



**ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 9, 2021**

*Approved 3-16-21*

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

**ZOOM Meeting**

---

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

---

## **I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

## **II. URGENT BUSINESS**

- The Senate meeting with the three pros, three against, and the two-minute speeches moved things forward; maybe we can continue to do this in the future. You may not be limit to two minutes, but there is a lot of repetition in the Senate, and this narrowed it down, and we got to the heart of it with the three pros and three cons.
- I want to follow up on my concern about the security in our IT transition, and I need to report that I got all my issues resolved except my iMac, and there is no way I can install outlook. Someone walked me through the whole process, and I was told to use apple mail; that was the only option available. He said there is a server problem that prevents some folks from installing and having duo work rights. It's telling me I have to enable cookies, but they are already enabled.
  - There is a flag in Safari, that is under privacy that you need to set. If you don't set that out, you will have duo problems. I will pass this information to the helpdesk.

Q: Why do all forms coming from people that we have to open up for campus always in internet explorer when my laptop cannot handle that? Why don't they send things through Chrome?

A: IT is actually switching its old system and we are trying to transition to a new one. The new one doesn't have that problem.

## **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- (Dabirian) IT is moving away from the concepts of desktops. We are trying to find CARES ACT money to upgrade all the staff with decent laptops across the board. We will give everyone a docking station in their offices and try to upgrade technology. This way, people can take their laptops home and work use for virtual environments. If you currently have a desktop, you can keep it until it dies, but we will not replace desktops in the future.

We are also trying to get upgraded laptops for students. Some of the ARTS, NSM, and Engineering students had a hard time with the cheap laptops. We are trying to order 2,000 laptops to upgrade them to do 100 percent of their work.

## **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 4.1 EC Minutes 1-26-21 - *forthcoming*
- 4.2 EC Minutes 2-2-21 - *forthcoming*

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

- I received a notice this morning which deals with the naming of facilities when a donor is involved. The statement came from Mark Filowitz and Greg Saks about which policy to use. Our policies don't necessarily match what happens when a donor is involved with the naming of a facility. I will send both policies off to the University Advancement Committee and have them make sure they are consistent with each other.
- We had our first on-campus experience with the three for, three against model. Is that something we want to consider doing permanently or something we only want to consider during jam-packed meetings?

- (Walker) We opened the door, and if we don't do it all the time, we will run into the same problem every time we try to implement it. I think we either go ahead and adopt this as our operation rules and be done with it. Or if we want to try it again when we have another controversial thing, we risk the body saying no, we can't do this.

Q: (Stambough) Is this something to put into the Bylaws?

- (Wood) I appreciated this approach, and there is consensus around this. I think folks enjoyed getting through the discussion and highlighting the main points. When I think about new Senators coming on, my concern is that will this lead to the more engaged, more experienced Senators dominating the conversation and not allowing the new senators to participate? That's why I'm wondering, for some discussions, we leave it open and where we want a lot of different ideas and voices shared, and for the more significant, more consequential votes, employ this approach.
- (Walsh) I think for necessary votes, we should invoke the three for, three against. But when something new, there may be voices with multiple perspectives that we want to have on the floor, not just pro or con, and I don't think we want to stifle that.
- (Gradilla) I felt the potential for more inclusion, so I think it does allow people to come in new instead of the current model, which allows senior expert Senators to dominate the regular conversation. Keeping track of the speaker's list, I did see newer voices come in this time as opposed to last time. And on the technical side, I would need a different form to keep track of because of the pros and cons, so I would need technical support for the meetings. I saw a different flow, and I think people knowing the two-minute time limit tend to focus a little bit more, so their comments were concentrated. So, under this very controlled system, it was effective. Now, do we need to do it when we have one item or two that are non-controversial? We can probably talk it through the first reading, I don't think we need to do it on the first reading, but I think the Marathon meeting would help move some of the stuff. I think it's effective when we have a full schedule for moving through things or when the President is speaking, and we have one or two critical things. I think that will also help us get it done.
- (Matz) I appreciated the ruling. There is more order with it, more voices are heard, and it moves items along quickly. I think to have it at one meeting and not at the next follow-through at the next meeting would be confusing. I think it's an opportunity to change the monumental problems we had with people speaking and repeating themselves.
- (Stohs) I think there are two issues, the three for, three against, or a time limit. Do we do one or the other or both? The two-minute time limit on speaking might be the best approach. That way, we wouldn't have to worry about the three for, three against. If it's three for, three against, and a two-minute time limit, then the time is strict in terms of how much you speak to any issue, and that might not be enough for some of the severe problems we deal with. In the Statewide Senate, you can always say if you need more time on an issue, more people can talk. Maybe it's better to have some type of limit, but then let people know if we need more time, the Senate can vote to have more time.
- (Dabirian) I like it, and it gets us more focused. I think we should have the three for, three against, but at any time, we can ask to go into a discussion that is not pros or cons. This way, it will get people to discuss something that is not there. When we need to vote on something, we do three for, three against, but if it's getting to the point where we need discussion, we can have a provision to move into the debate.
- (Wood) We need to think about this in terms of what the Senate is trying to accomplish. Issues that carry on over multiple meetings, there is a substantial benefit for encouraging people to be focused when we get down to the vote. Earlier in these longer issues, when we are trying to flesh out all the perspectives and understand a problem, we would lose out by not hearing the more than three views in our larger body. I'm suggesting that we tie our approach to the task that we are trying to accomplish, so we don't inadvertently pay the price, and we get the full benefit of more focused discussion, which I think we all benefit from.

