EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes

Tuesday, March 05, 2024, 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. Hultgren, R. Fischer, A. Nayak, C. Warren, B. Katz, M. Dyo, S. Kasem, N. Schürer, E. Klink, S. Collins, A. Russo, S. Apel, J. Klaus, J. Cormack, K. Scissum Gunn, A. Kinsey

Absent: P. Soni

Additional Guests: C. Ryan

1. Call to Order – 2:00pm. PFH welcomes guest, Colleen Ryan, who is attending as possible Staff Council chair for next year.

2. Approval of Agenda – AN moves, seconded and approved. Item 6.5 will be moved to next week.

3. Approval of Minutes: Meetings of February 27, 2024 – Moved by BK, seconded and approved as amended.

4. Special Orders
    4.1. Report: Provost Karyn Scissum Gunn
        *   KSG reports on the consultative process for two upcoming searches, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Associate Vice President for Research and Economic Development. Suggestion made to begin with interim appointments to begin on 7-1-24 for a one-year appointment. A reorganization of the first job may take place with the Vice Provost for Academic Programs being one position and the Dean of Graduate Studies another position, eliminating the Associate Dean of Grad Studies. A faculty director would replace the current Associate Dean position, thus creating a faculty-centric approach with a faculty member getting release time. These changes would "right size" the portfolio, and would not add any MPP positions.
        *   Re: the Associate Vice President for Research and Economic Development (ORED) – The economic development part of this position is under performing. Eliminating the "ED" part of this position. The position would keep its focus on Office of Research.
            o   SA notes there are other people on campus who currently do similar economic development work.

- o NS asks about the concern of "corporatization of the university" by removing the economic development part.
  - KSG has lobbied for an internal search with an internal review committee consisting of: J. Cormack, D. Sathianathan, the Academic Senate chair, AS vice chair, and AS secretary. The proposed search timeline:
    - o Week of 3/12 – present PDs to group
    - o Week of 3/18 – group would come together to work on a rubric for the positions and necessary qualifications
    - o Week of 3/25 – formal call for applications
    - o Three weeks later applications would be due (CV, interest letter)
    - o Week of 4/15 – group would review the applications and make recommendations to the Provost
    - o Week of 5/1 – announcement about who will fill the interim positions.
  - AN thanks KSG for conducting an internal search rather than just making appointments.
  - 4.2. Report: AVP, Student Affairs Jeff Klaus
    - JK provides his report – here
    - JK says there will be a lot of events for Women's History Month
    - The Undocu Student Summit will take place 3/15-3/16 in USU.
  - 4.3. Report: VP Administration and Finance Scott Apel
    - SA reports on an upcoming meeting of CFO's. Budget will be discussed, and information will be brought back to EC next week. Reports of Lena Gonzalez meeting last week, and notes she was asked to call us with any questions.
    - CW asks about second 5% raise which may not happen. SA says budget planning is being based on the second 5% at this time.
    - Brief discussion about possibility of Chancellor Garcia establishing retreat rights at CSULB's CED.

5. New Business
  - 5.1. Feedback for Faculty Affairs' Draft Message to Faculty
    - PFH shows draft message and asks for feedback. NS feels it is unclear. KSG says there are external constraints regarding the language of the message. NS is unsure of what this memo accomplishes. NH appreciates the spirit of this document, and KSG echoes that sentiment. CW asks about the procedure for some faculty who had their pay docked due to their absence due to the strike. SC notes the problematic issue with messages sent from FA 'after the fact,' instead of more proactive messaging. RF suggests clearer language to convey the spirit of not trying to vilify or marginalize faculty during a difficult time period. EK raises the issue of newer faculty being more like to report, and thus more likely to have their pay docked. Further discussion ensues about the docking of pay for some faculty.

Overall, EC feels the timing of this message is not good, and if they want to send this message, it should be revised with more examples and clarification about the purpose. EC offers several specific recommendations for the message. An edited memo will be sent forward to FA.

