

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes

MEETING #3

Thursday, October 10, 2019, 2:00 – 4:00 pm
Towner Auditorium (PSY 150)

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - 3.1 Academic Senate meeting of September 26, 2019
4. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS
 - 4.1 Executive Committee: Announcements
 - 4.2 Nominating Committee

REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR DR. JODY CORMACK: approved by AS

- Frank Cardinale, Lecturer Faculty

REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR DR. KERRY JOHNSON: approved by AS

- Connie Ireland, CHHS
- Lynda McCroskey, CLA
- Patty Seyburn, CLA
- Mark Washburn, COB
- Sharlene Sayegh, Lecturer Faculty

FACULTY CENTER ADVISORY BOARD (FCPDAB): approved by AS

- Betina Hsieh, CED
- Yolanda Green, CHHS
- Tianjiao Qiu, COB
- Elizabeth Ann Lindau, COTA

GEGC – GENERAL EDUCATION GOVERNING COMMITTEE: approved by AS

- Nancy Quam-Wickham, CLA (Term 2020)
- Rich Haesley, CLA (Term 2022)

PTAC – PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE: approved by AS

- Sarah Zigmont, Lecturer Faculty (CNSM) (Term 2020)
- Shadi Sadeh, COE (Term 2020)

GWARC – GRADUATION WRITING ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT COMMITTEE: approved by AS

- Noah Asher Golden, CED (Term 2022)
- Elizabeth Ann Lindau, COTA (2022)

5. CONSENT CALENDAR
 - 5.1 Proposed rescission of PS 89-05, Policy for a Smoke-Free Campus Environment (AS-1091-19/EC)—FIRST READING -No discussion, moves to Second reading
 - 5.2 Proposed rescission of PS 74-10, Subject: Parking (AS-1095-19/EC)—FIRST READING - No discussion, moves to Second reading
 - 5.3 Proposed rescission of PS 70-15, Solicitation by Faculty (AS-1098-19/EC)—FIRST READING- No discussion, moves to Second reading
6. SPECIAL ORDERS

- 6.1 Report from CSULB President Jane Conoley: TIME CERTAIN 2:15 pm-President Conoley reports that by the end of the calendar year every room that holds 60 or more will have a mechanism to lock from the inside, after that the smaller classrooms will be fitted with locks. It is a priority for the University at this time. EG asks if the electronic doors in LA2-4 can be remotely locked by police. SA will answer in the future. KC asks if the electronic doors can be coded for the faculty, and when do they make the announcement to use the loudspeaker for those students who did not check their email and texts. Colleen Ryan AA facilities specialist spoke about the locks. Labs are being worked on also with regards to the locks. JC asks if shelter in place has a protocol for the CDC where toddlers are kept. MA asks with regards to the variety of doors on campus, perhaps offer a protocol on how to lock the various types of doors on campus. Campus police will provide training to any who need this. Police website currently has a youtube video on how to do this. CB asks where the half million reserved for the locks have come from and she states that it comes from regular funding, not "special" line item funding. JC states this is a high priority and that it will be funded. CCC committee would like to compile comments about the tone of the messages for the shelter in place, and share the information with campus police. JC reported on the 22 acres and the Native groups and she states that much of the information has been misrepresented. Removing dirt and relocating, which was previously deemed appropriate, will now not happen. She is disappointed in the reporting and the escalation of this event and the reporting of. She states that the University thought they were following the recommendation of the committee. She also stated that elevators on campus have a full time repair person on site. Central plant has a chlorine smell on campus, many students have reported this. SA reports that the water must be treated with chemicals before usage, SA states he will check on this. Anti-abortion protestors on campus today, and JC reports that Student services would be available to assist any students in distress over these protests.
- 6.2 Report from CFA President Deborah Hamm- reported that the Safety Committee is not satisfied with the promises from the administration regarding the promise of locks, she states that this has been a problem for many years. She asks that faculty fill out their bargaining survey. Two bargaining roadshows are coming up. Campus safety is part of CFA's charge and welcome feedback.
- 6.3 Report from ASCSU Chair Catherine Nelson, TIME CERTAIN 2:30 – Chair Nelson reports on the 4th year of QR requirement is in front of the BOT at this time. ASCSU supports this requirement, evidence shows that a 4th year of QR in high school helps success rate and a major in a STEM field, hope it will help underserved populations. Ethnic Studies- AB1460 mandating a 3 unit ES requirement for all undergraduate students. Historically studied populations (African American, Native American, Latinx,) would be the focus of the studies. ASCSU is against this proposal, colleagues state that this has moved on intersectional basis beyond the four groups listed. Concern of legislature's outreach into curriculum development. There is a concern of extra units and transfer agreements. Cost to the CSU at around \$15-18M. The bill did not make it out of senate appropriations committee due to financing issues. This is a 2 year bill so Dr. Shirley Weber has another chance to put this bill through. ASCSU will try to get this under way this semester and come up with a resolution. ASCSU will work with campuses on this. Chair Pandya stated that our campus is currently in negotiations on GR and cannot comment on this at this time. Public drop box on ASCSU website "ethnic studies resolution feedback" is where you can leave comments. First reading resolution will be in November based on campus feedback. January plenary they expect to have a final vote on this. Also working on a resolution establishing that campuses to have a database to have access to permanent positions in one place. MA asked why Dr. Weber went to the CSU's instead of high schools with wider audience,