Q: (Kanel) If someone motions, does that person get longer than two minutes to present their case?

A: (Stambough) We didn't necessarily specify what we were going to go with, but nobody got close to two minutes.

- (Kanel) Just in case there is a need to explain things more fully, certain things need to be described in more detail, and it might go over the two minutes. I would hate for people not to understand the motion because they were chopped off at two minutes, so I would hope that person had a little longer. I think the biggest issue for me is people writing down things and being prepared for what they are going to say. It helps to have an organized outline, and maybe that is something people can learn to do

because that helps to push the thing along. I would like to see the person making the motion get a little more leeway if they need to explain something in much more detail.

- (Walker) I think we use first readings for discussions, and if we need to have time limits for those because of time crunches, we can adopt them as we go. When things come back for a second reading, we can do the three for, three against. This way, we get an open discussion, and we separate the two procedures. One procedure is for discussion and perfection, and the other method is for decisions.
  - (Stambough) With the possibilities, we can waive the first reading.
  - (Walker) Yes, we just have to write up the rules and give them to everybody.
- (Dabirian) I wonder if we can do this for the remainder of the semester and evaluate it by the Marathon meeting and vote at the Marathon meeting to continue the practice.
- (Stambough) We generally have so many things on the Marathon agenda that everything would either get a waiver for a first reading or will be kicked to the following year. We would have to make sure everything gets a first reading before that if we are going to act on it at the Marathon meeting unless we could generate a first reading waiver. I don't want ten items as a first reading waiver.
  - (Dabirian) Maybe we could split the Marathon meeting into two meetings. We would do all the first readings in the first part, and people can have a discussion. Then we start the second part, in which we consider those items.
- (Gradilla) One thing that should give us the momentum to do this is with all the EO's coming down, and with a new Chancellor, we are probably going to have new things coming down as we start talking more about the curriculum. As we have seen these curriculum battles that happen in terms of turf if it gets to the Senate and we are still not resolved, we need to have this structure to make sure people are heard and don't do a 15-minute monologue. If something comes to Senate that is contentious, we should require structured.
- (Kanel) Another way you can explain it to people that will help them. People on these committees spend a lot of time revising the UPS, and half the time, they don't even make it to the Senate floor before the year is up because we didn't get to them. After all, we spent so much was going over stuff. So, we want to be respectful of people's time who serve on the committees.

## VI. STAFF REPORT

No report.

## VII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

7.1 International Education Committee [Dabirian], W, 2-3-21, 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom

### **Announcements**

- The new fee structure is sent to the President
- Some impacted students due to the Myanmar coup d'etat. 13 students are impacted

### **Chair's report**

- A joint meeting with Extension Committee is to be scheduled

### **Virtual International Experiences Proposal**

- Virtual international experiences with a \$500.00 grant for eight courses
- Grants can be attached to courses during the Summer session and Fall 2021 semesters.
- Access to resources for study abroad participants from international institutions
- April Bullock, Natalie Graham, and Rebecca Gutierrez will participate

### **Study Abroad update**

- Jack Hobson shared the Global Engagement toolkit

### **International Program update**

- Degree-seeking international numbers are down
- Waiting for guidance from the Department of Ed for Fall 2021 and beyond
- What is the new normal for the international program
- Alternative virtual engagement considerations
- The court rule in favor of Optional Practical Training (OPT) for F-1 students

