



**ACADEMIC SENATE
MARATHON MINUTES
MAY 20, 2021**

Approved 8-26-21

8:30 AM - 11:15 AM

ZOOM Meeting

Present: Badal, Barber, Barros, Biesiada, Brown, Bruce, Brusckke, Casem, Childers, Choi, Dabirian, David, Fidalgo, Filowitz, Forsgren, Ghosh, Gillespie, Gnanlet, Gradilla, Graewingholt, Jarvis, Jefferies, Kanel, Linares, Matz, Meyer, Miller, Milligan, Nair, Perez, Self, Sheehan, Shoar, Stambough, C. Thomas, E. Thomas, Valdez, Virjee, Walker, Walicki, Walsh, Wood, Wynants, Zarate

Absent: Lucas, McLain, Reneau, Woo

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stambough called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

The Senate observed a moment of silence.

In Memoriam

- Anita I. Tyra, Emeritus Professor of Accounting [died: January 21, 2021; age 94]
- Kathleen (Kathy) Walker, Emeritus Staff to the Chief of Budget, Planning, and Strategy [died: February 2, 2021; age 88]
- Ernest (Ernie) H. Dondis, Emeritus Professor of Psychology [died: April 17, 2021; age 96]

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- M/S/P (Kanel/Walsh) Motion to adopt ASD 21-84 Resolution in Support of Addressing Community Mental Health in Post-Pandemic Campus Re-Entry. Motion passed by acclamation. Senator Kanel read the resolution. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.
 - (Wood) I wanted to add that this came from a statement originating from Public Health and Human Services faculty members. It reflects the grief that some members of our campus community have experienced and acknowledges that the experience of grief is not distributed evenly across our campus. Ignoring these experiences will only make them worse. This is an effort to bring our lived experiences to light. I'm very proud and thankful to the faculty and Senate Exec members who helped work on this.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

IV. TIMES APPROXIMATE

4.1 8:45 AM Recognition of Outgoing Academic Senators 2020-2021

Senators: Michael Biesiada, Rachel David, Mark Filowitz, Kristy Forsgren, Nicole Gillespie, Adelina Gnanlet, Maria Linares, Marcia Lucas, Robert McLain, Clint-Michael Reneau, Peggy Shoar, Mark Stohs, Heejin Woo

Chair Stambough recognized the outgoing Academic Senators and thanked them for their service while serving on the Academic Senate.

Acknowledge Standing Committee Chairs 2020-2021

| | | | | | |
|-----------|------------------|---------|--|---------|--|
| ASC | Sarah Hill | FAC | Joao Barros, Co-chair Peter de Lijser, Co-chair | ISLC | John Haan |
| AEEC | Jennifer Trevitt | FDCB | Kristy Forsgren | ITC | Chuck Grieb |
| CF&B | Deepak Sharma | FRPC | Nikolas Nikolaidis | Library | Sinan Akciz |
| UCC | Fred Kinney | GE | Greg Childers | PRBC | Maria Estela Zarate |
| Diversity | Aitana Guia | Grad Ed | Penny Weismuller | SALC | Jamie Tucker |
| Elections | Henry Puente | Honors | Craig McConnell | UAC | Tara Suwinyattichaiporn |
| EIP | Jochen Burgtorf | IEC | April Bullock | Writing | Janna Kim, Co-chair Teeanna Rizkallah, Co-chair |

Chair Stambough acknowledged this year's Standing Committee Chairs and thanked them for their service to the University.

Acknowledge General Committee Chairs 2020-2021

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Faculty Personnel: Reyes Fidalgo | Professional Leaves: Timothy Green | Faculty Research: Zair Ibragimov |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Chair Stambough acknowledged this year's General Committee Chairs and thanked them for their service to the University.

Recognition of the Executive Committee Members 2020-2021

Senators: Dabirian, Gradilla, Kanel, Matz, Stohs, Walker, Walsh, Wood

Chair Stambough recognized this year's Executive Committee Members and thanked them for their service to the University.

