



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
OCTOBER 6, 2020**

Approved 10-20-20

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

ZOOM Meeting

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-chair Walsh called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- I would like to follow up on a conversation from the end of last week's Exec meeting. I believe I heard that some of the decisions about how we move forward on this campus with Ethnic Studies Requirements are tied to prior GE decisions and votes in the Senate, and some of this is sort of a consequence of all that. If that is what I heard, I'm concerned because I think it will be counterproductive. My point of bringing this up is I think we have to be careful about those talking points and sound bites. I think the reason we move forward, and we push for Ethnic Studies on our campus is because we believe it, and it's the right thing to do. If we get into this is a consequence of votes on GE that we didn't like, I think that is a dangerous approach. I might have misunderstood, but that is what I thought I was hearing. I want to support Ethnic Studies because it is the right thing. It would be hurtful to frame what we believe is best for our campus-based on debates we had in the Senate or GE in the past years.
 - The only way that will come up is if we get into a discussion about Area Z.
- My concern is some students in this COVID environment are breaking under the pressure of being enrolled in 18 units or more. I recommend that something is sent out to the Provost and Dean Oseguera that people working with and advising students with the spring schedule should have more in-depth talks with the students on how they can handle it. We trust them, and we want them to make their own adult decisions, but I think it is important for us to have real conversations with students about 18 units in this remote environment is difficult. In certain majors where they are very process-oriented, you can't be doing that many classes and think you can keep up with it.
 - You can do a data dump of students with 18 units or higher and maybe give it to advisors to somehow reach out to them—some sort of proactive thing we can do for those with 18 units or higher.
 - You are adding workloads on advisors that barely have time to do the advising. I'm concerned about our advisors and departments to have to pay for advisors from their part-time bucket. The more work we put on advisors, the more they don't have time to do their regular advising.
 - A form has to be signed and sent to Admissions and Records for someone with excess units. The advisor and the department chair have to sign the form.
 - A&R revised the form; you only need approval for 19 units or more. When this was brought up, I said it was dangerous to go from 15 units to 18 units without advisors' signature.
 - If we could send a message to those taking 18 units or more to ask how they are doing, just some kind of support could help.
 - Why don't we find out whether the Student Success Teams are doing anything because some of them may be doing this, and that would be a better mechanism than a university message. It would have someone the students could follow up with.
 - We can send a message to Elizabeth Boretz to find out what they are doing for retention.
 - Changing it from 15 units to 18 units was for the majors with odd units (4 and 5 classes). A 15-unit cap required people to get all sorts of waivers and take a class with a lab.
 - I would like to see it put back to 16 units.
 - Let's try messaging the students first and get data before starting to redo the whole process.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 EC Minutes 9-29-20 - *forthcoming*

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

No report.

VI. PROVOST REPORT - 12:30 PM

I would like to talk with you today about two things, budget and cluster hire.

Budget:

I talked with you before about the budget. I think I inherited the scenario because we have budgeting that has been happening, mainly using over enrollment or one-time funds. It's a combination of that piece and the cash flow accounting model of how we ultimately work. Our current budgeting practice means that our colleges start with a certain amount of money and spend it down. At the end of that process, where there are holes, historically, funds get moved around to make everything look ok in Academic Affairs. We would all like to get to is budgeting where our colleges know how much it cost to do the work they do and provide the instruction they provide, and we expect people to work within those perimeters.

I have been working with Alyssa Adamson and have had conversations with VP Kim and the Cabinet members. We are bringing in NACUBO, which is the National Association of College and University Business in higher education, to do a tour of Academic Affairs budgeting. We think they will bring three people on the team.

What I would like to do is have the consultants come and do the deep dive. Part of what they will do is look at the university budgeting and how we manage different Academic Affairs funds. What is base budgeted, what is one-time money, and how those things look different in other colleges and various units. What would it look like to have an outside perspective on how we can use our funds differently? How can we work with the money we have in different ways? Ultimately, a big part of that is we don't have enough money in Academic Affairs, and that has happened because, over time, we have been able to use over-enrollment funds to kind of stick band-aids on things. The ultimate goal here is to understand better how money works in Academic Affairs. There is probably some overall correction that we can make internally by doing things differently. There are two additional pieces:

- there is not enough funding overall for the work we do, and
- the way that we instruct deans in different colleges to manage enrollment in their courses (for example, the blend of small and large classes; and the cost structure of what choices they make for instruction).

