



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
MARCH 24, 2020**

*Approved 4-1-20*

**11:30 AM - 12:50 PM**

**ZOOM Meeting**

Present: Gradilla, Kanel, Matz, Stambough, Stohs, Walker, Walsh, Wood

Absent: Dabirian

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

## **II. URGENT BUSINESS**

2.1 Item from ASCSU

- The ASCSU passed a resolution on the Ethnic Studies Bill.
- The Chancellor was very emphatic for 1) the safety and health of our students, and 2) academics, so I think we have to keep that as our mission and keep it front and center as we go through what we are doing for the rest of this semester. If we keep those two things in mind, we will be more guarded with decisions we will make.
- We do have to worry about budget as a few of us talked about yesterday. The Blanchard memo that went out on Ethnic Studies wasn't well received by a lot of faculty and a lot of campuses; we passed a resolution to try to push back on some of the stuff. Whatever the final version is, it looks like one of the things that he wants to focus on is campus flexibility and autonomy about how it is actually implemented on the campus. One thing we probably need to think about is how we want that process to look on our campus, so this is something to think about anytime between now and early fall because that is probably when something is going to come out.
  - I recommend that we depend really heavily on the Ethnic Studies Faculty input that they have already given through the dean, I think that should be something we really respect.

Q: Steve is your suggestion that at the moment this should be mostly Executive Committee but take something to the whole Senate this spring?

A: We need to wait for the memo to come out of what it is actually going to be. At that point we need to put some heads together to figure out what the process needs to be on our campus, to approve the category, to put in whatever particular learning outcomes or direction for the requirement we want, and how classes get approved to go into the category. This is GE and it's not at the same time, so our normal process probably is not quite appropriate for this directly.

- Have they talked about transferring in from community colleges? The bulk of our students are transfer students, so that's a big issue.

## **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No announcements.

## **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4.1 EC Minutes (Draft) 3-10-20

Minutes were approved.

4.2 EC Minutes (Draft) 3-17-20 - *forthcoming*

## **V. CHAIR'S REPORT**

No report.

## VI. STAFF REPORT

- Pertaining to the upcoming All-University Election and how we split the constituencies especially in regards to Student Affairs (SA). In the past, we had been referencing a memo from 2007 and it stated that the Student Affairs Executive Board was to be included in the SA constituency. Since SA has shifted so much in the last year their number jumped from 55 to 78 members, that would take a seat from L/A/C and distribute it to SA. We spoke with the chair of the Elections Committee and Sean Walker and we agreed to slowly move away from the 2007 memo and we would no longer be adding people to the SA constituency based off if they are on the Executive Board. We will leave people who were in the SA constituency prior to other elections, but going forward we will be moving away from the memo and the constituency will be as listed in the Bylaws. For this election there may be instances where people are classified the same way but because we are shifting away from the memo, one person might be SA and another might be staff. This is the way we can slowly clean up what was in the 2007 memo.
  - (Walker) This was the whole intent of revising the Bylaws so we knew exactly who was in each constituency and who would be voting. Aligning with the Bylaws removes it from the Executive Committee deciding who in each cabinet gets to votes where.
  - (Staff) An announcement is going out to the campus community today regarding the petition process and what seats are available.
- We also need to consider the faculty awards were schedule for the April 23<sup>rd</sup> AS meeting. Since we will not be on campus for the in-person classroom presentations and if we cancel that meeting, would the Executive Committee be ok for ta memo to go out from the President announcing the recipients of this year's awards?
  - (Stambough) Given the circumstances, that totally makes sense.

Q: (Stohs) Which meeting did we schedule VP Kim to do the Fiscal State of the University Report?

A: (Staff) The May 7<sup>th</sup> AS meeting.

Q: (Stohs) I'm guessing that we could do that via Zoom?

A: (Stambough) Yes.

Q: (Walsh) Don't we think we want to wait until the May Revise is out before VP Kim does his report?

A: (Staff) The reason he was scheduled for May 7<sup>th</sup> is because the way the calendar is set for this AY, there are only two AS meetings in May and we did not want the report done at the Marathon Meeting.