5.2   Proposal for Piloting a New Curriculum Timeline

- JC presents new timeline for curriculum to speed up the process. Proposed timeline [here](#). JC discusses the current timeline and notes several areas where there are barriers (e.g. 1st & 2nd reading at department level; JC's office identifying errors and needing departments to fix them; the 1st & 2nd readings at Senate). Goal is for one year or less for approvals. JC suggest using a "pilot" program initially for low enrolled programs who are looking to make revisions to their programs to remain viable. JC discusses further hurdles, deadlines, and connections to the CSULB Catalog, Cal State Apply (CSA), and the Academic Master Plan (AMP). PFH notes that this draft timeline has been shared with Enrollment Services.

- DISCUSSION:
  - AN asks about "special programs" (i.e. low degree conferring programs). When do they need to show 'progress?' JC says her initial assumption is five years, but feels that things may change with more pressure coming from the CO. AN notes the difficulty with single subject credentials.
  - NS says 'yes' we want things to go faster, but we also want things to go right (i.e. determined by the experts in the particular field). Asks if there is a specific list of the low degree conferring programs. Two things going on: 1) Trying to help the low degree conferring programs; and 2) To speed up the curriculum process.
  - NS suggests making it clear that this is only for low degree conferring programs.
  - JC suggests reducing the number of readings. NS shares concerns with cutting two readings (i.e. 1st & 2nd).
  - NS asks for opinions about cutting the College Level review. JC notes that the College level may have more knowledge about various disciplines than at the University level.
  - JC offers suggestion of bringing some curriculum items to a virtual process instead of having all the meetings.
  - NH offers some feedback about feasibility of meeting times, getting senate members to read material for only one reading, etc.
  - BK shares a positive view of this proposal – the aspect of having a proactive plan for what will be addressed at meetings will benefit committees.
  - Several EC members express support for removing the college level review.

- o BK suggests a potential effective approach to ensure that a certain percentage (or number) of committee members reported having reviewed a document prior to its review at a meeting.
  - o AR asks how many programs are currently "low degree." JC doesn't have an exact number, maybe 13? JC says she estimates 5-7 proposals going through.
- PFH asks "Can we pilot this pilot timeline?"
  - o EC unanimously agrees to the pilot as presented by JC, with the following clarifications:
    - ▪ Specific language will be included that this is for "low degree conferring programs only"
    - ▪ Department Curriculum approval by September 30th
    - ▪ Piloting for one year.

6. Old Business
   6.1. 2024 University RTP Policy Implementation and Timelines
   - PFH attended Dean's council meeting and presented this (timeline [here](#)). There has been a request to push back department deadlines from May 2025 to December 2025. The current College deadline is December 2024. PFH asks EC what timeline should be adopted? Multiple EC members support the currently proposed timelines (College 12/24 & Departments 5/25). EC supports the current timeline.
   - Guidelines for faculty hired 2024-25. They will have until their first review to decide which version they will be reviewed under.
   - Once faculty decide the document/version they are going under, they must stick to that version. KSG says that should be included in the Implementation and Timelines document. EC will add that language.
   6.2. 2023 Academic Senate Retreat Draft Report
   - PFH thanks all who contributed to the revision process. EC agrees to share this widely with the campus community.
   6.3. Updated on the New Faculty Title project
   - Proposal for new faculty titles presented to EC recently. Feedback given to working group who created. The working group will organize town hall meeting in April. They would like to include CFA and CO in this upcoming meeting. The meeting will be on Zoom and recorded. All faculty and campus community will be invited. A one-page FAQ may be created to summarize the document. RF asks if "entire campus community" includes students.
   6.4. Approval for CSULB Travel Guidelines
   - EC discussed the new travel guidelines previously and provided confirmation of our review, discussion, and thoughts. AA came back to PFH and said they are looking for EC's 'approval.' Discussion ensues about the

most appropriate response. EC decides to respond back with "The Senate EC are not opposed to these guidelines."

6.5. ~~Draft memo for CED Faculty Council - re: AS Council Membership~~
- Tabled until next week.

7. Announcements and Information
    7.1. Cal-GETC Administrative Implementation Guidance Memo is [here](#).

PFH shares that we will have guests over the next few weeks, including Chris Swarat and Shae Miller.

8. Reminders
    8.1. Academic Senate Meeting: 3/07/2024, 2-4 pm
- Agenda may be edited at the meeting to remove one item.

9. Adjournment – 4:03pm