Those decisions are also entirely dependent on college-specific practices and are not transparent.

I would like to get a conversation going. I would like this process to be in partnership with the Senate. I have asked Steve Stambough and Sean Walker to read the consultant's project framing draft, and they have given us some feedback. I would like it when those consultants come for them to talk with some of you. I would like the findings from that report to lead us to a joint task force or working group. I am sure some of the things that will come out of the consultant's recommendations are not things that I would ever want to decide centrally. Still, they will have to do with the conversation the faculty need to have about relative resources. Each college's picture is different when you look at the money they believe they have to work with and their instruction choices.

- (Wood) I would love to have an outsider opinion if advising happens in the departments, is it more efficient, better for students. We don't want students going all over campus to get advising in different places. What will serve them best?
- (Stohs) I wondered whether it might help to have the consultants, one faculty member, the campus, and the departments I can think of: Public Administration, Accounting, or Finance, someone who understands basic issues.

Q: (Matz) The college and the cost of the classes, because of accreditation, restrict many of the class size and the budget for the college, so I hope you consider that the consultants be part of the task force when you bring in folks from the university to work on this? Will chairs be part of it, because they are very instrumental in the budget for their departments.

A: (Provost) The accreditation concerns will be front and center. When the consultants do their work, they will give us the report; that will be the end of their process unless we decide to pay them to stay on. I think it is a good idea to invite chairs. I will look at your guidance. In my experience, doing a joint Administrative Senate task force is the way to move, so that faculty in the room are there for the shared governance and appointed by the Senate.

Cluster hire:

We have funds for about seven faculty positions that are in an account for GI 2025. As I have thought about what to do about those positions, I would like to do a cluster hire. The searches are preliminary because I am verifying that we have the funds to start up. We have the funds for salary based ongoing.

Q: (Walsh) Has anyone talked to you about doing spousal hires? That has been an issue in terms of hiring people of color. The position in the past has been no; we are not going to do spousal hiring.

A: (Provost) They have one of the options instead of running seven, and I run five in the cluster to keep two in the pocket for a possible spousal hire and do recruitment for a key faculty member this year.

Q: (Stohs) Does anyone on our campus have experience with these types of hires? I have heard of them for years. I also could imagine they are not necessarily easy to accomplish. Having someone with experience would be useful.

A: (Provost) I would say a little bit. Steve Walk was at UCR when they did many cluster hiring as a fellow, so he does have the playbook.

VII. STAFF REPORT

No report.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 Information Technology Committee [Wood], F, 10-2-20, 10:00 - 11:00 AM, Zoom

1. Online Best Practice Series—Please promote the Online Best Practices series
2. IT Annual Report—Most comprehensive yet; please share with colleagues, http://www.fullerton.edu/it/about/IT_Annual_Report_2019-2020.pdf
3. NVivo—Campus has purchased NVivo Enterprise, working out details now
4. DUO—Campus is moving to 2-factor authentication for students to enhance security; helpdesk has been boosted to provide assistance during the transition time
5. Equipment—Only a small portion of laptops and MiFis have been returned (i.e., they remain in use); MiFi will be a cost issue in the long term; coverage will go through the end of the AY and will end in May
6. Web Governance Committee (WGG) Updates—Formed and held first meeting 9/30; first task to audit and evaluate administrative sites currently on Fullerton.edu (~25K web pages); emphasis on accessibility, pathways to finding information, consistent branding (Colleen Greene is faculty rep on committee)
7. CANVAS—Migration is going well; it syncs with Peoplesoft 4 times a day; a majority of courses have migrated to CANVAS and working on increasing migration for Spring; the grade import tool will be available in the future; workshops continue, but attendance is flagging
8. Virtual Lab Update—Coming soon to Mac Virtual Lab (will replace current sign-up process); about 5,800 hours used by students last month; still underutilized, so advertising now to increase uptake
9. ATI Audit Update—Recommendation is that campus will develop 3-year ATI plan; will develop documented procedures that address faculty training, use of metrics, accessibility of instructional materials in LMS; had a recommendation regarding the need for support for additional faculty workload, but this effort got sidelined amid COVID; need to revisit recommendation and send to PRBC instead of Senate given the funding component
10. Tech Day—Is October 22-23, 8:30-12noon, virtual, http://www.fullerton.edu/it/events_projects/techday/TechDay2020/

