



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
APRIL 24, 2018**

Approved 5-1-18

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Bonney, Brunelle, Brusckke, Dabirian, Gradilla, Myck-Wayne, Oliver, Patton, Shahi, Stambough, Stohs

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- Our college just passed a policy about exams for courses saying that any exam must be proctored and that means on campus, which means online courses have to come to campus to test. Our UPS document says that faculty should pay attention to proctoring, it does not require. Our Constitution in our college says something like the College of Business shall not pass any guideline rule which conflicts with University Policy Statements. So if you have a University Policy Statement permitting un-proctored exams and a college requirement not allowing, that is a conflict.

Q: Did faculty have input into that?

A: We have a college senate, but I don't believe any of them teach online.

Q: So the question is, does this school's policy violate the UPS?

A: Yes and I believe it also violates our Constitution.

Suggestions:

- The simplest way to solve that problem is to define the use of turnitin.com as a form of proctoring.
 - There is a company that puts out two programs, and it is compatible with Moodle. You launch your exam, and it doesn't allow you to do any cutting and pasting, it takes over your screen so you can't open the second screen. The other program records you, but it is not paying for a proctor. You can have the instructions to hold up your ID, and when the professor grades it, they get random snapshots of the hour and they can go in and look at a whole video of the student taking the exam. And that was cheap, like \$6,000 per student for a campus of 40,000.
 - This academic dilemma is not something we can fix. I think it is something where some people in your college need to say this is a violation of Academic Freedom and you can't do that.
- We have lots of Centers in our college, and they are not academic units, and you don't know who has the authority. In the last two or so weeks, three of them have been called in and fired on the spot without any notice.

Q: Do the Centers have their Bylaws?

A: Most of them do not, maybe one or two might have Bylaws.

Suggestion:

When we review that UPS, we will take a look to make sure there is something in the document that Centers need Bylaws about leadership.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Brusckke) On April 27th there is going to be a symposium on Homelessness in Orange County. We have 140 spots, and 170 have already registered.
- (Dabirian) Technology Day is tomorrow, April 25th.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 EC Minutes (Draft) 4-3-18

M/S/P (Brunelle/Shahi) Minutes were approved unanimously.

5.2 EC Minutes (Draft) 4-10-18 - *forthcoming*

5.3 EC Minutes (Draft) 4-17-18 - *forthcoming*

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

- I always thought it was odd we would meet with the higher level candidates, and we wouldn't have actual input from Executive Committee, we would only have input individually if we completed the form. Do we want to meet after all the candidates have gone through and discussed them? Mainly I would think something from Exec would be strengths/weakness of candidates as it relates to shared governance, issues, and collegiality. We might not be able to come up with consensus over a particular search, and if so, we do not need to submit one. What are your thoughts on doing that?
 - (Brunelle) I would love to start that next semester because there are so many of them and I cannot make all of the meetings with Exec of all the candidates.
 - (Bruschke) Something that works pretty well on the Statewide level is appointed one person to do the draft and circulate the draft. If you didn't get a chance to see them, you don't have to do anything. And if it ends up we can't agree on the draft, we don't agree on the draft, but that is one way to tackle it.
 - (Bonney) Here is my concern, there is never a time when everybody from Exec shows up for one of these. So then the question is, so who's opinion is indeed being expressed? What do we mean by Exec? I'm uncomfortable with trying to create and Exec view when it isn't or even most of us.
- I met with the President regarding the GE Task Force, and he wants to move forward with the next steps he mentioned at the AS meeting. The fear he mentioned is we would be doing a lot of stuff here and people in the Chancellor's office would be working on something separately leading to another conflict because what they would come up might not match what we are independently working on. So he wants to meet with the GE Task Force this week or next week, then set up a meeting with the CO to show what we are working on and have a dialogue that might prevent conflicts in the future.
- Strategic Plan is moving forward, and I have the writing group for Group 3, I will give an update on what emerges from that meeting afterward.
- In speaking with the President, I informed him that we used to do mini-retreats. Do you think there is an appetite for doing this over the summer? Would you think that is something we recommend for the future people around the table?
 - (Dabirian) I think it would bring cohesiveness between the Cabinet and the Executive Committee if they met early on. Because the Cabinet can say here are some goals we are looking at for next year and Exec can say here are some things we have left over, and can we work together on them? A lot of times things come out that were not on the list, but it's great when you hear both sides list.
 - (Stambough) The President will bring it up at Cabinet.

VI. PROVOST REPORT - 12:30 PM

No Provost report.

