

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

Tuesday, March 15, 2022

10:00 a.m. – 11:32 a.m.

Video Conference

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, V. Harper

Visitor: M. Williamson

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

- Last Senate Meeting to introduce resolutions is April 28, 2022
- EC priorities include
 - 1) Academic Integrity (see 6.c.),
 - 2) UPRC Task Force (see 5.a iv), and
 - 3) Electronic RTP (see 5.a.iii.)
- Course Prefix – The Geology department sent an email in October 2021 to the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Affairs Committee Chair about GECCo using prefix SCI for GE GEO courses. There is no policy which says GECCo, or anybody has authority over prefixes. It's assumed that if a course is within a department, the department has prefix authority over the course. (A. Hegde) The recommendation was to send the issue back to the NSME Curriculum Committee to work it out internally, which went slowly. It took three years to get course approval from GECCo without any help from anyone else. That's a whole different area that will need to be discussed with GECCo. (M. Danforth) J. Tarjan clarified that GE course appeals go through the Academic Affairs Committee. He is in support of having the school curriculum committee decide on prefixes. (J. Tarjan) Who has oversight of GECCo? (M. Martinez) From an administrative perspective, oversight belongs in the Office of Academic Programs. GECCo does not report to faculty body outside of

GECCo itself. Thus, Referral 2021-2022 #7 GECCo Reporting Structure. There is a suggestion to have the Faculty Director of GECCo added to the AAC as non-voting member. AAC, as interdisciplinary curriculum committee, oversee GST and any appeals. That's how the prefix issue came to EC and AAC. GECCo can't unilaterally change course prefix. went back to GEO, but they were not happy with it. That's how the GEO's appeal came to EC. The EC responded in a memo to the Faculty Director of GECCo. The issue is that there's no policy. (A. Hegde) Any changes to the structure, such as unit distributions and the requirements for any part of the programs, goes through the Academic Senate. Assessment course requirements and learning outcomes and approval and review of courses are the responsibility of GECCo. (J. Tarjan) EC responded to the best of its knowledge. The Academic Senate Chair will talk with A. Gebauer. (A. Hegde)

- Professional Discourse - This is an overall problematic area that seems to be arising. E. Correa has great concern that if we continue to make decisions or to tiptoe around this and not call instances of unprofessional discourse out to stop-people-in-their-tracks, it will be a challenge to move things forward. (E. Correa) Prioritized agenda items for further discussion of this concern. (See 6.d. General Faculty Meeting, ii. and 6.i. Campus Civility – CPR)
- Emergency Operations Committee (EOC) Update – The sub-group is working on a proposal for Cabinet for their review in response to the Governor lifting the requirement to wear masks. The goal is to get feedback from the EC on the options for CSUB. (M. Williamson) Three options were offered. Discussion ensued. Q 1: Is there a policy if cases increase or if there's a new variant where strict measures can be quickly reinstated? Q2: Can instructors impose a masking policy for their own classes? (C. Lam) A: We always have to be ready to pivot if another variant appears. (M. Williamson) The University, through a requirement from the County, State Public Health can require masks, but individual faculty do not have the authorization to do that. (V. Harper) The classroom is faculty's domain. On the syllabus, the instructor states the rules. The student can decide whether to take the class or not. (M. Martinez) The

wearing of the n95 protects the wearer from others. The cloth mask protects the public. The n95 is available from campus. (M. Williamson) Suggestion: 1) The screening process needs to be improved 2) Do an educational campaign where if there is any kind of symptom they should not be on campus, and 3) include the Senate Chair as a sounding board to the message being crafted. (J. Tarjan) There is a problem in many departments that, since the mandates have been lifted, that some faculty want to go all virtual instruction. Think about what we're going to do to prevent faculty from doing that. A. Hegde will relay EC's concerns of using caution before removing beyond the status quo to the Campus Planning Committee. (A. Hegde)

- Faculty Forum with President – March 29, 2022 1:00 – 2:00
- BPA Search – Interviewing of eight candidates start next week. (J. Tarjan)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)

Request to add Summer Senate Retreat to New Discussion. (J. Tarjan) E. Correa moved to approve the agenda as amended. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

E. Correa moved to approve the minutes from February 15, 2022 and March 1, 2022. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

a. AS Log (handout)

i. AAC (J. Tarjan)

AAC acts as the curriculum committee (CC) for university-wide programs. A. Hegde and J. Tarjan discussed whether any items that are for AAC in their capacity as CC should go to the EC before being referred. It takes time to get through the agenda and the item is generally referred. The EC members were asked, as a practice, if only those items which are going to AAC in their capacity a university-wide CC be referred directly to AAC? They still need to go to the Academic Senate Chair and copy the AS Analyst to record the process step in the


AS log. (A. Hegde) Discussion ensued. Other school CC's have sent the request by email if it's something that does not need extensive discussion. If no one objects within three days, the proposal gets sent directly to AAC. There would be three-days for a member of EC to request it be to put on agenda for discussion. If no objection, the Academic Senate Office sends to AAC. (M. Danforth) The EC is to be copied in the email to AAC. (A. Hegde) The AAC does not have to go back to the Senate when courses are approved. New programs go to the Senate. (J. Tarjan) For anything that comes to AAC in the capacity of the university wide CC, the Senate Office will send to AAC and copy the EC. Remind others to bring things to us in a timely matter. If it doesn't work, we can go back to the way things were. (A. Hegde)

Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – AAC drafted resolution and then sent it to BPC and FAC for their input.

- ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)(deferred)
- iii. FAC (M. Rees)

Referral #3 Electronic RTP as Application Standard – If we're requiring it, faculty need to become familiar with it before Fall '22. There may be Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC) workshops with stipends. RES 202103 Submission of Electronic RTP Files for Academic Year 2020-21 was a temporary solution during the pandemic. Are we to continue to do RTP electronically while the investigation of software is being conducted? Currently, faculty have a choice about whether to use face to face or electronic SOCI. There is a concern, especially amongst untenured faculty, about getting more feedback. In BPA, the electronic SOCI completion rate is 35%, at best. Each school will have to decide the instrument for SOCIs, because we don't have a policy. (A. Hegde) Faculty and students were united in the Senate that we want to remain with paper SOCIs. Because of the low electronic SOCI response rates, we want to continue to use paper SOCIs. (J. Tarjan) Other campuses get higher response rates because they have incentives for students to complete SOCIs, like getting their grades earlier. ITS needs to hear again that electronic RTP is an option and not the default. (M. Danforth) ITS did reach out to the schools. The BPA Dean was asked to

write a memo strongly encouraging in-person SOClS. The Nursing Department requires paper SOClS for in-person courses. (A. Hegde) FAC is close to finishing a resolution. (A. Hegde)

- iv. BPC (C. Lam)
 - Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – the committee will review AAC’s draft resolution at the next meeting.
 - Referral 2020-2021 #20: The UPRC Task Force has revised three documents which form the new policy. (C. Lam) Return the documents to the AAC and BPC for discussion. A resolution is needed before the end of the semester. (A. Hegde)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. Summer Compensation – General Faculty and Department Chairs (deferred)
 - c. Searches (V. Harper) (deferred)
 - i. AVP GRaSP
 - ii. AVP IRPA
 - iii. Dean BPA
 - iv. Dean NSME
 - v. Dean Antelope Valley
 - vi. Dean Library
 - vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
 - d. Assigned Time 20.37 Review Committee (deferred)
 - e. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Budget Forum March 21, 2022 11:00 – 12:00
 - f. AB 928 (deferred)
 - g. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan (deferred)
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)
- a. Handbook 201.1 – CARS name change to GECCo – CARS is referenced in this section of the Handbook, but CARS no longer exists. The EC will make editorial changes during the summer. 
 - b. Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) Name Change – The request to change the name to the Department of Human Development and CAFS came from E. Correa, CAFS department chair. (A. Hegde) There isn’t any budget involved in making the change. (M. Danforth) Referred to AAC. (A. Hegde)

- c. Academic Integrity – The Academic Integrity Working Group has been working on some suggested language, policy and such. They meet today. A. Hegde informed the committee co-chair, T. Wallace that the Senate is looking for something now. The EC can expect something from them. It will be on the EC agenda for discussion and then referral to AAC and AS&SS. (A. Hegde)
 - i. Academic Integrity Pledge (deferred)
- d. General Faculty Meeting, Spring
 - i. RTP rebuttal letter acknowledgement: include interpretation of the substance of the letter (deferred)
 - ii. Guidelines for Chat during Zoom Senate meetings – According to an email sent recently to the Academic Senate Chair, someone from the gallery individually attacked a Senator rather than speaking on a resolution. At the next Senate, the Chair will announce that the meeting structure will follow its practice of Robert’s Rules and the process will be done with congeniality. If a Senator wants to speak to a resolution, they should preface their point with whether they are in support or in opposition. If someone from the gallery is called on to speak, they need to speak to the resolution, not to the committee or the individual presenting the resolution. It’s part of a larger conversation that the Academic Senate Chair and the Provost had about the lack of civility on campus. The AS Chair’s role is to conduct the meeting. If anyone observes any breach of collegial standards, please send a chat to the Chair, or asked to be recognized. Say, “what just happened is not appropriate”. When attacks and such actions are not addressed, they continue. The AS Chair will address it. Other Senates have disallowed chats between individuals. (A. Hegde) ASCSU has a similar issue. (J. Millar) (See 6. i.)
 - iii. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS (deferred)
 - iv. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action (deferred)
 - v. URC workload as campus grows (deferred)
- e. AP Assessment Quality Feedback (deferred)
- f. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)