11. Online Drop Form Committee—Jon Bruschke reported: We surveyed Chairs on how the new virtual form has been working: roughly 10% thought it terrible, 20% love it, most felt it a step in the right direction; our campus shutdown amid attempt to address Chair concerns; there are many forms in the hopper to be converted to virtual format: <http://records.fullerton.edu/resources/>; Loretta Donovan and Jon Bruschke will update the report on the Drop form and will send to Amir Dabirian/IT; IT will report back about what they will/can do
12. Faculty Student Success Dashboard—There are remaining concerns about what expectations may become as data become available; Jon Bruschke will share concerns with Amir Dabirian in writing as a first step in considering how to address these concerns; Amir will present concerns to the Faculty Affairs Committee

8.2 Faculty Affairs Committee [Kanel], F, 10-2-20, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom

FAC met 10/2/2020 with a quorum. Feedback and language for revising the Revocation of Emeriti Status was received from the Emeriti Association. The fully revised document will be drafted and voted on by FAC in 2 weeks and then presented to Senate Executive Committee. Library faculty are working on their DPS and focusing on following CPA policies. Once they draft their DPS, their wording will be woven into UPS 210.002. The biggest challenge is deciding whether to require a peer-reviewed publication. The timeline for completion is next summer. Kristi Kanel will offer her services to CAPS to help them create their own DPS. Finally, the need and usefulness of the prospectus was discussed and the need to word things in UPS 210.000 to inform all levels of review that it is not part of the evaluation process, and it may be modified without penalty.

8.3 Curriculum Committee [Gradilla], F, 10-2-20, 12:00 - 2:00 PM, Zoom

- UCC addressed being prepared for the Ethnic Studies Requirement in terms of the process of accepting new courses and curriculum overall.
- We addressed: UPS 411.103 (Televised Courses), and we decided to rescind this UPS based on the development of online platforms such as Zoom make Televised courses moot. All ADs responded that they favored rescinding this UPS. We agreed as a committee to rescind this UPS.
- UPS 430.000 (New Degree Programs and Master Plan) is up for its periodic review. And we are working on this document on “projecting degrees” for the Academic Master Plan. We are returning to this issue after a long hiatus. We first addressed this issue from when Mark Stohs was chair. As exec, we had problems with updating this UPS because it about a CO procedure. We are trying to develop a helpful update to guide departments, chairs, deans, and curriculum committees to plan accordingly with figuring out timelines and who or how a campus projection is approved.

8.4 Planning, Resource & Budget Committee [Walker], F, 10-2-20, 1:00 - 2:30 PM, Zoom

PRBC discussed the President’s budget letter and the ongoing issues associated with budget cuts. There are certainly large issues across the board; PRBC mostly discussed the use of over-enrollment dollars to do one-time funding, the role of one-time funding for mandatory cost increases, and strategies to mitigate the budget issues (e.g., furloughs, layoffs, and efficiencies) [no details discussed here] Certificate in Security Studies was approved by PRBC. PRBC approved the Institute of Black Intellectual Innovation.

