earlier. She also reminds the EC to keep in mind that the Academic Integrity Committee does their best to determine whether or not students have engaged in misconduct, and their decision is based upon the available evidence. Sometimes it is clear, but more often it is not.
- IE shares some ideas from the student point of view.
- JR highlights the importance of two issues that led her to bring these issues to EC in the first place: 1) legal exposure and 2) discretion of the faculty member.
- PFH concludes that we recently opened the academic integrity policy, and therefore guidelines will be the best approach.
- For the grade appeal policy, PFH notes that we will likely open this policy, because there has been a decent amount of discussion and agreement about shortening the timeline.

6. Old Business

- 6.1. Dean Curt Bennett’s proposal of a Fast-Track Change to [PS 20-01 Policy on Online/Hybrid Instruction](#)
- 6.2. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30 pm] Review Guidelines for Lecturer Faculty Evaluation and the length of guidelines
 Guests: Sabrina Alimahomed and Emily Berquist (Co-authors of the review guidelines)
 - PFH notes that we have two sets of RTP evaluation guidelines. EC supported the guidelines. But, some questions have arisen:
 - 1) Do we want to set some deadline or parameters for those guidelines?
 - 2) What group(s) will the guidelines be applied to?
 - 3) Will new faculty be covered?
 - AC asks who has the final say in answering these questions. NS suggests CFA. KSG suggests the president, or his/her designee.
 - SA says that when they first created the guidelines, representatives from Faculty Affairs worked with them. About one half of universities have adopted guidelines with applicability deadlines ranging from 2023 up to 2030. She also notes that training and information are key. For example,

faculty councils were involved in the sharing of information and educating faculty with the initial guidelines. At the time of implementation, the thought was a five-year window for people hired during the pandemic in order to get them through tenure. However, we may want to take another look at the language, because some new questions and issues have arisen (e.g. publishing time frames).

- EB notes that we may want to look specifically at new hires this year. Although the pandemic has slowed, a lot of these people were impacted during the pandemic as they were finishing their Ph.D.'s, caring for family, etc. Therefore, we may want to continue protections for them.
- DH shares examples of impacts on lecturers, especially BiPOC individuals. Also noted the need to change "RTP" to "evaluations" in the lecturer document.
- NS notes that some current issues are less about COVID and more about other issues (e.g. equity). Has there been consideration about incorporating these other issues into discussions and approaches for RTP? EB says 'yes.' There is a growing focus on the unique experiences of faculty that do not fit the 'normal' model. The pandemic may have opened the door for COVID issues in RTP, but going forward, the other issues may be the new focus for RTP reform.
- EK raises the importance of looking at RTP as two distinct and separate issues for tenure-track vs. lecturer faculty.

7. Announcements and Information

7.1. Updates from CSU Statewide Senate Chairs Meeting

- PFH reports on the last meeting, including: 1) strengthening Title IX procedures; 2) faculty retreat rights; 3) AB 928; and 4) CSU 2030.
- Cozen O'Connor on Title IX campus visits will be at CSULB on November 8-10, 2022.
- PFH will share the portal for CSU 2030 faculty feedback.

8. Reminders

8.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 10/13/2022, 2-4 pm

- DH will present a civility statement at this meeting.

9. Adjournment – 4:01pm