

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

Video Conference

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, V. Harper

Visitors: D. Boschini, C. Catota

Absent: E. Correa (excused)

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

- Some EC members met with Trustee Fong yesterday. (A. Hegde) The message to take back to the Trustees was the need to change the hiring practice and salaries of university presidents and the Chancellor. Things that were important were pushed aside due to implementing the Ethnic Studies requirement, AB 928, and the issue with the former Chancellor. (M. Martinez) The inadequacies of staff salaries discussed. If the institutional wants to attract and retain qualified people, they need offer higher salaries. The communication from the CO regarding the GVAR exam was discussed. Faculty need to be more involved in setting these policies. The CO seem to be working against the interest of the students. (J. Tarjan) Why are we getting policies, and what do they mean? Trustee Fong explained some things without being defensive. (M. Rees) She was surprised and pleased to hear that the Provost is on our EC. (A. Hegde)
- Last Senate Meeting to Introduce Resolutions - April 28, 2022
- Academic Senate Office Analyst - B. Bywaters is retiring July 1. (A. Hegde)
- Faculty Cluster Hire Framework – D. Boschini and C. Catota - The guests were looking for feedback from the EC. There has been strong buy-in from Administration, affinity groups on campus, and individual faculty leaders. There are: (5) five faculty expansion lines dedicated to departments who could specifically pursue hiring faculty members with a

strong commitment to social justice, research and other scholarly activities and a strong background in diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) to reflect the student body on campus and to advance social justice. (D. Boschini) Retention mechanisms have been added, through a number of benefits, including being automatically enrolled in the Faculty Leadership Academy, equity-minded mentoring etc. (C. Catota) (See handout in today's agenda.) Discussion ensued. Our junior diversity reflection course is taken by more students than any other. We can call them social justice and equity, but it sounds like the Framework being presented deals only with racial justice. We cover nine dimensions of diversity in our junior reflection course. Q: Are we to focus our course more narrowly such that the course would be just on racial justice? (J. Tarjan) A: When a department applies for the Cluster Hire, it is not for an individual course. It's for the department to seek one of the tenure-track (TT) lines. The departments are encouraged to think disciplinary areas, rather than specific courses. (V. Harper) Q: Does the focus have to be racial justice, or can social justice be more broadly defined as justice for people with disabilities, economic issues and other areas of diversity, etc.? The Management and Marketing department is looking for someone to take charge of this area. Our accreditation standards really require that nearly every textbook used in business courses has sections on diversity. Does the new hire have to be someone who is focused on racial justice, or can it be someone who has a broad perspective on justice and organizations and society? (J. Tarjan) The conversation needs to happen in the schools. The example that Interim Dean J. Stark used was that a Human Resources (HR) course could teach that. BPA could apply for a Cluster Hire and teach in the subject. In terms of scholarly background of the individual, they would have a background and bring courses and scholarship related to social justice, which encompasses more than specific ethnicities to help advance that for social justice and/or minoritized communities. (V. Harper) An example of the type of research CSUB is looking for is found at <https://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/clusterhire> (D. Boschini) Q: Is the \$1000 for additional support on top of whatever the School Dean commits to the new hire? The amount is a good gesture, however it's a

small enticement to a new hire. Q: When it comes to the commitment of departments to review and revise its Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) guidelines and engage in anti-racist/antibias professional development and training, what is leadership looking for? (C. Lam) A: The RTP guidelines starts with the faculty, goes to the Dean, and then is sent to the Provost for approval. It's a shared governance process. It's very individual to the department whether to participate in the cluster hire and how they can integrate these principles into the RTP process. The goal is to make long lasting change, in terms of the curriculum on campus and the composition and pathways of the future of faculty. Those departments will decide how to alter their RTP guidelines for social justice. If the commitment is there, it won't impinge on the final decision of the whether a department gets the line. (V. Harper) Anyone who isn't able bodied is part of a minoritized community. Example: housing insecurities, financial injustice, etc. Suggestion: Change the language to reflect the broader areas brought to the discussion. (J. Millar) Comments: 1) Some departments have changed their criteria to be more to be more encompassing of different life circumstances and have gotten push-back from their teams on not having a quota for publication, for example. The Deans need to be brought up to speed on what a more social justice minded RTP criteria might look like, in terms of being responsive to different workload demands affecting RTP. Some faculty may focus on service, because they spend more time advising students and mentoring more students. Some might focus more on teaching and doing that culturally responsive pedagogy. If the deans are not made aware what this looks like, there will be a break-down in the RTP revision process if it needs to get the dean's approval. 2) People need to understand that having a socially and culturally responsive curriculum is broad. For example, M. Danforth's Teacher Ed/Computer Science course for K-9 teachers. The concept of computer-science-for-all is new to them. They think that computer programming is only for the sighted. One of our best programmers is blind. Another has cystic fibrosis. They use assistive technology. We can include DEI in computer science. The departments need to think more broadly how to incorporate diversity into the

