



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 14, 2023**

Approved 12-5-23

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

MH-141

Present: Bruschke, Garcia, Jarvis, Kanel, Milligan, Self, Shepard, Swarat, Valdez, Walsh

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- Waiting to hear back from Pam Oliver on serving on the Deputy Provost Search committee. Additional faculty suggestions listed below in case Pam declines to serve.

- Leah Brew
- Joao Barros
- Michele Wood

- We just received an email yesterday from the Chancellor's office and they want us to have two faculty representatives for the search committee by December 13th, which is a pretty short notice.

For the last presidential search, we did a resolution at the Senate explaining we would run the election for the two faculty representatives the same way we do for the Senate seats. The election will run simultaneously with the election for the two vacant seats on the Academic Senate.

With the short time frame, faculty will not have the amount of time we usually allow for them to get the required signatures on their petitions, because they would have to take out the petition and get it signed over the Thanksgiving break.

The notice to campus will go out on Thursday and the petitions will be due on Wednesday, November 29th. That is not what faculty would consider a lot of working days, but for us to have an actual election by December 13th, we don't have a lot of options.

Suggestion for resolution:

- Change wording to read "3 WTUs or one course = .2 of a full vote"
- Due to the short turnaround time for the petitions, send an email to campus today with a copy of the resolution and inform them if the resolution is approved by the Senate, the official notice for petitions will follow.
- There are some faculty that submit applications for the Assigned Time for Exceptional Service award year after year. Are we to continue supporting people activities and their various departments endlessly through the assigned time? At what point should these projects be sponsored by the departments, or the college, or the Provost office? Many people are already getting grants and funding, but they meet the spirit of the grant and we have not put any language in the policy on this.
 - In the workload section of the CBA, it is supposed to identify people who have tons of service and giving them time off for it, and it is done at the campus level. How the campus distributes it is up the campus. I think it is in the spirit of the CBA to say if you are in a job where you are constantly overwork, this is our way of supporting you. I agree we should clarify this is supposed to be reducing workload. Do we mean this as a sabbatical, or is this an ongoing commitment the campus is making? Throwing it to committee every year is not the best way to use that money to achieve the purpose of reducing workload.
 - Aren't we supposed to be getting money from the Provost office for mentoring, outreach, and advising? Why don't we build up our system where advisement and mentoring activity is something that gets funded regularly by the colleges?

Suggestion:

Have the EATC to look at the UPS document and offer edits.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 EC Minutes 10-24-23 (draft)

- M/S/P (Self/Valdez) Motion to approve the October 24th minutes. Minutes approved.

4.2 EC Minutes 10-31-23 (draft) - *forthcoming*

4.3 EC Minutes 11-7-23 (draft) - *forthcoming*

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

- I met with the President this morning. We discussed one of the items in Goal 5 of the Strategic Plan, reducing bureaucratic friction barriers on campus. We talked about some loop closing stuff that we might do. I stressed the point of including auxiliary and foundation in on this because a lot of the headaches have been some stateside clashes with different processes on one side and the other.

She was talking about getting a lot of folks involved on how we are going to fix that.

I told her we in the Senate was going to do our best to try and reduce any barriers we might have set up in our processes. I also mentioned travel as a huge headache these days and how it has gotten worse since we went to Concur and not better.

- On open forum and a meeting for the president search committee will be on campus on Tuesday, February 6th. The time we have been given for the open form is 9:30 am - 3:30 pm, so at some point in the day there will be a meeting. Just want to put it on your calendars.

VI. PROVOST REPORT - 12:30 PM

- We are looking at some strategies for the retention of our students and the Chancellor's office is looking at retention. One of the things they are looking at is a program called Second Start. Second Start allows a student who was on academic probation or DQ to come back through a small application process. This program allows you to reset the gpa.

There are six campuses looking at doing this as a pilot. I am volunteering CSUF to do it as a pilot to see if it will help our students moving forward.

Suggestion:

- (Jarvis) Have the Chancellor's office offer this to graduate students as well.

- Another thing I want to bring to you is stop outs. One of the things we looked at is one of our barriers for our students is stop outs. If you step out after one semester, then after the second semester you are completely out of the campus.

We are moving it from one semester to two years. I was going to do it unlimited, but unlimited would be too complicated. Two years is very doable from the campus perspective.

The advantage of it is, you start on campus and discover you gpa is too low, you are having a hard time at the university, so you want to go to the community college for one or two semester and come back. You cannot come back. You would have to reapply, have the golden four, have 60 units, have the GPA and all the requirements to get back. This would allow our students to stop out, take care of business, and then come back.

This would allow them to do a reverse transfer, go back to the community college for one semester, then come back again. It would allow a lot of flexibility for our students moving forward. They could start back at 30 or 35 units with no restrictions from Admissions, and we don't have to us an application.

Q: (Jarvis) What would happen with the catalog year?

A: (Provost) The catalog year stays the same.

Q: (Jarvis) Where are we with the College/Department based admissions?

A: (Provost) our biggest restriction is Admission. Every time we talk to them, they do not have the capacity. That is something we need to look into.