8.5 Graduate Education Committee [Wood], F, 10-2-20, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, Zoom

1. EGCE 551 Review. Reviewed EGCE 551 to determine if it meets the writing requirements using UPS 320.020 to evaluate the adequacy, of course. Concerns were expressed that the syllabus falls short, includes insufficient detail, assignment detail is sparse, more detail on each assignment, and how students would have the opportunity to improve with feedback required to meet the writing requirement. Motion approved to provide feedback to the submitter with a successful syllabus as close to their syllabus as possible (committee approved EGCE 567 last year), UPS 320.020, and feedback about how the proposal can be strengthened.
2. AVP Frey Report on Grad Admissions.
 - a. There have been some changes in admissions: There is a new Director of Admissions. Programs can no longer change deadlines mid-cycle. Requested feedback/input on admissions requirement changes. For spring 2022, admission requirements changes need to go through a curriculog program change proposal. Asked if this process could be reduced to an expedited process? The catalog can be updated all year but is only published once a year. Support expressed for streamlining the process. Need to consider if there are unintended consequences of this.

- b. Graduate TDA development is still underway. This probably won't be available until November. Grad programs is hiring another evaluator to help facilitate review for grad admissions. Programs for the fall pilot: MS Nursing, MS Information Technology, MS Software Engineering (online), MS Education Technology, MS Statistics, MS Counseling

8.6 Student Academic Life Committee [Stohs], T, 10-6-20, 9:00 - 10:00 AM, Zoom.

- Review PPT presentation, Academic Advising Overview.
Slide 3:

9/20/2020	Census Flag
New FTF	New UDT
5,424	4,708

ALL of these students (count as of the date given) completed the GE advising (online) AND are now close (equal) to census count for new students.

- Survey about GE advising experience was about the first 400 students advised (largely to ensure that it was going well/ok) – had about 400 comments total, those provided in the PPT were selected more or less randomly. A lot of positive feedback.
- Work to be done: the UPS student rights and responsibilities doc.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9.1 Ethnic Studies Process

1. ASCSU Chair Note on Ethnic Studies Collaboration
 2. CSUCES Letter Vice-Chancellor Blanchard and Chair Collins
 3. CSUN Ethnic Studies Resolution
 4. Working Draft Proposal for University Graduation Requirement Committee for Ethnic Studies Requirement
 5. Title 5, California Code of Regulations - Notice
 6. Title 5, California Code of Regulations - Proposed Regulations
 7. Title 5, California Code of Regulations - Statement of Reasons
- (Walsh) We need to have a conversation regarding the Ethnic Studies presentation to the Senate; it needs to be shortened. How would we go about suggesting that to the presenters?
- (Stambough) When reading through it, I liked some of the history. I think trying to take stands and fight some fights that were already over there is a little bit of that still in there. If we can weed some of that out, I think that might streamline it and make it 1) easier to go to and 2) not create controversy where there is none anymore. Some things are totally out of our control. The timeline is the law; it overrides anything that the Board of Trustees could do. I like creating an ad hoc committee to help GE, especially identifying the courses that are going to go in there right away.

In my meeting with the Ethnic Studies Faculty, they were pleased when they realized our process, with what the law says. The law states that any course has to be sponsored by or cross-listed with Ethnic Studies Departments. That means the Ethnic Studies Departments have gatekeeping powers over what goes into the course. It will still go to the GE Committee, and they could send it back and say what to do with the syllabus. I recommended in the Learning Goals we put in the UPS maybe line one bullet one, so it's there, and we don't run into a legal problem down the road.

Q: (Walsh) Do you have a thought about how on Thursday we avoid discussions veering off into Area Z?

A: (Stambough) I don't think we do necessarily. We have a really short period of time to figure out Areas F, D, and Z. I was going to introduce those, and we think of those as the Ethnic Studies Requirements as the creation of Area F, but there are ripple effects that we have to take care of before the catalog year as well. Thursday, we are not making any recommendations on anything except maybe creating the ad hoc committee. Things people need to think about and GE Committee will be dealing with this at one of the later meetings this month or maybe an early November meeting, we are going to have to make decisions on Areas D and Z. I will shape it so nobody things everything has to be decided right away.

- (Wood) If you can summarize all of the past arguments that have been resolved in one sentence, that might help prevent people from reigniting those.