4.2 8:50 AM**Subject: Resolutions**

- M/S/P (Wood/Kanel) Motion to adopt ASD 21-69 Resolution in Commendation of Dean Laurie Roades. Motion passed by acclamation. Senators Kanel and Wood read the resolution. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.
- M/S/P (Dabirian/Walker) Motion to adopt ASD 21-70 Resolution in Commendation of Dean Morteza Rahmatian. Motion passed by acclamation. Senator Dabirian read the resolution. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.
- M/S/P (Dabirian/Walker) Motion to adopt ASD 21-82 Resolution in Commendation of Vice President Danny Kim. Motion passed by acclamation. Senators Dabirian and Walker read the resolution. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.
 - (Virjee) When I first met Danny when I got here three and a half years ago, I was blown away by his acumen. He is a numbers savant. I've dealt with CFOs my entire career, and I've never found one as special as he is. Everything he did was student and faculty-centered. He prided himself on being an academic as much as a CFO. Every aspect of the campus was important to him. He was committed to building the future of our campus, whether it was the renovation of the library, the building of the promenade, renovations to McCarthy Hall, the baseball and softball renovations, parking structures that are going up, the new court yard, or our master plan. They are all a part of Danny's legacy. He is an amazing CFO, and he was and remains relentless with the Chancellor's Office for justice for our campus. He was tenacious for making a case for CSUF and uncompromising in the face of sometimes ignorance and denial, and I believe that when that changes, it will be in no short order of Danny's legacy. He is a Titan through and through. He is also an amazing father, husband, friend, and brother. This past year has not been easy on any of us. It has not been easy for Danny and his family. We, as his Titan family, stand with him, and we are so sad to see him go as he retires. He is brave. He is determined. He is fearless, and he is full of life and laughter in the face of this danger. It is because of that and of his faith that he will prevail. Danny, we love you.
- M/S/P (Matz/Milligan) Motion to adopt ASD 21-67 Resolution in Senator Mark Hoven Stohs Commendation. Motion passed by acclamation. Senators Matz and Milligan read the resolution. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.

4.3 10:30 AM – 10:45 AM

Subject: Executive Summary – CSUF GE Task Force Report

Presenters: Merri Lynn Casem and Janna Kim

Merri Lynn Casem and Janna Kim gave a presentation regarding the executive summary from the CSUF GE Task Force Report. The slides covered the following:

- Chancellor's Office Revised EO1100
- GE at CSUF
- Membership of the GE Task Force
- Challenges
- Retaining a Unique "CSUF-Stamp"
- Navigation Major Changes to Our Curriculum without getting Stuck
- Addressing fiscal Concerns and Potential Impact
- Recommendations
- Explore Core: Multidisciplinary Courses
- Explore Core: Logistics

Q&A:

Q: (Sheehan) I just think this is such an exciting interdisciplinary way for students to learn and approach some of these lifelong learning issues. I guess you're right that this kind of belongs in Area E. I'm concerned because my college, the College of Communications, is not represented in this pilot program. Is there a way to get my college involved at this very late stage in any of these pilot courses that you've lined up?

A: (Casem) With the GI 2025 funding and the FEID funding we had, we held an open house for folks to come together and have discussions. It was a campus-wide invitation, and so the absence of representation was not an exclusion, but more likely than not, everybody could attend at that time. This is again where I would turn to our Provost to consider ways to continue to create opportunities, some of which perhaps would be incentivized, for curricular development. Still, there's such potential for all kinds of interactions and connections. The fact that you're not in this set does not mean that you could not ever be. We would love to have every college and all kinds of exciting combinations represented, so it's just having time and space to do the work. Please participate; that'd be lovely.

Q: (Sheehan) There's no way to get onto one of these pilot courses, though, that are in the works already?

A: (Casem) I think that could be a conversation. We could certainly put you in touch with other folks.

- (Kim) I also think that with these courses still being in the process of going through course approval, it wouldn't be wrong to have a conversation right now with the current teams and see if there is interest. Again, I think part of it is sometimes a particular department might need to withdraw for a semester or two, and then another department could step in. So, yes, we can help facilitate those conversations.

Q: (Kanel) Do each of the faculty who teach here, do they get counted as a three-unit course load even though they're not teaching the entire class?

A: (Casem) Yes. For the example that Janna shared, the migrant lives with three co-instructors; there are three modules. I will teach my module three times to three different sets of students, so the cross-listing piece is the idea that there would be essentially three sections of this course. Ultimately, I'm teaching every week of the semester. Still, the benefit or the bonus is I'm teaching the same unit of instruction three times in the semester just to different students.

(Childers) If possible, I would encourage you to look beyond Area E and maybe even go into the upper-division and look at Area B5. Area E has many courses in that area already, and B5 is an area that needs courses right now. Also, stepping back and looking at the larger picture, I know one of the concerns from 2017 that we had unlimited double-counting was this idea of breath. That students would be looking at courses within their major. We have four years of data now, and the evidence just isn't there that students are explicitly looking in their major. The GE Committee has been in contact with those in advising, and they report that they're seeing the students are still very much interested in using GE to explore their interests. Students are exploring course offerings outside of their majors; just keep that in mind that we may not want to solve a problem that does not exist.