- 7.2 Information Technology Committee [Wood], F, 2-5-21, 10:00 - 11:00 AM, Zoom
1. Approved minutes.
  2. IT Report from Amir
    - a. There is a group looking at refreshing the IT Strategic Plan, goals remain the same but updated objectives and strategies (end-to-end equitable and accessible environment, empower the university to enable multiple modalities within the curricular and co-curricular experience, partner with colleges to establish IT liaison committees, reduce digital divide via student laptop distribution, partner with the academic division of student affairs to implement a mandatory laptop program, etc.), the draft will be shared with senate IT committee, feedback due 2/12.
- 7.3 Faculty Affairs Committee [Kanel], F, 2-5-21, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom
- FAC met with a quorum.
  - Subcommittees updated the rest of the committee about the status of the documents each is working on, such as UPS 210.000, 210.001, 210.002, 210.070, 210.080. Next three meetings, the entire committee will go through all revisions from subcommittees line by line and clean up and vote on revisions.
  - Many revisions deal with online and virtual evaluation processes and trying to make the documents reader-friendly, making things less burdensome for faculty. Cleaner definitions of PY1-PY6 are done... just about done with 210.000!
  - Subcommittees will meet again to clean everything up and fine-tune with a soft deadline of March 5. FAC wishes to get these documents to the Senate floor this Spring.
- 7.4 Planning, Resource & Budget Committee [Walker], F, 2-5-21, 1:00 - 2:30 PM, Zoom  
Minutes December 4, 2020 – Approved
- New Business**
- COVID Impact on Working Condition (Alisha Brown):  
Alisha gave a summary of programs available to CSUF employees for wellness and the benefits of the programs.
  - Update to State Budget and COVID-19 Relief Funding (D. Kim/L. Graylee):  
Laleh presented on the Gov. budget update. CSU requested \$556 million in new resources. Gov. budget proposed \$144.5 million baseline, \$225 one time; no determination of what areas these funds will go to. Mandatory costs will be covered first. One-time money will cover deferred maintenance, Emergency student financial assistance, faculty professional development., and computing talent initiative. State budget outlook is positive, short-term surplus. Long term, there are deficits; how will the state balance this? Gov. budget is usually the ‘floor’ last year was an exception. There’s a lot of uncertainty, so we’ll see how this plays out. There will not be a tuition increase.  
  
Covid/Cares Act - campus received \$43 million total, including an MSI grant. There are \$2.6 million left. Cares act II \$81.88 billion in support, CSU got \$67 million. \$20.5 million for financial aid and \$47 million for the institution. More flexibility for this time and auxiliaries may be included. Unspent balance from prior funds will fall under the new rules.  
  
Unclear on how the current package in congress will impact higher ed. It will probably help, but the details are murky.
  - Program Review  
M.S. Ed Admin, M.S. Higher Education, M.S. Reading and Literacy, M.S. Curriculum and Instruction, M.S. Special Education, M.S. Transformative Teacher in Secondary Education (these are elevations to comply with the CO policy on concentrations) Approved
- 7.5 General Education Committee [Stambough], F, 2-5-21, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, Zoom  
No report submitted.
- 7.6 Library Committee [Matz], M, 2-8-21, 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom
- I. Scholarly Communication – Mark Bilby reported on the Elsevier Agreement
    - a. CSUF has 25 articles submitted for open access and is #2 in the system; system-wide guides; information will be distributed to all faculty
    - b. The conversation continued on university support for fee support from possibly the deans; support from graduate studies and OESP

- II. Dean's Report
  - a. Waiting for support for the archive collections for Art History
  - b. 4-5 floors – cleared for occupancy; now we just need to get back onto campus
  - c. Day of Giving, March 9, Crowd Funding
    - i. Use funds for more lockers
  - d. Reentry to campus (Dean Bonney on the committee)
    - CAREs
      - i. Two deans (Sac State & Northridge) along with CO on open access, intellectual properties, and copyright

### III. UPS 508.000

- a. Still in discussion; update document; reviewing codes and wording

7.7 Extension and International Programs Committee [Stohs], M, 2-8-21, 3:00 - 4:00 PM, Zoom  
Usual meeting – quorum.

- 1. Certificate in Game-Based Learning - provided via email and DropBox
- 2. Advanced Manufacturing Engineering Certificate Program - provided via email and DropBox
- 3. Sub-Committee on EIC approval processes (Ambrosetti, Carr, McKinley, Wang)
- 4. Summer and Intersession faculty pay, class sizes, revenue: continued discussion without all details being set yet; lower student class price (state-supported), and paying faculty by class size won't be implemented until summer 2022.

