

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, February 07, 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, E. Klink, D. Hamm, A. Russo, J. Hamilton, J. Cormack, K. Scissum Gunn, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: S. Ahmed, M. Finney

Absent: K. Janousek, P. Soni, I. Olvera, S. Apel

1. Call to Order – 2:03pm
2. Approval of Agenda – Moved by MA, seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of January 31, 2023 – Moved by MA, seconded and approved.
4. Special Orders
 - 4.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
 - KSG reports on concern about IRB process. A self study was conducted, involving external review. A report was generated. That resulted in an MOU. Points of inclusion within the MOU have been reviewed and the official results will be posted on the website by JC. JC will visit with EC to discuss the points.
 - In 2021, a resolution was adopted by the senate to include gender neutral language in all communications. Question – Is there a process we need to pursue to ensure alignment with the resolution? PFH says that a discussion began last year that says as policies are opened for review we will be mindful of the language to align with the resolution. We would like to formalize the process, and we need to consider that. DH suggests having someone assigned to review policies and websites. NS asks if there is already a body tasked with reviewing for ADA compliance. AC notes that EC has limited purview for policies and documents outside of the senate. KSG says that if EC establishes an approach, that might serve as a template. Also asks if there is a core of individuals who have the expertise in that area (e.g. equity advocates). KSG reads from the resolution, which suggests that “all new” policies and communications will adhere to gender-neutral language. RF suggests having an email or website for individuals to report noncompliance

with gender-neutral language. PFH suggests having us continue to brainstorm about this issue and revisit it.

5. New Business

- 5.1. Academic Calendar Committee's Recommendation for 2025-26 Academic Year Calendar. Presenter: Nancy Meyer-Adams
 - NMA presents the CACC's 25-26 calendar recommendations. Options 1 and 2 presented to EC. EC discusses the two options. Both options meet the required number of instructional days. EC approves option two (Final day of classes on 12/10 & includes a 'reading day' on December 11th. Finals run from 12/12-12/18 with four grading days).
 - Brief discussion about other new holidays (e.g. Juneteenth, Lunar New Years, etc.)
- 5.2. Concerns related to [PS 14-04 Academic Centers and Institutes \(ACI\) Policy](#) –
 - PFH mentions one member of the review committee may recuse themselves from the review. This committee member is a first-year faculty member from the college that houses the center in question. The report is already completed. PFH asks EC their views about allowing this person to step down from the committee. EC has been asked to make an exception to policy and allow this person to be removed from this committee. Discussion ensues about denying the request, leaving it up to the committee member, and other options. PFH will reach out to the committee to see who specifically desired the request.
- 5.3. [Time Certain 3:00 pm] Feedback and concerns related to the roll-out of SPOT Report "chicklet"
Guests: Shariq Ahmed, AVP Academic Technology Services, Malcom Finney
 - SA and MF report on feedback related to the SPOT report. Multiple problems and concerns are raised (e.g. lecturer faculty not having access to the "chicklet," SPOT reports missing standard deviation, department and college numbers being identical, number of students per course being incorrect, and faculty not having access to the evaluation data).
 - Feedback presented to SA by EK and others. Spring '22, the process began with a small pilot. Fall '22 was the first time using Qualtrics instead of ClassClimate. SA says this process is not effective at this time, but they are working on the problems. 40% completion was reported for Fall '22 SPOT evals. Faculty without the chicklet can reach out to ITS, reports are available on the chicklet for those who teach. Once faculty are in, it is a 5 or 6 step process to download the eval results. This was created to alleviate the burden on staff and put it on faculty. One on one support is available for faculty currently on a drop-in basis. NS says, "this does not work" and this is the problem. NS asks for an explanation as to why this is not working widely. AR states this is a nightmare for staff members, and as a senior staff member many questions come to him. AR says the staff and chair should have access to the evaluations like it used to be. Staff say that if it had gone to the staff

and chair first, many of these problems would have been avoided. NMA asks why faculty got “both” chicklets, perhaps they should have only gotten access to one. NMA says this has been a complete nightmare to staff and faculty both. NMA asks MF why all faculty were not granted extensions, rather than on a one by one basis. MF says the rationalization was to avoid all the requests coming in at the same time. MF says extensions will be granted to any lecturer faculty who request them with Matt M. NMA asks if in the future a blanket statement should have gone out granting an extension. EK says this is not a single issue, not just SPOT but also Interfolio which is a mess. SPOT must be integrated into Interfolio and many staff members do not know how to operate Interfolio. SA says the training will be improved and not in a webinar form going forward. The data discrepancies have been corrected. A PDF report will be able to be downloaded going forward. SA says these problems will be address and corrected.

5.4. [Time Certain 3:30 pm] Proposed changes in curriculum approval process
Presenter: Jody Cormack, Vice Provost Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate Studies

- JC presents the curricular process, there is no policy, just practice. There is currently a document with arrows showing the process. She proposes certain curriculum items, such as certificates, minors, and credential options being grouped together. These do not go to the CO, they are internal only. She would like to stop these being approved by AS and to stop them at CEPC. It would save time to stop the last step. AC says this may affect the timing of the passing of the CEPC charge. He supports this change. An alternate suggestion would be that CEPC send to AS when they think it is necessary, if for instance it is controversial. NS asks for examples. A recent minor in South Asian studies, she states could skip the step of AS approval. Micro credentials could include courses in Education to help faculty as “professional development” for teachers. MA suggests formal guidelines be stated as to which items go to AS and which do not. If the item uses primarily existing curriculum, go to CEPC only. If it uses a majority of new curriculum, then go to AS. NS asks how this will be documented. NS says credentials are not on diplomas, and why. What items shall be on a diploma. A “for credit” course will be on transcript, a “non-credit” course will not be on transcript. AC trusts CEPC to handle this. AN asks if this will apply to discontinuances, JC says those shall go to Senate.

6. Old Business

6.1 Questions related to CPaCE AD Search Committee

- PFH asks EC to make decisions on certain parts of the policy
- Section 3.3.4.3 – re: lecturer faculty. There are three ALI faculty members willing to serve. EC discusses three candidates and selects to support Courtney Stammler
- Section 3.3.4.4 – EC discusses and supports Jacqueline Record

- Section 3.3.4.9 – EC discusses and supports Anna Behar-Russel

6.2 Discussion of the actions proposed by faculty parents re: Child Family Center

- PFH asks EC about the CFC issue and the presentation last week.
- They are asking for an opportunity to speak at the senate, and they are also asking for an emergency resolution (keep CFC open during planned renovation, keeping temporary faculty).
- KSG reiterates that we have exhausted every option available.
- NS notes that there is no such thing as an emergency resolution, there are simply resolutions, and they require two readings.
- We will table the discussion about allowing them time at the senate.
- EC does not support a resolution.

7. Announcements and Information

- 7.1. [ChatGPT maker releases AI detection tool](#)
- 7.2. [Infographic: Generative AI Explained by AI](#)
- 7.3. 2022-23 PaCE Fellows Program

8. Reminders

- 8.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 2/09/2023, 2-4 pm
- 8.2. Meet Trustee Maria Linares: 2/13/2023, 9:30-10:00 am
- 8.3. Institute for The Future (ITF) training: 2/14/2023 and 2/15/2023, 9am-4pm

9. Adjournment – 4:07pm