curriculum because traditional mindsets might override a more modern mindset of what accessibly means. It will be a learning opportunity across the whole campus, particularly for departments that are not involved in this sort of activity to begin with. The listening sessions need to include a bit of educational focus for all the constituents. (M. Danforth) Q: Does the word, "minoritized" mean that a community could be made into a minority? (M. Rees) In the academic department of higher education, the discussions have been moving around, focusing on the term "minoritized". As a Latina, she is made to be a minority instead of actually being a minority. It's the process of becoming a minority in a majority white United States. (C. Catota) It's not a common term and it's not understood. The recommendation is to do a definition and consider that it may not be a useful term. (M. Rees) Definition of minoritized: A social group devalued in society and given less access to resources. The shift from minority, which doesn't have a vector, is different. Minoritized is where the power structure of society is actively making one "this"; they are defining therefore "this" doesn't have access to "that". It puts the actor, the position of power, to determine who one is. That's the problem. (V. Harper) It's a concept that needs to be made more clear. (M. Rees) It's an education for all of us. (A. Hegde) An analogy might be the use of the term "slave" or "enslaved". Slave says that's identity, and enslaved is the circumstance in which one finds themselves without choosing. In terms of department structure, the Management and Marketing department has a student/faculty ratio 50% higher than the rest of BPA. Even though diversity is a major part of the department's curriculum, there isn't anyone with a graduate degree with of any kind of training in those areas. If it's a TT line, the department has standards that are mandated on it. The idea is to expand the number of outlets for publication. We go with the list of business publications. We could encourage someone to topically look at pedagogical research that supports justice in the classroom and their educational outcomes. The hope is that it is not framed in a way that schools with accreditation can't get their people tenured. J. Tarjan emphasized that the department has a lot of majors who could benefit with training in these areas. He hopes to

apply for a position to hire someone in that area. Q: How do we change the tenure status? According to accreditation, we're at the minimum of scholarship. The standard is that there has to be some inclusion. There's a limited number of publications that count for this. (J. Tarjan) A: Every department and school have their unique situation. Discuss it. It doesn't say replace current criteria; it's in addition to them. We have to make an effort to have those conversations. (A. Hegde) The Deans Council will ultimately allocate the lines to this effort. D. Boschini & C. Catota are working on an application form for the departments to complete. The details are still being worked on. (V. Harper) Suggestion: Keep timeline in mind. When a department is interviewing a candidate, the RTP criteria is shared. If a department needs to make changes to the RTP criteria, they'll need to do it before that individual comes on board. (A. Hegde) Q: Is there an accrediting body that would not support Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (JEDI) principles? (J. Millar) Regional accreditation doesn't delve into RTP guidelines. Disciplinary accreditation can have some restriction in terms of publications and types of publications, etc. It's going to be an effort when RTP guidelines are addressed in any department. We're looking for significant, permanent change, not just hiring. (V. Harper) Within our Bylaws, for accreditation purposes, if a publication is not in the list we use, faculty can make a claim to the Dean and the department chair can authorized it. (A. Hegde) Regarding changing RTP criteria, using nursing as an example, there could be a statement about culturally responsive instruction to be relatable to the community one serves. In terms of service, the department will hold discussions regarding closing the equity gap. It could be part of the department's change. It could be analyzing data to develop awareness to principles at the start of peoples' careers. They could choose to participate when they've already started their careers. (D. Boschini) When there is a change in RTP criteria, it will create more conversations in existing faculty. They may choose to engage more in DEI scholarship or teaching of service. (A. Hegde)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M. Rees moved to approve the agenda. J. Tarjan seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The March 15, 2022 Minutes were tabled until next meeting.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

a. AS Log

i. AAC (J. Tarjan)

Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – A resolution is ready to go.