- (Stambough) This is a special meeting on this topic, so that it will be a mostly open discussion. I will explain what the law says, what the FAQs say; I will mention that the memo's specific language is coming out that day, and here are questions we need to address and discuss.
- (Stambough) One thing I will mention, if we do the two proposed resolutions the Ethnic Studies Chairs sent, none of them are Senators, so they cannot propose the resolutions. Somebody will have to introduce, write or re-write, but an introduction will have to come from a Senator.
 - (Walsh) Do we know if they were approaching a Senator to do that or whether we should take the ball and do some revisions?
 - (Gradilla) I don't know because it is still in the process of getting all the different pieces going. For ease, I can carry the resolution and then turn it over to them to talk about it.
 - (Walsh) I think that would be ideal because I don't think it looks good for Senate Exec to be making revisions without that conversation with them; it needs to be their proposal. They do have Senators besides yourself who can do introductions. I think it would be good to have the agreement ahead of time, at least a draft of the resolutions.

Q: (Walsh) Are you comfortable if we send you some suggestions on the resolution today?

A: (Gradilla) Yes.

- (Walsh) I want to make sure the Ethnic Studies faculty who are not on the Senate have a vehicle to ask the Senate that we endorse their objections to the Chancellor's office. I don't think the second resolution has to be on the table; I think the ask has to be on the table and not in the form of a resolution, but want to hear those voices and those objections. But we do want to pass the resolution on creating the ad hoc committee.
 - (Gradilla) So just as a strategy, we convert the longer resolution into allowed commentary, and it is the commentary that will frame the ad hoc resolution? I will let them know as they speak and frame the short resolution, and their denouncing of the process is part of the Academic Senate record. We will frame in the minutes that it is recorded and noted their disagreement of the process as they present their resolution.

Q: (Kanel) Could we give them a time limit? Can't we give them like fifteen minutes to get it all in?

A: (Stambough) We could. There are basically two different parts, a verbal report where objections are stated to the way the law was interpreted. Could there be a short version of the way the law was interpreted verbally and a written report that the chairs ask the Senate to receive? The report could be more detailed, they could just highlight and summarize and not give a full lecture to the Senate, and the resolution would be more of an action item. That would save time, and it gets everything on record.

Q: (Stambough) What does everyone think about if I would talk to the Ethnic Studies Chairs about making the long resolution into a report that they could present and the Senate could receive and mention that report will be in the official Senate documents so that it would be on the record. In addition, we would say as representatives of the campus and Senate, and the three Statewide Senators will present this at ASCSU when it comes up.

A: (Walsh) I think that is an excellent idea because it puts it in the record, but it's not the Senate making promises.

 - (Matz) If they can have clarity in the report, we do not have to sort through to get what their points are, but rather bullet points or clarity, so it is easy to see what their points are.

X. NEW BUSINESS

10.1 Search Committee - Dean of the College of Business and Economics

The Executive Committee discussed the list of faculty members from CBE that either self-nominated or were nominated to serve on the search committee.

The Senate Office will reach out to the faculty members, and once they accept the invitation to serve, their names will be added to the October 15th AS agenda for Senate approval.

10.2 Campus Morale

10.3 Discuss SOQ Task Force Membership and SOQ Task Force Report
(<http://www.fullerton.edu/FAR/soq/SOQ%20Committee%20Report%20FINAL%205.6.2019.pdf>)

- (Stambough) We need to reconstitute the SOQ Task Force Committee. We can go through the previous committee members' list to see if any are available to continue. If they are not available, we need to develop faculty members to serve on the committee.

Q: (Walsh) Are you thinking of reconstituting it in the spring semester or now?

A: (Stambough) As soon as we can staff the committee and get it approved.

Q: (Walker) Are we sure we need it? I thought we were going to let FAC get to work on this?

A: (Stambough) FAC can get to work on it. FAR suggested we have the task force committee again to help go through some of the very specific things. It was one of the old task force report; the task force comes back and goes through the data. We would take the charges from their report, reconstitute it and let them finish their work. The report would then go to FAC so FAC could work on it as well.

10.4 Ethnic Studies Presentation and Resolutions

1. Ethnic Studies Presentation (Draft)
2. Resolution on the Implementation of AB1460 at CSUF
3. Resolution to Create the Ad Hoc Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Stohs) Meeting ended at 12:55 PM.