



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 28, 2017**

Approved 3-14-17

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Bonney, Brusckke, Dabirian, Gradilla, Matz, Meyer, Oliver, Stambough, Stohs, Walker

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bonney called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Brusckke) The National Debate Championship this year is in Kansas, the Cal States are not allowed to attend, so our institution will be hosting an alternative championship in March.
- (Meyer) The rumors are true, I will be running for re-election on the Statewide Senate; I turned in my petition.
- (Meyer) President García will be meeting with the College of the Arts faculty and staff tomorrow for questions and answer session.

IV. TIMES APPROXIMATE

11:30 AM

Topic: Men of Color Study Findings

Presenter: Dr. Vincent Harris, Director of the Male Success Initiative

Dr. Vincent Harris gave an overview on the following:

- Action Research Grant – Collaboration across campus
 1. Office of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness
 2. Office of Institutional Research & Analytical Studies
 3. Office of Vice President for Student Affairs
 4. Office of the Provost
- Context & Data:
 - Cal State 6-year graduation rates by Freshman Cohort and Gender:
 - 40,235 students
 - 1,088 Black students
 - 431 Black male students
 - Chancellor's office and DOE reported numbers:
 - 846 Black students
 - 306 Black male students

The reason why the two sets of black student numbers are different is the top numbers are self-reporting ethnicity, the bottom number is official reporting number which we report to the State, Chancellor's office, and Department of Education, depending on their definition of African American Students. A lot of African American students reported as multi-race or Hispanic students. There was a different ethnicity classification that came out from the Department of Education in 2009.

- Participants 2015-16
 - 32 Black male students (3 rounds of focus groups)
 - 1 in fall 2015
 - 2 in spring 2016

- Research Questions:
 1. Environment: Where I come from? First impression of CSUF?
 2. Barriers: What I face?
 3. Strategies: How I persist? Support I need?
- Call to Action – How do we help our Black male students overcome barriers at CSUF?

We have presented this to different committees across the campus. This is a centralized presentation for the Academic Senate and is by far the most important personation.

Q: Thinking about the “take homes” for Thursday’s senate meeting and today, what do I as Department Chair take back to my faculty to say tomorrow “I want you to think about doing “x” to try to improve the experience of students.” What is the one thing I could as folks to do?

A: When you are considering the handout, when you are considering an environment, in what environment have our faculty felt uncomfortable, but it was supposed to be a welcoming space? That would indicate an understanding of how our black males feel. Just that initial understanding would get them in the right action or mind set. Then when we think about barriers, what barriers exist in our departments for black men specifically? Those can be are they not receiving research opportunities, do they not know about what they can publish? Identify those barriers. Then the strategies, I would highlight strategies that other black men have done to persist.

Q: You are showing us an abbreviated version of a much longer presentation, some of the Senators may ask if we could have access to the larger presentation.

A: We are planning to give out the full presentation, but we will present an abridged version.

Q: The first main slide about graduation rates, would it make sense to link it initially to the Graduation Initiative 2025?

- I disagree because it is the right thing to do regardless of whether we have the Graduation Initiative or not.

Q: How does online education fit into this? Is more online education contributing to the disparate graduation rates to the achievement gaps?

A: Based on my previous analysis of online classes, usually for undergrad population if there are some specific classes, the online class sections repeat rates are a higher than face-to-face section for undergrad students, particularly for the lower level students; freshman and sophomore. But grad students’ repeat rates are lower because they know how to study through the online platform of classes. So their success rates are much higher, but for undergrad students usually slightly lower.

Suggestions:

- You are focusing on the classroom; a lot of things are out of classrooms. If you could frame it as a department and not just focus on the class because it could be advising or departmental clubs, they have a bigger portfolio than just the classroom.
- It would be a good follow-up study to look at the men that graduated and the ones who did not. If you could do two studies, what were the barriers that caused them to drop out and what was the strategy they used to be successful and graduate.