Referral # 43 Course Prefixes – a draft resolution is being finalized.

ii. AS&SS (E. Correa) (absent)

iii. FAC (M. Rees)

Referral #12 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards - No matter what we do, someone is upset and it's politicized instead of celebratory.

RES 212219 implementation – The call for the formation of Task Force forthcoming. The campus will continue with Box in Fall while the software options are evaluated. The campus will pilot the selected program for a year and have training. (A. Hegde) Recommendation to Task Force: Have an alternate mechanism for granting and withdrawing permission to access Box. (J. Tarjan) Craft a memo of the issues and sent it to the Provost for his office to handle. It's a good idea to have someone in the School as a co-owner of Box. (A. Hegde)

iv. BPC (C. Lam)

Referral #38 Saturday Commencement – BPC's memo to EC in the agenda packet. Item complete.

Referral #20 UPRC Changes – The recommendations were taken to the UPRC Task Force. A resolution is ready unless AAC has input.

Other items: BPC will be making their recommendations on budget: deferred maintenance, and salary inversion.

b. Provost Update (V. Harper)

i. Cluster Hire – D. Boschini and C. Catota to attend DCLC.

ii. Tenure density – More lines outside of cluster hires are expected.

iii. Academic Affairs Conduct: The President is supportive of the proposal. The details to follow. First stop is CFA. Highlights are 1) Add case management system to Academic Affairs and Counseling. It adds a lot

more capacity to Faculty Affairs. 2) Hiring a person to support D. Boschini to get more information on a particular incident. 3) There are other ways to deal with instances of conduct. The Ombudsperson position will get increased compensation/release time. 3) Title change. D. Boschini will become the AVP Faculty Affairs and Deputy Title IX Officer. (V. Harper) The call for Ombudsperson is pending the modification from the Provost. (M. Danforth) The ASCSU is working on a resolution to advocate for Ombudsperson on every campus. It likely will produce some guidance. (M. Martinez)

- iv. Summer Compensation – General Faculty and Department Chairs (deferred)
- c. Searches (V. Harper)
 - i. AVP GRaSP
 - ii. AVP IRPA – expect an announcement in days.
 - iii. Dean BPA – outstanding candidates
 - iv. Dean Antelope Valley – completed by end of semester
 - v. Dean Library
 - vi. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies (no update)
- d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation (deferred)
- e. AB 928 (deferred)
- f. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)

- a. Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Policy Revision – It is counterproductive to drop the GWAR exam while still capping majors at 120 units. The CSUB GWAR committee is committed to have GWAR as a check of students writing ability before graduation. They generated a list of approaches they can extend toward these new rules, to be researched in depth during 2022-23. K. Flachmann to share the list of options upon request. This may be the start of conversations at the CO to get rid of GWAR. (A. Hegde) With engineering and accounting and several other majors across the system, we can't show any longer that transfer students can graduate with 60 units. Where there are ADTs in other disciplines, we may have to declare them non similar. Because of this, we may have to withdraw some of the transfer agreements. It seems very inappropriate.

- They did not talk with people involved with transfer. (J. Tarjan) We are subject to transfer agreements by law. (M. Danforth)
- b. Article 20.37 Applicant List – A California Faculty Association (CFA) representative asked the Senate Chair for the list of applicants to see if faculty of color have applied. The EC agreed that it's not appropriate to share the list of applicants. Further, it's not required.
 - c. Academic Integrity Policy – The Academic Integrity Working Group has put together a policy. See the handout in agenda, *Academic Integrity Policy*. It was referred to AAC and AS&SS to consider whether there needs to be any changes to the proposed policy. Academic integrity was the top issue for action, per General Faculty surveys. AS&SS set up a Testing Center Task Force. AS&SS members and ASI were aware of the Task Force, but some administrators were not aware that they were on the Task Force. It hasn't met. Nothing has been completed since the Task Force has not met. The Senate won't have much to present on that in the Fall. (A. Hegde)
 - d. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force (deferred)
 - e. Potential Modifications to Administrator Search & Screening Procedures (deferred)
 - f. General Faculty Meeting, Spring (deferred)
 - i. RTP rebuttal letter acknowledgement include interpretation of the substance of the letter
 - ii. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS
 - iii. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action
 - iv. URC workload as campus grows
 - g. AP Assessment Quality Feedback (deferred)
 - h. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)
 - i. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
 - ii. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1
 - iii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 - Workload
 - iv. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
 - v. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)

