

ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE EXTRA

MINUTES

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: BPC 134 AND VIDEO CONFERENCE

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, V. Harper, and B. Bywaters (Senate Analyst Retired Annuitant)

Absent: J. Millar (excused)

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Add EEGO Programs – Certificate. EEGO listed a NSME program as a certificate. E. Correa moved to approve the agenda. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. November 8, 2022, Minutes – Updated: 5. Continued Items, a. Academic Senate Log, ii. AS&SS V. Harper thanked E. Correa for leading a conversation on the advising report with the staff advisors. E. Correa moved to approve. C. Lam seconded. Approved.
- b. February 14, 2023 E. Correa moved to approve. C. Lam seconded. Approved.
- c. February 21, 2023 E. Correa moved to approve. C. Lam seconded. Approved.
- d. February 28, 2023 - pending

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

- a. AS Log (*deferred*)
 - i. AAC (J. Tarjan)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. BPC (C. Lam)
 - iv. FAC (M. Rees)
- b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. COVID Policies
 - ii. ITS Policy Timing
 - iii. CO Update

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV) This item has been on the agenda since last year. The concern is that someone who only served one year still is learning how the Senate works. Ideally one would have been on the committee they wish to chair. Consider applying these term limits considerations to ASCSU. (A. Hegde) Inconsistency between Appendix B and C in the Handbook regarding the Chair Term and the Vice Chair Term. It could be used to argue that Chairs and Vice-Chairs should only serve a one-year term, for a maximum of two years. Our practice has been a two-year term for a maximum of four years. (M. Danforth) The referral to take Appendices B and C into consideration. (A. Hegde) Sub-committees can have discussion in their committee about non-Senators who then become Senator and how it would affect eligibility to chair. (M. Danforth) Referral to all the committees on By-Laws change:
 - i. Chair Election Statement of Interest, Two-years on Senate requirement before eligible for Chair of sub-committee, Term limits
 - ii. Structure of BPC - The CFO is a member of the BPC and he wanted to change that.
 - iii. Qualifications of Standing Committee Chair (A. Hegde)
- b. MSA discontinuance, EEGO – It will be referred to AAC upon receipt of the rationale from EEGO. (A. Hegde)
- c. Proposal for emphasis in Biochemistry B.S. – AAC (HOLD; referral in progress for Concentration and Emphasis)
- d. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. Voting platform replacement – The VotingPlace election software required a special exception from ITS because it's not fully accessible. It also doesn't support single sign-on. M. Danforth and the School Election Committee (SEC) Chairs has looked at replacement vendors. They have the single transferrable vote (STV) as required by the Handbook and pass the accessibility review per Section 508. The preference is that they support single sign on with MS or Shib,csu.edu. Of the three platforms examined, Simply Voting is the preference of the SECs. It meets requirements and has mobile optimization. Pricing package is \$500 for every 10 elections. There is a one-time set up charge with ITS. (M. Danforth) Are the SEC Chairs and M. Danforth Election Committee Chair sufficient to decide or do we want to send to BPC and the Senate? The current software license expires May 4, 2023. (A. Hegde) Operations handling can be done by the EC. (J. Tarjan) Consider a one-year trial with Simply Voting. (R. Rees) We can renew VotingPlace without ITS Service Consulting again. It would be the fall back. (M. Danforth) The EC will support the recommendation of the Election Committee Chair, M. Danforth, and the School Election Committee Chairs to procure Simply Voting. (A. Hegde) M. Danforth will begin the Solutions Consulting process with

- ITS and then it will move on to Procurement. (M. Danforth) When it's in place, an announcement will be made at the Senate with an explanation of the process. (A. Hegde)
- ii. General Studies (GST) Review Committee – M. Rees volunteered to be on the committee for one year. J. Tarjan has a two-year term ending 2024. A call is needed for University wide positions. There would be a one-year and two-year term in that call. (M. Danforth) Fall 22 FYS and GST Instructors are due for review (M. Rees) The call to go out at the appropriate time. (A. Hegde)
 - iii. HIPs taskforce [RES212212] 5th resolve- composition discussion – The Task Force to advise how High Impact Practice (HIP) would be designated. We need to figure out the composition of the Task Force. (A. Hegde) Discussion ensued. The Task Force will determine criteria and what needs to be done in order to prove we have of High Impact Practice (HIP) such as a particular type of research at a high level. There should be a representative from Academic Programs to staff the Task Force for it's technical part. It should be someone who can gather statistics, work with the CO to report learning outcomes in communities which helps allow us to do research. (J. Tarjan) Ultimately, it'll be guidelines (not review like GECCo) for syllabi and what would allow an ASC to select a particular HIP for that particular course. The HIP Task Force is an advisory to the DCLC and Curriculum Committees. They would want HIP in their bylaws. The At-Large non-school instructors would allow counselors who teach classes to participate. (M. Danforth) The EC agreed on the structure of the HIP Task Force: Four (4) FT General Faculty, one (1) from each school appointed by the EC, and two (2) FT General Faculty At-large appointed by the EC. Candidates to make a brief statement why they want to be on the HIP Task Force. (A. Hegde)
 - iv. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity) (HOLD) - Consider deleting item because there many actions taken through the DEI Fellows and the Cluster Hires are taking place. (A. Hegde) There is some appetite for school RTP criteria. (M. Danforth) A suggestion is to have C. Catota convene a meeting of the new Cluster Hire Faculty with URC to discuss this. They could take it on as one of their tasks, as they were charged with doing it. (J. Tarjan) The concern(s) could be brought up during C. Catota's DEI Listening Sessions. (A. Hegde) When people do Open Education Resources (OER) they are doing a lot of work on the front-end to create these classes. It is an equity issue. (E. Correa) Within the STEM disciplines, the NSF Advance Grant, which is reviewing policies & procedures to see if there are any gaps or disadvantaged portions. We are reviewing the unit RTP criteria within each of the