7.8 Faculty Research Policy Committee [Walker], T, 2-9-21, 9:00 - 10:00 AM, Zoom

The committee continues to work on a survey about faculty experiences with research and scholarly and creative activities. The committee will be reviewing the policy on Centers since this has now shifted to ORSP.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Proposal for the School of Accountancy

8.2 Ad Hoc Committee - to review the Proposal for the School of Accountancy

(Stambough) I received the School of Accountancy proposal from the Dean of CBE, and we need to create an ad hoc committee to review the proposal and hold at least one open hearing. They have six weeks to work from beginning to end and then bring it back to the Senate for consideration and approval.

We have not received volunteers from the dean for this committee. So, I'm putting this on your radar, and next week we can finalize the names and put this committee on the agenda for the next AS meeting.

Q: (Dabirian) How many members do we need?

A: (Stambough) Five faculty members, no more than two from CBE.

Q: (Stohs) Is someone from Exec supposed to be on this committee?

A: (Stambough) We are not ineligible for it, but there is no requirement there has to be the chair or designee from Exec.

- (Stambough) Think about names, and I will get some suggestions from Dean Rahmatian, and we will work on this next week.
  - (Gradilla) The UPS on centers is not helpful. The Chicax/Latinx faculty are trying to get a university-wide institute off the ground. Luckily, we have the brakes put on it because you can get an institute approved through UPS, but there would be zero dollars attached to it and no commitment from anybody to help pay for it or subsidize it. There needs to be some tinkering in terms of how we do centers. There're significant inequities in terms of what a center is or what it means, and we do need to give it a little more due diligence. If it's a critical area, we should figure out how to fund it through the PRBC process. Of course, other centers will pop up, like the center on stuttering and the different types of centers we have tied to the curriculum within a college. So, I think we need to give that UPS another look over to see if we are doing justice.
  - (Wood) We need to have a conversation around the larger perimeters and meanings of centers. Once we do that, I advocate for flexibility for the colleges.

- (Dabirian) PRBC worked on the UPS on centers, and I agree it needs to be revamped again. I would recommend sending it back and having it updated. The other thing is the Chancellor's office sets perimeters for centers, and we have to report back to them. There is already an umbrella that exists that we have to follow.
- (Walker) The center UPS will get revised by the Policy Research Committee because changes have to be made because they are changing who is running the centers, who is over them. If there are suggestions, please send them to me, and I will forward them to Nicholas and Binod.

Concerning the funding on centers, I agree with Alexandro, but I am not quite sure how we do it. In the past, one of the things that were supposed to happen with centers there was supposed to start with some seed funding or either funding from the college or university. They were expected to be self-sufficient at some point. I don't think that has been a policy practice procedure that has happened at every center founding.

- (Stohs) I understand the CFA thing, but I don't believe there is any limit on how someone can get paid as the center director.

### 8.3 General Committee Senate Nominees

Exec begin working on filling general committee vacancies. An email will be sent out to faculty asking them to serve. Once we receive an acceptance, the faculty member's name will be added to the consent calendar for Senate approval to be added to the all-university election ballot as the Senate Nominee. These committees need to be finalized and on the AS plan by the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting for Senate approval.

### 8.4 Statements of Opinion

(Stambough) Think about this and we will discuss it at next week's meeting.

### 8.5 GE Task Force (restart)

(Stambough) I talked with the Provost about this, and whether it is a task force, a working group, or what the overall strategy should be is not set in stone, but what is set in stone is we have to move on this. We did have a task force that met for a couple of years, they gave their reports, but there was no follow-up. Even though it was only a few years ago, it was four Provost ago. Now is the time to get this moving in a more substantive way to follow up.

The Provost is talking to the deans and what she wanted me to bring here, and then we will compare notes, is what the steps should be? In just brainstorming, some sort of working group on the overall picture of what GE should be, taking up what the task force report was for those two previous years and seeing what action items can come out of that and what they might have missed. From there, maybe a mini-retreat between some in the Senate and some in Academic Programs. When we can get back in person, perhaps a slightly bigger retreat with department chairs, focusing on them.