Community Colleges and UC's. She stated that there was a high school version but was withdrawn due to criticism by some minority groups.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 7.1 Proposed Policy on Service Learning (AS-1082-19/CEPC)—SECOND READING- lines 86-98 Schurer amendment, regarding how courses get certified. Juan Benitez stated his approval of the amendment. Voting on amendment Yes=50 no=2 replaces lines 88-103. Line 106, change 8 to 6, lines. Motion on line 105 add "as above" and delete lines 106-107. Strike all of line 105 in addition. DS moves to replace line 89 "6 weeks" by September 1 for spring and summer or February 1, for fall. Seconded. Vote on amendment Yes=45 No=8. Voting on the policy as a whole: Yes=56 No=4 **Policy Approved as Amended**
- 7.2 Proposed revision of Policy on Online and Hybrid Instruction (AS-1077-19/FACT/EC)—SECOND READING- Lines 10-17 no amendments, Schurer amendment lines regarding modes of instruction and percentage of time spent face to face vs. online and hybrid. Becky Nash asks if the percentage reflected the contact hours. Colleen Ryan "courses that at least 80% of instruction occurs synchronously in a location where both the student and instructor are physically present" Vote on 2.3 amendment Yes=483 no=3, amendment passes. MA amendment states face to face means 100%. Time has run out, will be returned to Oct. 24
- 7.3 Proposed revision of Policy on Faculty Awards (AS-1067-18/FPPC)—SECOND READING
- 7.4 Proposed revision of Policy on Establishment and Dissolution of Departments and Programs SECOND READING
- 7.5 Proposed Policy on Campus-Specific Graduation Requirements (GR Policy) (AS-1078-19/CEPC)—SECOND READING, TIME CERTAIN 3:30- Motion to postpone for 20 minutes to discuss how GR policy will affect campus resources and curriculum with possible financial and fiscal consequence, by Praveen Shankar, seconded Christian Molidor. CM asks if URC has looked at this policy, JZP states that this is not in the charge of the URC to review new curriculum. **Vote on motion, Yes=35 No= 18, Motion passes to postpone discussion for 20 minutes to 3:55.** PS is concerned that this will increase the unit requirement for certain majors There might be impacts on resources such as impacts on advising under this new proposed draft of SLO-based GR. DS states that these are the course-based version of these requirements already existed. They are included in our mission statement, and also will be taken into effect during our accreditation process. C. Brazier states that there is a misconception on unit requirement, students can take the units as an undergrad. P. Soni states that these constraints may require students to take additional units. Nancy states that the website shows the old requirements and new requirements side by side and she says there are 9 additional units to be added to some majors. HB asks if this policy will be immediately put into effect or if there will be a delay. Senate will determine timeframe. KJ clarifies that these requirements are overlays of GE courses or overlays in the major, so they are not additional units per see. They can continue to be overlays, GEGC recommended major specific prerequisites in GE to allow more flexibility. AC says to think of effects on students and their success need to be taken into account. He believes that the goals may not be accomplished within the confines of a class. Jalal T is concerned with transfer students who cannot meet several requirements at the same time, how would it impact them? J Cormack says these requirements can be articulated, currently not that many articulation agreements exist. Praveen Shankar says he does not want to remove GR, but to make an informed decision on how it affects all the programs. He says colleges and programs need to be asked about impacts. F. Golshani states that the committees did speak to Faculty Council and he states there was a poll that overwhelmingly asked for no graduation requirements (5-2 vote by the Fall ad-hoc committee in favor of not having any GR). He states

this will impact how advising happens, graduation, and checking of transcripts and it will be very problematic. Think of students whose graduation can be delayed because of additional requirements. NS states that these previous concerns have already been brought to CEPC and GEGC. All committees other than the fall ad-hoc committee voted with this new draft. There was an attempt to address the issue with removal of Category F in the GE. PS stated that URC has not been asked about GE, while not in their charge, they said they would report on impacts on resources if requested. D O'Connor states that many may agree with GR in principles, however, the challenge seems to be implementation and how cumbersome it is. He suggests a re-framing of the policy and perhaps have programs address the requirements for them. M. Lounsbury agrees with Dean O'Connor and says many of these requirements will be very problematic for her college. She states it is confusing and the requirements should be moved to various programs. Joe Phillips states that there is misinformation being floated out, he believes that this is removing his voice as far as the GR goes. He believes that students should take GR, which make you a better citizen. MA asks if there is any deadline for GR. JZP states no deadline. EG states that additional courses can seem problematic to certain majors with accreditation issues. She states that much of this goes along with EO1100 and we are trying to make our campus comply while aligning with our core values. N. Cheffer says that 2 groups did approve, but 1 (the Fall ad-hoc) committee did not. JZP states that CEPC and GEGC did take those committee findings into account.

8. NEW BUSINESS
 - 8.1 N/A
9. ADJOURNMENT-4:01 pm