- STEM disciplines. It's another avenue for input. (M. Danforth) Maybe we can fine tune in future meetings. It continues to HOLD. (A. Hegde)
- v. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change – It's an attempt to avoid having calls in Fall because the lack of some school participation. School positions get two call attempts before it reverts to an At-Large position, but there is no limit to the number of calls for At-Large before we revert to an appointment. (M. Danforth) Have the EC members contact those who didn't make the Senate At-Large position to nominate themselves for election to school and university wide committees. Referral sent to BPC.
 - vi. Committee proliferation – How many of the 56 committees are active and which are not? K. Van Grinsven can reach out over the summer to identify which are active and those to be convened. How are committees, such as Ad Hoc, convened? (M. Danforth) It's an on-going task. (A. Hegde) An idea for the Summer Senate Retreat is to look at a way for the faculty voice in all matters in the university – specifically academic affairs. (J. Tarjan)
- e. Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) - FAC
- i. Clarify handbook language for 3-year Lecturers and PTR Committee – Six-year lecturer section is being worked by FAC. The three-year lecturers need to be taken up. The language through-out the Handbook needs to be cleaned-up. For example, it includes Lecturers and post-tenure faculty in RTP sections. (M. Rees) Formation of the PTR committee needs to be taken up. For example, when there aren't enough professors in a department and recommendations outside of the department need to be made to build a PTR committee. When there is a conflict with the recommendations, such as one was also going up for review, how is it handled? When the Handbook language is not clear, we have to go by precedence. The composition of the PTR committee is unclear – everyone from the department, but when there isn't enough for the committee. (A. Hegde) Referred to FAC
 - ii. 2nd Year Review Materials: drafted referral – The EC agreed on the language. Referred to FAC.
 - iii. Review letter thoroughness; including reviewers addressing all criteria. When a rebuttal is put in, the next level very rarely acknowledges it. (A. Hegde) Originally, the concern was that not all areas were addressed in a letter. Progress, or achievement of criterion in each area. (M. Rees) The URC intentionally put in verbiage that they have reviewed rebuttal(s). The problem recently has been with Box. It's been very difficult for the URC to find materials because everyone has a different organization of how the file is presented. (C. Lam) There has been much training and presentation of material

instruction for the Deans. (M. Rees) Include this in the Deans' orientation. (A. Hegde) With the new platform being discussed by Task Force there will be better organization of electronic materials. Materials also need to be placed in the Personal Action File (PAF) in the Deans office. (M. Danforth) Some of the committees are addressing their own criteria. It could be discussed in DCLC. Consider drafting a template to help the committees, especially for Lecturers. (J. Tarjan) If something isn't addressed, then at the last minute, the response is we don't need it. One needs to be informed every year what is required. (M. Rees) A possible solution to the inconsistency of the Deans' addressing the rebuttal and all the criteria could be to have an evaluation template of the three areas drawn up by the department, school, or university. Include the names of the people at the different levels. A checklist is helpful, especially for Lecturers due to more mandatory content. It comes in the form of a draft letter. For other people, they at least had to have an evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Consider overview of the research when reviewing Scholarship and what's in progress. (J. Tarjan) What happens when there are factual inaccuracies? (E. Correa) It goes in a rebuttal and making sure all levels can find it. The Personal Statement is not part of the list in the Handbook. (M. Rees) Refer Letters in the RTP to FAC. Whether it's guidance or a checklist, the main concern is the reliable review of the RTP and/or the rebuttal and acknowledged at the next level. (A. Hegde)

f. Academic Administrators

- i. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1 (*deferred*)
- ii. Academic Administrators Search and Screening Procedures - The Provost has added an extra step before the candidates come to campus. Currently, Provost's role comes after the Search Committee's work. (A. Hegde) Some searches ago for Deans, the consultant put something before the Provost. The candidate goes through eight hours of conversations and interviews, etc. The recommendation was to have an open, unstructured conversation with the Provost. It's being referred to as The Saturday Conversation for the candidate and the Provost to get to know each other. The BPA Dean Search is an example. It occurred between the first level cut and the finalist determination. There was discussion about it with search committee and they supported it. The question came up from a committee member who thought it was an opportunity for the Provost to have a cut. It is not. It does not affect them proceeding to the next round. There could be language added to the Handbook that it is a requirement that the Hiring Officer receive the consent of the Search committee to have a conversation prior the final visit. (V. Harper) It

