

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, February 28, 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, P. Soni, D. Hamm, A. Russo, S. Apel, J. Cormack, K. Scissum Gunn, A. Kinsey

Additional Guests: M. Swanson, N. Iacono, P. Henderson, K. Johnson

Absent: K. Janousek, E. Klink, I. Olvera, J. Hamilton

1. Call to Order – 2:01pm
2. Approval of Agenda – Moved by MA, seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of February 21, 2023 – Moved by MA, seconded and approved.
4. Special Orders
 - 4.1. Report: Provost Scissum Gunn
 - JC reports for KSG. JC reports on SPOT evaluations follow up, deadline was yesterday, no critical issues heard. ATS has determined Qualtrics is not the best solution for SPOT. ATS will do an assessment and make recommendations to KSG. ATS lost two staff members before SPOT and new staff were not familiar with the program. MA asks how Spring '23 will be administered, and JC says there is not answer at the moment.
 - Working with the CO on the next graduate initiative, wants to be sure faculty input is included. Will bring questions to EC for approval or may have an interactive discussion.
 - PFH states that her dept review committee cannot access cases through Interfolio, and she has reported this. She asks other chairs if they cannot access either, other chairs concur with similar issues. One chair could access, others could not. Deadline extensions for review committees are a college issue, not university issue.
5. New Business
 - 5.1. Setting the agenda for the Academic Senate meeting, March 09, 2023
 - PFH shows draft agenda for next AS meeting. Four curriculum items are in CC, two items are in new business. New business items will have time certain –

7.1 will be 2:30, 7.2 will be 2:45, then 2:55 for 8.1. At March 23 AS meeting, will have an ASCSU presentation. EC approves agenda.

5.2. [Time Certain 2:45 pm] Concerns related to staff vacancies and turnover

Guests: Marita Swanson, AVP, Human Resources Management

Scott Apel, Vice President, Administration & Finance

- M. Swanson and N. Iacono present a PP presentation on staffing data. MS reports that the data given to staff council were given to know where staff are in various departments and colleges. Some faculty feel that turnover in the coordinator role is affecting them. Staff employment are bargained by their unions and must follow their procedures. Hiring for vacant positions is initiated and managed by the colleges/departments with assistance from HR. SA says there are not extra funds on campus, so to hire someone, something else must be cut. Some recruitments are held back to allow for other expenses to be approved. Since January '22 there have been an average of 33 applicants for each opening. Information presented regarding college headcounts is presented. Increasing staff satisfaction is a goal for HR. MS states that the benefits received by staff are world class and are very lucrative. We also have pensions which many companies no longer have. Work-life balance is something that most staff members have. HR will soon provide an annual total compensation statement to staff and faculty. More staff development and training will be available for staff along with a center coming. Growth opportunities for staff are being examined through the Beach 2030 initiative. Currently there are 700 staff that have a work remotely agreement. Staff movement within the campus and the CSU are encouraged. In 2022, 77% of IRP requests were approved.
- QUESTIONS:
 - DH mentions many current problems on campus are due to staff shortages, she asks if that is accurate. SA states that HR data are anecdotal. Many shortages in ATS and FA currently are an issue. This item came about due to President Conoley presenting staff numbers. EC feels there was a lack of civility in the presentation, with a combative tone and feeling of a personal attack on AR.

5.3. [Time Certain 3:00 pm] NACADA review results (Academic Advising)

Guests: Paul Henderson, Director, University Academic Advisement

Kerry Johnson, AVP, Undergraduate Studies

- KJ & PH share findings from the review of our advisors. First step was Survey administered to students in Sp'22. Second step was selecting three NACADA Consultants (Jermaine Pipkins, Casey Self, Kathleen Smith). They visited campus for four days, and had the survey findings, self-study reports, etc. shared with them. Use of "Nine Conditions of Excellence in Academic Advising."
- Showed what we do well – our advisors are committed to our students, utilize valued tools, connection with our students.