We can do this with different venues, but it is very accurate that what GE should be around campus is different. It doesn't have to be the same all the way across. It is also true the experience is very different across campus. There seems to be a ton of concern about the competing influences and what the overall purpose is.

If we are going to tackle this and know it is a problem, what is it that we want to tackle? How do we want to tackle it? Once we come up with some ideas, I bring them to the Provost. She gets the ones from the deans to us, and we figure out what our action items are along the way.

- (Wood) It might be helpful to focus at the beginning on big themes. What are the themes of our concern? What are the themes of the vision we want to achieve? Then a thing to focus on is the unification of our GE program. What are some ways to weave themes that reflect our campus value and GE's purpose more coherently through the different offerings?
- (Stohs) One of the underlying issues over the past several years is how do we, as a campus, bring in new courses into GE regarding the criteria? Is it solely discipline-based, or is it by the course learning outcomes?
- (Kanel) Perhaps the colleges need to weigh in on exactly how GE courses and learning objectives can be presented to students from every college of how it connects and relates to their real-life future careers. How the GE from other colleges can be interweaved into your major, your career path.

One of the most significant issues people think about is reduced FTEs and SFR, which GE and no one seems to want to talk about. For many departments, their GE is how they get that. They have 100 people in their classes, that's how they manage all that stuff. If you start talking about people who wouldn't need to take this anymore, they will feel afraid, and I don't think that is fair for them. We need small majors, too; they offer something very unique and special. I would hate to see those smaller majors be taken apart because they couldn't get enough students through GE to handle that.

Where do the community colleges enter into this? A vast portion of our students is transfer students. In my department, maybe 82 percent of our students are transfer students, so they don't even take GE here, except that upper-division in resident GEs. Does anybody know the general percentage of the first-time freshman who has to take all their GE here who does not transfer?

- (Walsh) The whole funding issue will have to be addressed. We are going to have to get away from the FTEs model. If she is not already persuaded, we can convince the Provost that we need a new funding model.  
I spent an hour this morning talking with two of our community college pipeline partners. They are concerned about Area F and the impact it is going to have on their sociology students. Whatever we do going forward, we got to include either the Articulation Specialist or whoever it is that works closely with community colleges, or we are going to create a huge problem. They are already suffering based on the Ethnic Studies Requirement, which they fully whole-heartily support, causing prominent wrinkles in their curriculum planning.
- (Walker) I think the deans, AVPs, and the Provost need to sit down and come up with ground rules for how this committee should work and what they should be considering. It would be necessary for Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate to have a vision of a set of ground rules that we will use to have this discussion. Things that we will talk about and things that we will leave out, then let the faculty go to work. It would be beneficial for the task force if the deans and AVPs could give them something we would like them to accomplish.
- (Dabirian) Unless the Provost comes and says, "We shall do this" and "here are the basic concepts," we will not have a consensus on this problem. We will lose some part-time faculty in these departments, but no full-time across the board will lose any money. We will protect the faculty in these places, and we will put in some financial reserves to make this work. Unless the community comes together and does this, we are not going to get a consensus.
- (Wood) One of the challenges we face in the whole discussion is we all have an interest in the outcome, and we all have a conflicting interest. We all are here to serve our students and make our colleges and departments as successful as possible. There are so many different perspectives and impacts on our campus. We could maybe reach a consensus on not exploiting part-time faculty and providing increasing equity for our faculty across campus for our students across departments. It's a challenge for us, and I think it is crucial to protect the smaller departments from destruction. We value them, we want them to be successful, but we don't want to impact and drive everything else. We have to think about the interest of the big departments, the small departments, and the folks in the middle and how we can create the best experience for our students, given all this diversity. It's a challenge because it's so hard to separate our interest from these more extensive discussions. We have to find a way to work through this and protect our overall community and academic experiences for everybody.
- (Gradilla) I recommend if we can have the committee have different charges. Whoever our Strategic Enrollment person is will be tasked with the GE stuff and small departments' survival. We still haven't seen Strategic Enrollment do everything it is promising to do. We may need a separate or parallel task force committee to talk about small departments' viability separately.

#### 8.6 Retention of Faculty Author Rights to Deposit and Disseminate their Scholarly Articles: An Open Access Policy

1. AS-3376-19: Resolution in Support of Faculty Publication Rights with a Green Open Access Policy for the California State University
2. CSU East Bay: Revised Open Access Policy

## IX. ADJOURNMENT

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