

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING Minutes

Tuesday, February 20, 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, J. Klaus, J. Cormack, K. Scissum Gunn, A. Kinsey

Absent: P. Soni, S. Apel

1. Call to Order – 2:00pm
2. Approval of Agenda – Moved by AN, seconded and approved.
3. Approval of Minutes: Meetings of February 13, 2024 – Moved by BK, seconded and approved.
4. Special Orders
 - 4.1. Report: Provost Karyn Scissum Gunn
 - KSG reports on the Second Start CSU pilot program, from the CO. CSULB is not participating in this program. KSG explains why – We initially assessed this pilot program in December '23. The program is aimed at developing strategies to re-enroll students who have stopped for a variety of reasons. One of the elements of the pilot is that eligible students will get a “GPA reset.” The pilot would also take place in specific programs rather than being campus-wide. Campuses would have to develop a new type of transcript for these students. These factors would lead to potential equity issues. CSULB is already engaged in activities to target the same need – a program called Equity Priorities. Approximately 12 campuses are participating in the pilot, and we will wait to see how their outcomes look,
 - Extended cabinet last week with members of Exec in attendance. The discussions that took place will be shared soon.
 - The DFW report was shared with PFH and is available [here](#).
 - Working on BMAC guidance memo soon.
 - KSG will be absent next week, JC will present in her absence.
 - **QUESTIONS:** SC asks if there has been any feedback re: Black Excellence. Notes that Sac. State has a Black Honors College. KSG responses that there will be a discussion about the Black Honors program. Campuses have received an RFP re: “statewide site for Black Student Excellence.” CSULB will apply.

- AN asks about Second Start – Would students return as stateside or self-support? KSG says both are under consideration. JC adds more detail about CPL (credit for prior learning) approaches to best suit students.
- NS asks about moving summer session back to stateside, which other campuses have done with significant increases in enrollment. He asks if we are considering this. KSG notes that campuses facing enrollment decreases may be the ones utilizing this strategy and asks NS to check to see which campuses are doing this.
- NS also comments about Second Start and equity – Notes that students who are in continuous enrollment and do not get grade forgiveness. That may encourage students to take a “five-year break” instead of staying enrolled.
- NH asks about upcoming BMAC memo and emails that went out during the strike. Brief discussion ensues about ‘mandated’ emails and clear communication about such emails.

4.2. Report: AVP, Student Affairs Jeff Klaus

- Report available [here](#).
- Some highlights from report and discussion include: phenomenal work of BMAC’s LIFE Project; communication between BMAC, faculty, and students re: “reasonable accommodations;” HyFlex courses; students struggling with transition into the workforce and potential for workshops; and percentage of face-to-face courses being on Zoom.

5. New Business

5.1. Discontinue [PS 07-03 Discrimination Policy](#) due to [CSU Policy 12891658 Nondiscrimination Policy](#)

- JC reports on the CSU Policy (#12891658) from the CO and the outdated nature of our campus policy (PS 07-03). AN notes that only half of our policy is affected by this CO policy. BK notes that our policy could be more specific, as long as it is in line with the CO policy. JC suggests having AS edit this policy to align with CO. CW asks about Prop 209 and any potential conflicts with this policy.
- Motion made to give this policy (PS 07-03) to FPPC for revision - Revise the policy to make sure it aligns with Title IX and Prop. 209. EC agrees unanimously.

5.2. Support New Faculty Titles

- PFH shares the request from D. Sathianathan and the working group. Currently there are three titles proposed (Professor of Practice, Artist in Residence, & Clinical Professor). Shares the current document that describes the titles, terms of appointment, etc. They would like EC to draft an endorsement in support of the creation of the new faculty roles/titles (e.g. memo, etc.).