1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan's suggestion)
 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 3. Structure of BPC
 4. Strike "at least" (J. Tarjan's suggestion)
- vi. Committee proliferation
 - i. Dean Professional Development (deferred)
 - i. Responsiveness
 - ii. Understanding/following the Handbook
 - iii. Understanding/following the CBA
 - iv. Supporting (not undercutting) chairs
 - j. Summer Session GE courses (deferred)
 - k. Exam Modality for Flex Classes (deferred)
 - l. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee (deferred)
 - m. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (deferred)
 - n. Reconsider Time Blocks (deferred)
 - o. Investment Divestiture (deferred)
 - p. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) (deferred)
 - q. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (deferred)
 - r. Distinguished Professor Award – (handout) FAC
 - s. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
 - t. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
 - u. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING April 7, 2021**

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- President's Report – L. Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10-10:15)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

New Business

RES 212226 General Studies Review Committee Implementation

RES 212227 Levels in the Performance Review Process

RES 212228 Re-Entry Students Policy

RES 212229 Change of Department Name from Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HDCAFS)

Old Business

RES 212221 Academic Calendar – Fall Recess Schedule

RES 212223 Approval of BA in History with a Concentration in Social Science Teaching

RES 212224 Completeness of Periodic Performance Review Files

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

Search and Access Academic Policy – It was very difficult to find policy on Dropping a Course. There is no way to search through the Catalog. Dropping a Course policy is listed under the Registrar. The students must be struggling to find information, too. Is there some way we can index for commonly used sections, like course grading, adds, drops, withdrawals, etc.? (J. Tarjan) At some point we could have a conversation with IT. (A. Hegde) Name tags could be added to each header. At the top, have a table of contents that links down to each of the name tags. It's ADA compliant. (M. Danforth)

Exceptional Service Criteria for Early Award of Tenure - Based on RES 212202, would faculty who are currently in the process of early tenure be allowed to go under the criteria of only exceptional scholarship and teaching or would they all be considered under the exceptional service criteria, regardless of when they came in? EC's feedback to go to AVP FA. (A. Hegde) It needs to be uniform all schools. (M. Danforth) FAC can have a discussion too. (A. Hegde) ASCSU recognizes it that it's a systemwide issue. Look at whether the department has criteria. If the department's criteria hurt faculty when they apply for tenure, then it's on the department to fix it. When we look at early tenure, candidates should excel in all three areas. The system is likely to

advocate for departments to establish their own criteria. If service is not in the department criteria, faculty can still do it. The Provost and President will have their own criteria. (M. Martinez) It used to be just two areas had to be exceptional. Those departments that didn't address that, faculty who would go up for early tenure where there were no criteria, they couldn't get it. If they wanted to go up for early tenure, they'd have to adopt the new criteria that had it. Now, early criterion is defined in two areas, because that's what the Handbook said when they arrived. If someone is in their fourth year and they want to go up in their fifth year, and then new criteria for early tenure adopted, they have no time to make any adjustments. New faculty who come when the Handbook says "three areas", should be held to that. If a department hasn't revised their criteria, the faculty is to be held to the existing criteria. (M. Rees) It's hard to establish exceptional service as a criterion when regular service isn't generally valued. If we change it, it applies to all faculty the next go around. (J. Millar) Early tenure is not guaranteed. We're clearly saying it should be rare. If a department didn't have criteria for early tenure, they couldn't go up for early tenure. Similarly, if a department didn't have criteria for exceptional service, they wouldn't be eligible. The request is for FAC to discuss it, and then draft a memo to AVP FA. (A. Hegde)

Meet in person after Spring break – The majority of the EC in favor of meeting in person with the option of Zoom.

9. ADJOURNMENT

A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:25.