VII. STAFF REPORT

No report.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 Internships & Service Learning Committee [Shepard], W, 11-8-23, 9:00 - 10:00 AM, Zoom

- Met via Zoom, a quorum was met.
- Chair Amber Chitty Wilson convened the meeting.
- The committee approved the agenda and minutes.
- The committee continued discussions of revisions to UPS 411.601 through line-by-line wordsmithing driven by thoughtful discussion based on recommendations of various stakeholders, including CICE and risk management staff. Some of the discussion included making sure the newly revised UPS is in compliance with CO executive orders and audits since the last UPS revision in 2015. Revision discussions will continue at the next meeting. Tentative goal is to potentially complete revisions at December meeting for forwarding to Academic Senate in January.

8.2 University Advancement Committee [Self], W, 11-8-23, 9:00 - 10:00 AM, Zoom

- Met via Zoom with a quorum.
- Discussion of UPS 103.005 [World Wide Web Policy].
Section II. Guidelines for All Websites (and official social media accounts)
 - Need to define “officially recognized CSU Fullerton social media accounts”.
 - To protect student media organizations such as Daily Titan and Titan TV, the language of “including ASI-recognized student organizations with the exception of student media organization” was suggested.
- A concern was raised that people at CSUF are saying bad things about other faculty/staff/students at CSUF that are not true. Because nobody can afford hiring attorneys for litigations, those who say bad things are getting away with it without any consequences. This is beyond the scope of this UPS. It should be brought to the attention of the Provost (by Stephen) and of the Executive Committee (by Eriko).

8.3 Library Committee [Milligan], M, 11-13-23, 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM, PLS-256

- Quorum was reached.
- Dean Bonney may still attend Spring 2024 meetings until new Dean starts.
- Associate Dean of Public Services, Mike DeMars. Presenting on Library Student Survey and Focus Group data from Spring 2023.
 - Distributed survey in March 2023 – 2400 student responses. Average student body captured.
 - Overwhelmingly students found library website easy to use. Small percentage utilizing librarians / Research Services (67% have not, the rest have used either in person or virtual assistance). Not as many as we hoped (about 50%) are aware of our subject specialist librarians.
 - Most people are aware of the library’s programs: Peeps contest, Loteria, Dog therapy, etc.
 - 42.6% are checking the library for textbooks, 36% were not aware we carry textbooks.
 - 47.8% of students prefer eBooks. 18.8% no preference. 33.4% prefer print books.
 - 24/7 Study 45.4% use library during this time.
 - 87% happy with the hours the library presently provides.
 - Overwhelmingly students found the library a welcoming, inclusive, and safe space.
 - Seating seems to be the biggest area where students feel needs improvement. Finding space was a common response in the free text responses.
 - Survey asking for additional quiet space resulted in making the fourth floor south designated quiet space this fall.

- 10% of students aware of the meditation space.
- Navigating the building between the north and south building is a challenge for students.
- Student Asks: Private study space, group study space, quiet floor, better communication
- New row of 14 study rooms coming on the south side to help with these.
- Students like the study pods, 24/7 research help, and library programs. Those who received library instruction found it very valuable. We can do better communicating all the great things at the library.
- Virtual tour is a challenge since changes occur so often, partners move. Will look further into this.
- Students unsure why some partners are in the library and what they do. Students don't understand why they aren't allowed in specific areas without a reason or why some spaces get more room than others. Open seating spaces available to all students is needed.
- Edits will continue at December meeting to updates to UPS 500.150 and 508.000.

8.4 Extension and International Programs Committee [Shepard], M, 11-13-23, 3:00 - 4:00 PM, THall-1424

- Committee met with all members attending via Zoom and administrators attending in a conference room. A quorum was met.
- A few items covered by administrator presentations: 1) Challenges of non-credit professional certificates and programs: In recent years, a lot of those programs have sunset and staff have left. EIP is now coming up a plan to bring new in-demand non-credit professional programs back. The provost has asked for a plan for the future. 2) Summer/Winter schedule was discussed – provost wants more “student-driven class offerings” to help facilitate timely student graduation and the team will be offering more data to identify what classes to offer that will likely have highest demand.
- Other issues discussed: John Hickok from the Library shared answers to questions about whether extended education students get the same library access as matriculated students. (Quick answer: mostly, but not entirely. Mostly, they get “general public privileges” which is defined in Library policies. Some students in certificate or audit-only courses may not get remote access because of vendor contracts. They can get access to library e-resources by coming to the library in person. John would like to do a test-case with an audit-only student and instructor to troubleshoot access issues and make sure the administrators of both the Library and EIP understand access issues).
- The committee voted to record future meetings to facilitate minute taking. A brief discussion ensued about appropriateness of Zoom recordings of meetings.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 9.1 Academic Budgeting - (Discussion item)
(tabled until next meeting with Provost)

X. NEW BUSINESS

- 10.1 Revisions to UPS 100.700 - Revisions to UPS 100.700 Formation and Review of Campus Centers and Institutes

- (Jarvis) Line 30: delete “Academic Senate”.
- (Jarvis) Lines 33-34: delete the wording “the president’s designee”.
- (Swarat) Line 39: add the wording “in concurrence with”
- (Jarvis) Line 102: delete “by” replace with “to”.