VII. STAFF REPORT

The Senate All-University Elections 2018-19 is underway, closing at 4:00 pm on Thursday, so if you have not voted yet, please vote. So far 565 people have voted. As far as the Senate staff is concerned, this is the best election we have had and the new voting system is working fine.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 ASI Board [Stambough], T, 4-17-18, 1:15 - 3:45 PM, TSU Legislative Chambers

No report submitted.

8.2 Diversity & Inclusion Committee [Gradilla], T, 4-17-18, 1:00 – 2:00 PM, PLS-260C

Discussion Topic: Definition of Diversity

* Vita Jones and Bobbie Porter discussed the definition of diversity in UPS 210.001 and suggested that it would be appropriate for this committee to suggest changes to this UPS.

- We discussed the importance of defining diversity in a way that “speaks to the campus” and is flexible enough to apply at the college level. New wording in the strategic plan states that the goal is to make CSUF a “university of choice” for a diverse population.

- We discussed the idea that with a new definition, diversity should be observable and measurable, such that it would be possible to determine whether specific goals had been met – to minimize interpretation that the goals are 'optional.'
- The definition should be helpful for recruitment, retention, and faculty success
- The committee looked at a PowerPoint file (Jones) and discussed the potential wording for UPS 210.001. The PowerPoint file includes three links at the end with three specific questions.
- The current version of UPS 210.001 includes language which emphasizes compliance with federal law: the committee discussed the importance of moving beyond compliance into inclusivity in the policy statement language.
- The committee discussed the importance of specific language for diversity in faculty recruitment: if the applicant pool mirrors the current state of the field (e.g., regarding tenured faculty) does that provide the diversity that we as a university want? Consider aspects such as the needs of CSUF students rather than the general composition of an academic field.
- The committee discussed the importance of social justice and representation in defining and identifying a 'diverse population' and the importance of a global context / global vision of the university or a specific academic field
- Suggested language: "California State University Fullerton defines diversity as..."

Other issues were discussed such as completing committee work before the end of the semester. And holding elections for D&IC chair and vice-chair.

8.3 Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee [Bruschke], W, 4-18-18, 1:00 - 2:15 PM, MH-141
No report submitted.

8.4 Writing Proficiency Committee [Oliver], F, 4-20-18, 9:00 - 11:00 PM, MH-166

- There were no announcements or urgent business.
- The minutes of the March 16, 2018 meeting were amended and approved.
- **Old Business:**
Merri shared input from the Academic Senate regarding concerns with individual portions of UPS 320.020. The committee made revisions to revisions to those sections of concern, and it will be sent back to the Senate
- **New Business:**
 - a. The committee approved that an upper division writing class, even if it was new, counts as long as the department approved the course.
 - b. A previous Student Petition was approved
 - c. TDA concerns regarding Upper Division Writing were dealt with by adding language to UPS 320.020 IV. Student Petition and Approval that will be sent to the Senate
 - d. Election of a Chair for AY 18/19 will be done at the first meeting in Fall 2018.

8.5 Faculty Affairs Committee [Bonney], F, 4-20-18, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, MH-141

The committee completed what may be the final round of revisions to UPS 210.070 and initiated some minor revisions to UPS 210.001. They expect to complete both documents at their final meeting.

8.6 Academic Standards Committee [Brunelle], F, 4-20-18, 1:00 - 2:00 PM, MH-166

The Academic Standards Committee met today, 1-2 pm in MH-166. Most of the meeting consisted of a report form and fascinating conversation with Jessica Wagoner, Director of Admissions, and Darren Bush, Interim Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, relating to undergraduate admissions policies. The committee also approved methods to better alert students to deadlines about W/WU grades and the consequences of failing to file to drop a class and receiving a WU grade. The current committee Chair, Stephen O'Connor, also alerted the continuing members that he will be on sabbatical next year and thus unavailable to chair. He solicited nominees for a new chair.

After the meeting, Stephen also asked me to convey to Exec the need for the next committee chair to be given a sense by Exec of what business the committee should focus on next year.

8.7 General Education Committee [Bonney], F, 4-20-18, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, MH-141

There was an extended discussion the issues still facing the GE Committee including future revisions related to C3, the work to be done on area E, the review of past exceptions to the GE Requirements and whether the GE Committee can continue to conduct recertification in its present form. There was a

discussion of the so-called Clarification on EO 1100R.

8.8 Honors Program Advisory Board [Patton], F, 4-20-18, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, PLS-120

No report submitted.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

9.1 UPS 100.003 - Associated Students Inc. Board of Directors University Policy Statement

Q: (Bonney) Have they ever done this?

A: (Stambough) I don't believe so.