- Recommendations for Improvement – need to academic advising (philosophy, practices, processes) for the university; create consistent student experience; move focus of advising from transactional to a developmental/holistic approach.
- Further considerations shared (e.g. students want one advisor, they want more outreach, want longer advising appointments). Also, impact of other programs on our advisors (e.g. Long Beach College Promise, Transfer Success Pathway Program).
- One point of importance – create an Academic Advising Task Force to: define & develop consistent advising practices; review staff and faculty advisor program descriptions; identify ways to support and expand Equity through Advising Work group; & address faculty and staff advisor training and development.
 - Would like one faculty advisor from each college to participate. Looking for feedback from EC to do this. PFH asks if there is a charge for this task force. KJ says they finalizing a draft of the charge, and provides a brief summary (e.g. break the task force into multiple subcommittees focused on each of the five issues raised from the study)
 - NS asks how graduate advising is being included. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies (D. Perrone) will be on the task force.
 - PFH asks about the membership of the task force. KJ lists various positions (e.g. deans, associate deans, students, advisors, HR). NS asks about possibility of including a representative from the community colleges.
 - MA asks about recommended student-advisor ratios. KJ says some suggestions have been around ~300/350 to 1. We are well above that. But, the responsibilities for different advisors differ, therefore we will need to look at PDs for those advising roles to adjust ratios in a proper manner.
 - AN asks about the role of study abroad advising (international education). KJ sees this task force as being the first iteration of improvements and focusing on the five issues. Going forward, international education advising should be a part of focusing on our larger values and goals once we get some of the initial issues addressed.
 - Questions and discussion ensue about appropriate representation and selection of members across colleges for those who have staff advisors, faculty advisors, or both.
 - NS asks how quickly they want this task force put together. KJ says they want it within the next few weeks. If we go to faculty councils first, that will slow the process down.
 - The three colleges in need: CLA, CNSM, COE

- PFH says our best approach is for EC to send out a call to faculty advisors in the three relevant colleges and asks for nominations. PFH asks KJ to provide information about the obligations of the task force (meetings, days/times). MOTION made and passed. KJ will get the information needed to EC ASAP.

5.4. [Time Certain 3:15 pm] GVAR Placement Examination (GPE)

Guests: Kerry Johnson, AVP, Undergraduate Studies

- A new way to fulfill the GVAR. About 5,000 students need to take it, and they will have to pay for it. The administrative barrier is that we have held students from registering, thus leading to delays in graduation.
- KJ shared updated findings from data. A logistic regression analysis showed no differences in DFW rates between those who took the exam prior to taking writing intensive courses versus those who did not.
- KJ asks about suspending the GPE through F'23.
- MA asks how many campuses have a GPE exam. KJ says we are currently the only one with such an exam. Others have moved toward a course-based mechanism for meeting the GVAR requirement.
- AC asks about the format and style of the test. KJ briefly summarizes it. The concern raised is whether or not the current form of the test is actually testing what it was meant to test.
- GVAR committee is "torn" about effectiveness of GPE, and they are leaning toward "okay, let's get a new requirement in place."
- NS notes that the exam is designed to help our students understand where they are in the process of writing. He suggests a better approach: 1) make the test free; and 2) institute a requirement that students must take the placement exam by a certain point in their studies at CSULB. This approach could alleviate some of the issues.
- PFH asks how best for EC to move forward. KJ would like EC to make a recommendation to suspend a portion of the GVAR policy.
- MA asks about opinions of GVAR and URC on this issue.
- Item is tabled at this point.

6. Old Business

6.1. White paper for Academic Senate Retreat

- PFH tells EC about reaching out to facilitators, heard back from one with positive feedback. She asks how we should disseminate this paper. Shall we request an agenda item for the President's exec team? May post white paper on AS website. EC decides to disseminate the AC draft to President Executive Team, Provost message, Superintendents of districts of those who presented.

7. Announcements and Information

7.1 Updates on the previous concern related to Academic Center review

8. Reminders
 - 8.1. Next Academic Senate Meeting: 3/09/2023, 2-4 pm
9. Adjournment – 4:07pm