would only apply to Administrators, not faculty. Section 306.9 in the Handbook (A. Hegde) Other institutions often have the Provost meet the candidates before the Search Committee. It's more of a conversation. (E. Correa) Deans are not the faculty's direct report. If it goes into the Handbook, truncate it for Provost Council reports. (V. Harper) 309.3 we don't anticipate the use of a search firm. The other change goes to 309.6 e., we've been violating that. The language would allow other individuals to be there, including the appointing officer. 309.6.g, allows the hiring of an outside search firm. It would come in alignment with Deans and Provosts searches and give the process flexibility, but not to be standard operating procedure. (J. Tarjan) 309.6 Associate Deans applies but not specific requirements on a specific day. The hiring officer has the option to interview but doesn't have to be on the same day. (M. Danforth) Include roles and procedures that indicates the Provost or Appointing officers to meet with candidates to discuss ideas, not to eliminate candidates. Consider the suggestions from J. Tarjan. Add new item, 309.6 i., Option for the university to retreat. Refer to BPC. (A. Hegde)

- iii. Dean Professional Development [Orientation] – FAC (deferred)
 - 1. Responsiveness
 - 2. Understanding/following the Handbook
 - 3. Understanding/following the CBA
 - 4. Supporting (not undercutting) chairs
- g. Campus Modality Philosophy – Handbook Appendix (deferred)
- h. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.) (deferred)
- i. Sabbatical Eligibility Language – Handbook Change – Some people have not been here for seven years, yet they are on the eligibility list. They were given credit for service in other institutions. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) says full-time for six years at that campus. The Handbook says “full-time positions in academic assignments” So people are getting credit for sabbaticals before they're eligible. The Handbook language needs to be consistent with the CBA. (M. Rees) Referred to FAC.
- j. Various policies (deferred)
 - i. Policy Documents: Program Review Guidance, Honor's Program, Campus Survey of Items of Cultural Significance (**handout**)
 - ii. School/ College Creation Policy Holder [SEEC to issue report]
 - iii. Canvas access policies (**handout**)
 - iv. Reference Letters Policy- Link: Employment Policy Governing the Provision of Employee References
<https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/12142918/latest/>
 - v. Course Drop Policy – AAC
 - vi. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (HOLD- check with Provost)

- k. Open Educational Resources (OER) (deferred)
- l. Carry-over from 2021-2022 Annual Report (Possible New Referrals) (deferred)
 - i. Honorary Doctorate – Handbook Change
 - ii. Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR) Constitution; academic integrity for faculty –FAC
 - iii. RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority – *(HOLD- pending action from President)*
- m. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927] – EC (deferred)
- n. Exam Modality for Flex Classes – AAC and AS&SS (deferred)
- o. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC and FAC *(HOLD- check with Provost on if award still exists)* (deferred)
- p. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) – BPC (deferred)
- q. Investment Divestiture – BPC (deferred)
- r. Academic Integrity Policy AI (deferred)
- s. Proposals Direct to ASCSU (E. Correa’s request) (deferred)
- t. Advisor-initiated course adds in Adobe-Sign – (M. Rees request) (deferred)
- u. Skipping Course Waitlist (deferred)
- v. Advisory Group to Academic Integrity (J. Tarjan) (deferred)
- w. EEGO Programs – Certificate (M. Danforth) (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: DEZEMBER LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER, ROOM 409-411

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Minutes
 - a. February 16, 2022 *(attached)*
- C. Announcements and Information
 - a. President’s Report – Lynette Zelezny **(Time Certain: 10:10 AM)**.
 - b. Elections and Appointments- M. Danforth
 - c. Enrollment Management – D. Cantrell **(Time Certain: 10:20 AM)**.
- D. Approval of Agenda **(Time Certain: 10:05 AM)**.
- E. Reports
 - a. Provost’s Report
 - b. ASCSU Report
 - c. Committee Reports: *(Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC to be posted on the Academic Senate webpage; Senate Log attached)*
 - i. ASI Report- C. Vollmer
 - ii. Executive Committee- M. Danforth
 - iii. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)- J. Tarjan

- iv. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS)- E. Correa
- v. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)- C. Lam
- vi. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – M. Rees
- vii. Staff Report- S. Miller

F. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:45 AM)**

- a. Consent Agenda
- b. New Business
- c. Old Business

RES 222316 Interim Director of Academic Advising Recommendations

RES 222317 Periodic Evaluation/Performance Review Calendar - Handbook

G. Open Forum **(Time Certain: 11:15 AM)**

H. Adjournment

8. ADJOURNMENT