Suggestions:

- (Brunelle) If this is going to remain a UPS, there needs to be so the clarification of what is the purview of University Policy, what kinds of things could they be trying to format policy on because I don't think it should be open-ended.
- (Dabirian) I think we should rescind it.

(Stambough) We will put this on the AS agenda for rescission.

- (Dabirian) I would talk to the two ASI Senators, Senator Basil, and VP Eanes to give them the reason Executive Committee is recommending this UPS document be rescinded.

9.2 UPS 210.200 - Performance Review of Administrative Personnel

Q: (Myck-Wayne) Is there a University Review Board?

A: (Bonney) No, We have never done this.

- (Dabirian) This review has not been executed since 1982.

Q: (Myck-Wayne) What is the review policy for Deans? Is there any faculty input?

A: (Bonney) They are MPP's, and they are reviewed quarterly by the Provost. No, there is no faculty input.

(Stambough) It may come up that there may be an entirely different process we can use. There are some on other campuses, Sonoma has a well-developed one. It is on a rotation basis for every five years and for a new one it would be after the third year. Faculty would not provide an evaluation, but it would be giving feedback. It would be a review, as a student review of instruction.

(Dabirian) This process was used before the MPP Evaluation was in place.

Suggestions:

- (Brunelle) I think we should rescind it and if it has to be argued, then it gets argued before the Senate.
- (Bruschke) I like the idea of sending this to FAC asking them to rewrite it to get rid of the thing that doesn't exist but does write a policy that includes the feedback of faculty.
(Bonney) We have to be careful about this, and there are legal issues involved. Just like a department chair can't evaluate an ASC.
- (Bonney) I think another project for next year's Senate would be to think about collaborating with HR to try to provide a feedback system for Deans or folks in those other positions, not as a review or an evaluation or work on a process where you can get input from faculty.
- (Stambough) Rescind and pass a resolution that over the next year a committee to be put in place to see how the faculty feedback can be done to support the MPP evaluations.

This UPS document will be put on the AS agenda for rescission along with a resolution to work out a process for faculty feedback on MPP evaluation process.

9.3 UPS 280.000 - Intramural Research Grants

This document will go on the AS agenda for Senate approval.

9.4 Committee Restructuring

(Stambough) Some of the committees have a tremendous amount of stuff to do, like the Faculty Affairs, General Education, and Curriculum committees, but other committees are less labor intensive because of the things they do. But the nature of committee chairs and members not being proactive with their agendas, they are saying we have nothing to do because you have not told us what to do. If they are interested in the area they should have some stuff they are interested in looking at, we can give them some guidelines, but the Executive Committee should not be setting the agenda for every meeting. There should be committee members who interested in policy to have something there, the ex-officios who are coming from the Admin side will have stuff that needs to be cleaned up and the two sides come together.

I am trying to figure out how to get to that, that's a healthier more vibrant committee system, then give me an agenda.

(Stohs) At the Statewide meeting yesterday I talked to a lot of people, and one of them was the Vice Chair of the Executive Committee from San Diego, and he has been the vice chair for years, and he said one of the responsibilities of the vice chair is to be responsible for the committee work. Something like that could be a possibility.

(Bonney) On the one hand, you can get them started; you meet with the committee chair at the beginning of the year. The other would be to look at how other campuses have structured their committee systems because they are different from what we have. They are more focused and directed regarding actual governance issues and less task and subject oriented. That would be a useful exercise, and another opportunity revise both the Constitution and the Bylaws. We might find that rethinking what it means to be a Senate Committee, doing the work of the Senate means, which might spark up interest in getting onto the Senate itself.

(Dabirian) I am a chair of a system-wide committee, and at the beginning of the year, the Executive Committee decided who would take on the liaison role and who would work on agendas. We assigned officers to be in charge of certain things; this was it was not all on the chair.

(Bruschke) The things I see are absent, and the assigned time, there is not a lot of enthusiasm for chairing a committee. There are a lot of people that would be willing to do it and willing to be on the committee, but they get if I chair this it is going to be time intensive. The committees are terrified of doing anything that involves any money. Our committees have to have some way of communicating with PRBC to say we get you are not going to approve every single thing and we are not the budget committee, but here is an area we think the state of research is such that the campus needs to invest in this.

(Stambough) It would probably help if we restructured committees around core functions and it would give us fewer committees and more accessible to staff. We might be able to make a budgetary case for release time. There might be some consolidation, and the committees will be more labor intensive, which would justify assigned time and make it more attractive. This issue is something that I can refer to the Constitution Committee which will be reconstituted with a new committee next year.

X. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Shahi) Meeting adjourned at 12:50 PM.