Question for Exec:

- Our mission for the semester is to help people hear this message so people can start thinking about having these kind of discussions. We have tried different administrative groups and the Student Affairs Leadership Team, but one big population we would like to reach is the actual faculty who teach in the classroom, students, and the staff. Would like your suggestions as to which groups you think we should reach out to.
- I would go to department meetings. Also include the staff, how friendly, are they welcoming when any student walks in.
- Most colleges have meetings with the Chairs, and going to the Council of Chairs meeting would be a way to reach a large number of people. Give them at least three things they can talk to faculty in their department meetings. Educate them so they become your advocate.
- It will take a lot to go around to every single department meeting, but you might want to focus in on some of the really large majors and especially large majors with large number of African American male students.
- Create a three-minute video introduction and then the presentation, because you have to get them engaged. If you have something they can email to study and then they talk about it in the chairs meeting.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 5.1 EC Minutes (Draft) 1-31-17
M/S/P (Matz/Walker) Minutes were passed unanimously.
- 5.2 EC Minutes (Draft) 2-7-17
M/S/P (Walker/Oliver) Minutes were passed unanimously.
- 5.3 EC Minutes (Draft) 2-14-17
M/S/P (Oliver/Gradilla) Minutes were passed unanimously.
- 5.4 EC Minutes (Draft) 2-21-17 *forthcoming*

VI. CHAIR'S REPORT

- The Online Task Force the Provost has put together, that is just collecting information, had its first meeting today. They have volunteered the Associate Deans to do this work.
- At the Chairs meeting last Thursday everybody was pretty pleased with the fact that there was a Tenure Density Task Force and that it actually had a pragmatic tone to it. What they are going to do is, how much would it cost both for the system and individual campuses. They expect that report to come out in the next couple of months; they deferred it until they could get more stuff.
- The GE Task Force is in the process of being formed. Chris Miller was absolutely clear that she thinks all campuses will be strongly encouraged to undertake a GE self-examination. There is a lot of pressure from both the Governor and the Trustees. ASCSU is trying to be proactive in articulating the strong suit about why we have GE. I did like the suggestion that we should think of this as a way of training people for careers.

Q: Was there any discussion related to GE and Associate Degrees for transfer? Was thought brought up?

A: It was mentioned as one of the things the task force would have to look into. There is this notion that GE at some level is going to have to show a way of being connected to people's majors. And Stepanek, when he did his report to us, was equally clear about the importance of educating the Board of Trustees.

Q: Anybody remember how many of the members of the BOT attended a CSU?

A: I think it's on one hand.

- (Meyer) On the subject of GE, while at our gathering in San Diego last week, I did some chatting with people about transfers and GE and apparently none of them had issues we seem to be having in our campus which is our GE Advisors are not really acknowledging the CSU Breadth. They are accepting the 39 units, but we are requiring students to take more than three upper division classes. That is not supposed to be happening.
- (Bonney) That is something I will talk to the Provost about the next time we meet.

Q: (Walker) Do we have evidence of that? Do we know where that has happened?

A: (Meyer) Several students that I have advised are running into being told they have to take four or five classes. Or not processing the GE soon enough and ending up taking a class they have already taken.

Q: With your meeting with President García, did she talk about her meeting with the Secretary of Education?

A: No, I have not met with President García. She and I will not meet again until late in March; there is a lot of work going on in Washington.

- Stepanek, I thought, was fairly negative about the budget. While he said it was great the campuses were making resolutions about student fees, the reality was the fixed costs are going up and there is no other way to cover them. They are expecting as much as a \$55 million additional expense with the remaining bargaining units that still have not met. That was not included in their original budget request, certainly not included in what the Governor has offered us. And he also thinks the concern about coving health care may mean we will not get as much.
- AB 847 requires Academic Senates to post their membership publicly. People are kind of interested.
- There is an Exit Questionnaire being circulated for comment. We should all encourage folks to respond with what they think about the questionnaire. It really not something that belongs with AEEC because we don't review assessment instruments, that is not part of what we do in that committee. But it is something that we should encourage the faculty who are chairing departments to be fairly aggressive in their responses so if there are questions that really don't work, we get rid of them. This is a questionnaire that HHD had been using for a couple of years just for their majors.
- We need someone to replace Irene on the Director of FDC search committee.

Ron Oliver volunteered to replace Irene. We will put Ron on the Consent Calendar for Thursday's Academic Senate meeting.

VII. STAFF REPORT

We received one petition for the CSU Statewide Senate Seat. Deadline for petitions is March 9th.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 ASI Board [Bonney], T, 2-21-17, 1:15-3:45PM, TSU Legislative Chambers

No report.