### **Additional Report:**

We tested the options for voting for the Executive Committee during the Electoral meeting. It was decided that although Senate meetings are open, we would only send the Zoom meeting invite to Senators only for the Electoral meeting because that is the only way to control visitors from not participating in the voting process.

## VII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

7.1 Faculty Affairs Committee/Diversity & Inclusion Committee [Walker/Gradilla], T, 3-20-20, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom

(Gradilla) This meeting has been rescheduled to Friday, March 27<sup>th</sup>.

### **Additional Report:**

(Woods) The General Education Committee (GE) has been meeting via email to review some History courses and it is going fine, very routinely. GE is going to do a Zoom meeting to deal with the challenge that is brewing.

- (Stohs) I have been emailing with Brenda Bowser telling her about the polling option that is available in Zoom.

Q: (Wash) What class is being challenged?

A: (Wood) It's an Education class. I think they are still trying to work it out, but it's not clear how it's going to go. I will update you all at the end of the week.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

### 8.1 Revisions to UPS 300.030 Academic Appeals

- (Stohs) Lines 12 &13: one issue I have it says “prior to filing an appeal the students should make every effort to resolve the allegation as soon as a grade is assigned”. But there may not have been a grade assigned, because later in the document it says maybe it was just a penalty in the class. So, I’m not sure that is a good addition, but I don’t know how to resolve it.
  - (Kanel) Maybe that should say once an allegation of dishonesty is made.
- (Stohs) Lines 129-132: read “The consultation process for both the Chair and dean or designee typically. Involves explaining the appeal process and helping the talk through their concerns. Often the Chair or dean designees guides the student to return back to the faculty member to resolve the issue, preventing the need to proceed with the formal appeal process”.
  - (Kanel) The Chairs and deans all said that is kind of what pretty much happens. The associate deans explained that process.
  - (Stohs) On line 131, do we want the word “often” or “typically”? Wouldn’t typically be a better word there because often makes it sound like that is just the way it happens. I think we probably want a little bit of a suggestion.
  - (Walker) Lines 131-132: the wording “Often the Chair or dean designees guides the student to return back to the faculty member to resolve the issue, preventing the need to proceed with the formal appeal process”, is not policy and that should not be in the document.

Q: (Stohs) So do we just leave that out?

A: (Walker) The reason I would say it doesn’t belong is because even as a suggestion, if I was a student and I read that, it would mean that everybody is doing their best to keep me from filing an appeal.

- (Kanel) But that is part of the consultative process. The deans who I’ve talked to, they like that in there, but I’m sure ASC won’t mind taking it out because it is not policy; it is telling you what the outcome of the consultation process usually is.
- (Matz) When I was in the Deans office, that is what Herb Rutenmiller use to do, he would talk to the students and that would resolve at the level back to the faculty.
- (Stambough) If you want to make it more policy, how about something more along the line of “students following the meeting with the consultation with the Chair or the dean, students have the option to return back to the faculty member to resolve the issue before meeting with a formal appeals process.”
  - (Kanel) We can use the word “may”; students may return back to the faculty member to resolve the issue before meeting with a formal appeals process.
- (Stohs) Section B.3 – this paragraph needs some work.
  - (Walker) This paragraph and the place where it is in the document is what drives everyone bananas, because it is in the wrong place. We should be specific, it should say if the faculty member does not respond to the student within a certain number of weeks, the student should just follow the normal process at that point.

(Stohs) I think we need to work more on that paragraph, but we have to stop now because the Provost has joined the meeting.

### 8.2 Social Distance and Protecting our Campus Community Health, Broadly Defined

### 8.3 Approval of Senate Governance Meetings Using Distance Methods in Spring 2020 - (Discussion)

### 8.4 How Many Meetings Should We Have? - (Discussion)

### 8.5 How To Run The Election Meeting Via Zoom? – (Discussion)

**Provost Oliver and President Virjee joined in the meeting and there was extensive discussion on the topics listed below:**

- The Ethnic Studies Resolution passed by the ASCSU last Friday (Resolution 3397)
- The Budget for the CSU and the impact on CSUF in particular
- Connection with CFA (possible furlough next year)
- Grading for CSUF (issues and possibility of going to P/F)
- General Issues (housing, health, etc.)
- Summer Session planning (some classes are already full)
- Searches (Faculty, staff, admin, etc.)

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.