- NS does not support, noting these positions will add more work for faculty (e.g. search committees), the positions will not build cohesion among faculty, and the positions may negatively affect faculty morale.
- KSG notes these positions will be on a smaller scale than we probably recognize / expect. The positions are there to complement existing faculty roles. Also notes the focus on future of higher education, and how these roles will assist in that goal.
- NH notes questions still looming about the hiring process for these faculty. Also notes concerns about the potential use of general funds to finance these faculty lines. NS encourages cutting the paragraphs referring to the potential use of “general funds” from the documents.
- NH suggests that if a memo is drafted, the Academic Senate should vote on it.
- CW comments on the search process for these positions: Will they be “open” or “targeted?” Also notes problems with the use of the term “professor of practice,” and questions whether these lines will exclude individuals who the concept of professor of practice was originally intended for (e.g. multi-year lecturer appointments). AN shares the same confusion about the language “professor of practice” and the historical use of this term to encourage faculty, versus this new iteration / meaning of the position.
- EK highlights potential problems re: workload related to evaluations of these faculty; potential grievance issues, and conflicts between creating lines for these positions versus allocations of tenure track hiring lines.
- RF suggests that any memo coming from EC or AS should ask for clearer language about the unique nature of these positions that highlights their limited use, and also articulates how these positions will not interfere or conflict with other faculty lines and opportunities for advancement. RF also supports having the AS vote on any memo.
- Grammatical Error that needs to be corrected: “Glance” changes to “Glance” (pp. 16, 28, 38)
- KSG believes there can be a co-existence between bringing in different types of instructional faculty while also increasing tenure density. Also suggests holding a town hall for discussion and clarification of the positions prior to bringing anything to the senate floor.
- Proposed Action: Town Hall before having this brought to senate. Invite senators, faculty councils, individuals who can provide specific examples, and the working group members. QUESTION: Who sponsors the event? The working group bringing this forward or the Senate? PFH will reach out to the working group to suggest how to set up a town hall.

5.3. Draft CSULB Travel Guidelines

- PFH shares new travel documents with EC along with guidelines. HR and staff have approved the guidelines, now seeking faculty approval. FA

would like EC to approve these guidelines. Discussion ensues about financial information (e.g. per diem changes), practical concerns that might conflict with the current guidelines (e.g. travelling to countries with limited accommodations, student safety), current language in the guidelines (e.g. “with University clearance”), and date of informing staff (12/5/23) versus EC (2/20/24). PFH will reach out to FA with feedback about these guidelines.

- 5.4. Concerns from CED Faculty Council re: service expectations
 - CED Faculty Council reached out to PFH asking for a memo including permission from EC to allow for service exceptions (e.g. they are asking for permission to send lecturers to serve in roles mandated by policy for tenure track representatives). CED has a limited number of TT faculty to perform all of the service.
 - AK will create a document showing the number of seats per year required per college to present to CED before a decision is made. A memo will be created from EC supporting this. RF suggests CED keep track and provide a yearly memo stating when and how often a lecturer faculty is sent in lieu of a T/T-T faculty member.
- 5.5. Review the draft policies in queue
 - PFH tables this item due to lack of time.
- 5.6. Change of Time Certain Items (ACSEM Charge and Resolution) for 2/22 AS Meeting
 - PFH asks if the time certain can be changed to 2:30 and 2:35.
- 5.7. Questions about GVAR Policy
 - CEPC has raised some questions about class size caps, number of sections needed, and the fiscal implications of these requirements. Asking if this needs to be sent to URC due to it now having fiscal implications.
 - EC agrees to send it to URC.
6. Old Business
 - 6.1. 2023 Academic Senate Retreat Draft Report
 - PFH asks that EC review the draft.
 - 6.2. New RTP Policy Implementation and Timelines
 - NH will send out an email to EC about some issues he raised, and EC will communicate via email.
7. Announcements and Information
 - 7.1. None
8. Reminders
 - 8.1. Academic Senate Meeting: 2/22/2024, 2-4 pm
9. Adjournment – 4:02pm