8.2 Campus Facilities & Beautification Committee [Stambough], F, 2-24-17, 11:00AM-12:00PM, MH-166

- The committee discussed coordination of future Campus Cleanup Day which is being transitioned to a Titan Day of Service. This program will be expanded in future years.
- Conversation continued about a space for a faculty club. There are plans for a social event in Titan Hall. Some conversation occurred about inquiring about the long vacant 9th floor of LH as a possible space for a faculty club/social area.

8.3 Planning, Resource & Budget Committee [Meyer], F, 2-24-17, 1:00-2:30PM, CP-1060-05

- Minutes of February 10, 2017 meeting approved.
- New Business:
 - Concentration in Anesthesia in the Doctor of Nursing Practice-Postponed
 - Master of Science in Human Service-Postponed
 - Presentation of overview of Graduate Studies at CSUF by Katherine Powers
 - Power Point of this presentation to follow.
 - This Should be an exec or a Senate presentation

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9.1 Statements of Opinion

They are on the AS agenda for the March 2nd meeting.

9.2 Revision to UPS 100.001 - AS Bylaws

1. Parliamentarian

Steve has come up with some language on the parliamentarian piece. We've agreed we would bring it next Tuesday inside the document so you can see what it looks like.

9.3 Revision to UPS 211.000 - Responsibilities of Departments and Department Chairs

We started talking about this at the CSU Chairs meeting last week, but got distracted by some other things that came up that seemed more pressing, so I don't have the information we wanted to get for further discussion on the reviewing of Department Chairs. This will stay on as old business for next week's meeting.

X. NEW BUSINESS

10.1 Revision to UPS 370.200 - Exclusion of Person(s) from Campus Meetings

This document was one of the tenure reviews because it had not been looked at since 1986.

(Walker) Lines 70-74: re-write as below

Under the rules of the organization persons attending meetings under the terms of this policy may or may not participate in the deliberations of the meeting.

(Walker) Lines 13: remove the words "legally defined"

(Stohs) Lines 48-50: fix the numbering under "Executive Sessions"

Q: Our interpretation of this policy is the Mexican American Student Group was holding a meeting, the Young Republicans show up and say we are attending your meeting. My reading of this is the Mexican American Student Group can say no you are not. That is what this policy does, correct?

A: That would be correct. You can't participate, you can watch if it's a public meeting.

Suggestion:

(Walker) Line 36: remove the word "student"

Question:

One thing this policy is frustrating about is our committees can actually have closed session, they can go into executive session by a majority vote of the members and I don't believe they are covered by the open meeting act, even though we abide by it. The way this is currently written, this actually would

not allow our committees, should they want to go into a closed session, to be able to do it. It says the topics which may be discussed, so when you look at Executive Session (Line 44) the implication is that those are the only things you would every go into executive session for.

- Chair Bonney will look at the appropriate code sections in Executive Order 1068 to see if we can get some clarity.

We will come back to this document next week.

10.2 Two Proposed New Degrees: MS in Education Technology and MS in Accounting and Finance

These will be added to the Consent Calendar on the March 16th AS agenda.

10.3 UPS 211.100 - Appointment of Department Chairs and Vice-Chairs

Chair Bonney will send out a letter to all the Chairs explaining the document.

10.4 Clarity needed for Degree Name Change – email exchange with Katherine Powers and Brent Foster

We will discuss this next week.

10.5 Revision to UPS 210.007 - Appointment of Administrative Personnel

1. Revision to UPS 210.007 - Appointment of Administrative Personnel

We will continue this discussion next week.

10.6 Revision to UPS 210.500 - Searches for Administrative Personnel

1. Revision to UPS 210.500 - Searches for Administrative Personnel

10.7 UPS 3XX.XXX – Student with Disabilities

10.8 Revision to UPS 411.201 - GE Breadth Objectives and Course Development (writing requirements)

10.9 Schedules for questions and challenges to course proposals

1. UPS 411.100 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Courses
2. UPS 411.102 - Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Academic Jurisdiction
3. UPS 411.200 - General Education Guidelines and Procedures: New and Existing Courses

10.10 UPS 230.020 - Policy on Faculty Office Hours

10.11 UPS 210.200 - Performance Review of Administrative Personnel - are we going to rescind or fix?

10.12 Free Speech

1. CSU OGC Free Speech Training 1-26-2017 ASCSU

10.13 CF&B name change

10.14 Having Dr. Kari Knutson Miller making presentation to Academic Senate

10.15 Having a presentation on Open Access

10.16 Anti-Bullying Policy

10.17 CSU Online Learning Principles

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Meyer)