This document will be forwarded to the agenda for the next Academic Senate meeting.

- 10.2 360 Evaluations of Deans - (Discussion item)

Executive Committee had an extensive discussion on the 360 Evaluation, also reviewing UPS 210.200, which was rescinded by the Senate on July 2, 2018.

Q: (Kanel) What is the downside to evaluate the Dean?

A: (Walsh) The downside is if you have the Provost do it, the Provost won't know about the festering issues in the college the dean is not dealing with.

Q: (Kanel) What is the downside for administration if faculty get involve in the 360 evaluation process?

A: (Walsh) There was no downside, it is typically done in many places. I am just complaining about the instrument that was used was a very flawed instrument.

Had we really been able to say if the Dean operated with integrity, if they were honest in interactions, do they deal with conflict, then we might have been able to avert some problems a long time ago. But that was not the focus of the instrument the university paid for.

Q: (Kanel) What is the point of the evaluation? Is the Provost going to do something about things based on the evaluation or let it just ride, no matter what the faculty say? Is there a downside to the Provost to reprimand Deans? Is it a problem with getting Deans, so they keep them?

- (Shepard) At Long Beach, there is a committee of faculty that is the evaluation and review committee that engages in a substantive evaluation in the third year of someone's appointment, and then every five years thereafter. It spells out the process about what the committee does, who they interview, who consult with, and how they write up an evaluation. It is very much faculty driven, which is different from some of the ideas we have had in the past here.
- (Swarat) The MPP evaluation is not very detailed, it has three criteria. Sometimes the evaluation is useful, sometimes it is not useful at all.

Kristi asked what the downside is, I think part of the thinking was there was already a HR performance evaluation on an annual basis. Maybe instead of adding another thing on top of it as a separate process, we could just improve that process, make it more comprehensive so we don't have two processes initiated that could potentially be in conflict. One thing we could do is be involved with deciding how better to compliment the HR process, so the performance evaluation could be more meaningful.

The CSU has an anonymous evaluation process for the presidents, where they reach out to you every three years and ask you to write a letter about the president's performance. I don't know how they choose the people who they seek out, but that is another process that is out there as well.

Q: (Valdez) Are we discussing whether we want this to happen? Because my understanding in meeting with Steve Stambough with the COACHE data, was this is what we were going to do. It was going to be a 360 review and it would include Deans, faculty would complete surveys, and there would be a university wide committee that would look at it, complies and send feedback.

A: (Walsh) I don't think any of us were aware of that. If that is what's on Steve and the Provost's agenda, that would be great.

- (Valdez) When he was on the Exec agenda to talk about this, was when other things were happening with HSS, and the conversation was derailed.
- (Bruschke) That would be great. I presume we would want to put it into a UPS document, so it maintained our control.

Suggestions:

- (Jarvis) Talk with the Provost about what he is planning on doing and institutionalize it.
- (Swarat) We should work together and coordinate this and not have two separate evaluation processes, because that would be confusing.
- (Kanel) Have FAC put hiring of administrative personnel and put reviewing of administrative personnel into the UPS document, like what Long Beach has done.
- (Walsh) I think it should be a separate UPS and not amend one we have recently updated.

Provost joined the meeting and discussion continued.

- (Provost) I have not talked to the Deans at all about this, I have it on my calendar to talk with them to see how they want to receive input. Once I talk with the Deans, I will bring it back to Exec.

Q: (Kanel) You said you want to get the Deans input on how they want to be evaluated, or get feedback?

A: (Provost) No, what I'm saying is one of the things I want to bring up to them from the COACHE survey is people want to be involved in the evaluation process in each of the colleges. The goal is to have a process for them to gather feedback through the evaluation. The evaluation process is set up by the Chancellor's office. All of us get evaluated on an annual basis, there is a timeline for that, it is already set. The process we don't have is providing feedback in the process from the constituency

Q: (Kanel) So they will only be evaluated according to the policy of the Chancellor's office? We cannot have our own campus policy of how we want to evaluate them.

A: (Provost) There is a process for all the MPPs to get evaluated by the Chancellor's office, it is given to us just like the bargaining units are. The area that we can improve on is make sure there is a feedback process.

Q: (Kanel) What would be the best way for us to set something like that up? Would that be through a UPS of some other way?

A: (Provost) That I don't know. It could be through Qualtrics, they have a 360 review software that gives feedback, there are multiple ways to do it?

Q: (Kanel) How would the policy be constructed?

A: (Provost) I don't know if we need a policy. Do we need a policy to say the feedback is there? We can just do a process change within HRDI with the perimeters of the Executive Order.

- (Bruschke) Jason brought up that Long Beach has a document on this that is pretty elaborate, what we would call a UPS on our campus. I would feel more comfortable doing it that way, rather than relying on HRDI.
 - (Provost) I am open to look at it, I would love to see it. Jason if you could send it to me, I will discuss it with both HRDI and the Deans. And I will report back at my next meeting with Exec.

10.3 Targeted harassment of professors - (Discussion item)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Shepard/Garcia) Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.