- i. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
- ii. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1
- iii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 - Workload
- iv. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force
- v. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
- vi. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
- vii. Committee proliferation
- g. Summer Session GE courses (deferred)
- h. Exam Modality for Flex Classes (deferred)
- i. Campus Civility – Committee for Professional Responsibility (CPR) – There seems to be a dynamic of incivility that is pervasive and continuing and not a sense of real action to prevent it from recurring. While we have rules, regulations and professional dispositions, the fact is that when people are speaking with the intent to silence an entire group of people, it is highly problematic. People have the right to speak without being attacked. As academics, we need to be able to engage. More needs to be done. It is not just censoring or an imposed follow-the-rules posture. People should be told before or after the meeting that these types of behaviors are not appropriate and if this continues, there will be consequences. It has to be more than just saying “Please don’t do this”. While everyone has the right to speak, it must be respectful and to be at a point where other people can still engage and not feel attacked. Some people need to be told; your behavior is not appropriate. Perhaps the message has to come from administrators that it’s not the way we treat each other here, even if you’re angry or sad. (E. Correa) This was discussed in one of the Strategic Goal meetings. One of the steps we’re going to take is to reconstitute the CPR. If certain individuals continue certain behaviors, there could be some consequences to that. It’s getting to the point where certain individuals are afraid of being called out. (A.

Hegde) This kind of behavior came up as a theme in the survey made for the General Faculty Spring meeting. M. Danforth embraces the idea of being comfortable with discomfort during the pandemic as long as people aren't mean. Remind people to use diplomacy. (M. Danforth) This is an incredibly important topic. J. Tarjan and another department chair discussed behavior in the context of Title IX with M. Brown. Faculty don't believe there are consequences for their poor behavior. There are a number of instances where faculty feel no consequence when it comes to the very serious issues of academic integrity, even when others feel that faculty member should be dismissed. People don't think things are taken seriously when faculty members misbehave. J. Tarjan asked M. Brown, what does it mean when crime rates increase? Does it mean there's more crime? Often times not, because people start to report things to police. In his opinion, there is pent-up-demand to address professional responsibility, whether it's policing our own or making sure people act within the bounds of proper legal or procedural mandated behaviors. It appears that the administration doesn't take this seriously. (J. Tarjan) Those faculty in CPR are going to see situations from multiple different perspectives. Each person fully believes their perspective, but it may not be the complete perspective. Example: Someone executed their duties as Chair, yet the faculty member felt it was motivated by a personal dislike, even though it was actually motivated by the professional situation: they were not responding to students, not showing up for office hours and late to class. The CPR needs orientation on what would be the appropriate mindset and boundaries they should take, before they start reviewing cases. (M. Danforth) Whatever the reconstituted CPR looks like, those discussions will come from the AS. Keep thinking about those ideas to improve the collegial relationship on campus. Training and having consequences are excellent ideas. (A. Hegde) Q: What is the relationship between the Faculty Ombudsperson and the charge of CPR? (C. Lam) The Ombudsperson is a mediator and would also be involved with the CPR. (A. Hegde) There is a proposal in front of the President that goes further. The CFA union will see the proposal first. That dialogue with the CFA will be about our approach to dealing with faculty-to-faculty conduct. There

are circumstances where we want to hold administrators accountable. The genesis for the proposal was the Campus Climate Survey and what we saw in the situation with Chancellor Castro and other issues. After we get feedback from the CFA, the proposal will be brought to the EC as an informational piece. It is far more comprehensive than what we had in the past. (V. Harper) If the CPR is reconstituted, it would be helpful for the EC to see that information. (A. Hegde) The issues around the return to campus makes this a perfect time to have a program outlining our code of conduct. (M. Martinez) The Provost's Office has examined the Subchapter 7 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code and Handbook 303.8.3 Procedures for the CPR. There is no need for additional policy guidance. The Provost Office is seeking to offer a better enforcement mechanism and to modernize some of the processes in the Faculty Affairs Office. The Provost looked at the Title IX and HR complaints from the last five years to get a sense of the current state of the campus. The President is receptive to the approach. There's been communication with system representatives on how our approach compares with other campuses. We seem to be on the leading edge. (V. Harper) The EC looks forward to seeing it. Thank you. (A. Hegde)

- j. Summer Senate Retreat (deferred)
- k. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee (deferred)
- l. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (handout) (deferred)
- m. Reconsider Time Blocks (deferred)
- n. Investment Divestiture (deferred)
- o. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) (deferred)
- p. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (deferred)
- q. Distinguished Professor Award – FAC (deferred)
- r. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
- s. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
- t. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING March 17, 2021 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)**

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- President's Report – L. Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10-10:15)
- Department of Nursing Impacted Status – D. Wilson (Time Certain 10:15)
- Ally Software Pilot Report – F. Gorham (Time Certain 10:20)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (Time Certain 10:25)

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

New Business

RES 212223 Approval of BA in History with a Concentration in Social Science Teaching

RES 212224 Completeness of Periodic and Performance Review Files

RES 212225 Task Stream Usage and Access Policies

Old Business

RES 212220 Formation of a General Studies Review Committee

RES 212221 Academic Calendar – Fall Recess Schedule

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

9. ADJOURNMENT

A. Hegde thanked the members for staying over and for the great discussion. He adjourned the meeting at 11:32.