(Thomas) That was an excellent presentation, and I'm a full partner and agree that this is the moment for us to do this. We will be voluntold the following change to our GE, and we're just too strong as a community of faculty that care about our students, and we really can have collegial conversations about things that are hard. We took the time and had the disagreements and the challenging moments to say this is the format that our students need to discern how they think, what they want to pursue, and what they need to know for their future. I'm inspired by the approach where we can think about collaboration. We can think about true exploration and understand that our students are primarily uncertain, even when they're declared majors, and about how knowledge can lead to their future.

(Virjee) I want to emphasize something on this issue since we first heard this report, and it's just as good this time as it was the first time. The legislature continues to meddle to the extent that we allow them to do so and are reflective or are passive on this shame on us. As we speak, there are assembly bills in Sacramento dealing with general education both at the community college level and at the CSU level, and if we sit back, not only will the Chancellor's Office continue to engage in activity that limits and cabins us in GE but so will the legislature. There is no better university, no better faculty senate, no better set of faculty leaders, no better set of academic leaders to lead on this than on our campus, and we should seize the moment.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/P (Walsh/Kanel) Motion to approve ASD 21-61 Academic Senate Minutes 4-22-21 and ASD 21-72 Academic Senate Minutes 5-6-21. Minutes approved by acclamation.

- 5.1 ASD 21-61 Academic Senate Minutes 4-22-21 (Draft)
- 5.2 ASD 21-72 Academic Senate Minutes 5-6-21 (Draft)

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar approved by acclamation.

- 6.1 ASD 21-81 PRBC New Program Proposals – Spring 2021
- 6.2 ASD 21-73 Revision to UPS 100.001 – Academic Senate Bylaws (waives first reading)

VII. CHAIR'S REPORT

[2-page report](#)

VIII. PROVOST REPORT

I am producing an email to send to Academic Affairs that will have some updates on travel and travel restrictions in place of a report. I just wanted to say thank you all. I have thoroughly enjoyed this first year of serving as your Provost and sincerely appreciated the help of so many of you as I've tried to navigate this new culture and develop new relationships.

I'm looking forward to working with you in person.

IX. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE REPORT

[4-page report](#)

X. ASI REPORT

No report.

XI. CFA REPORT

[7-page report](#)

XII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

12.1 Q & A Fiscal State of the University

Chair Stambough continued the Q & A segment of the Fiscal State of the University from the previous Senate meeting and opened up the floor for questions.

Q: (E. Thomas) I'm asking a question on behalf of all four College of Communications representatives. Can you speak to whether it may be time to examine SFRs especially given our concerns about the budget model and how they link to academic quality and structural misogyny and racism?

A: (Virjee) Thank you for the question. I think it is more rhetorical than anything else. I think the issues of your budget and your student-faculty ratios reside with first your dean. This is a conversation for you to be having with your dean and then your Provost. This doesn't change the fact that we all have a strong commitment on our campus to examining, acknowledging, and rooting out systemic racism and institutional discrimination. If institutional discrimination harms people of color, then that is something that we need to pay close attention to. I am not intimately familiar with your college's budget or even the budget within Academic Affairs, so that's where I would suggest that you start.

Q: (Walsh) The thing I'm concerned about and wonder if you have any insight into the Chancellor's Office thinking is that there's a vast disparity between the low enrolled campuses and those of us that are not low enrolled. What is the review regarding making those campuses whole or rewarding those of us who've kept our enrollments up?

A: (Virjee) That's a great question, and it's one that we have been raising with the Chancellor's Office. It's a double whammy for us because if you look at how campuses are funded from the Chancellor's Office, they're supported on a target enrollment basis. The money we get stateside, separate from tuition, comes based upon the projected FTEs. We get dollars per target for our students, and when we're overenrolled, we don't get additional funding for those students. So, the overall amount that we have for students is less than if we were on our target, and there's no recognition for that. That's one way in which this is an inequity that needs attention. The second, which is less obvious and perhaps less transparent, is for campuses that are enrolled, they also get their state funding based upon target enrollment. So, they are getting more dollars per student because they're registered, and we are getting fewer dollars per student because we're over-enrolled. This is part of the reason that Cal State Fullerton is the lowest funded CSU on an FTEs basis.

There are a couple of answers to how we would deal with that. The first is we could not be over-enrolled. The problem with that is we're the only CSU in Orange County, which may sound like not a big deal, but as I tell people all the time, there are five in LA County. There are five in the Bay Area. There are three in the Central Valley. There are two in San Diego, and there's one in Orange County, the sixth-largest county by population in the country. We believe in access for students, so we stretch as far as possible to provide that access. We push as far as we can to provide access for students with whom we've got a social compact as a state that if you do the right thing, you can go to a University, go to a four-year university, and that's what Cal State Fullerton is. So we extend ourselves beyond our target enrollment to accept as many students as we can and still live within our size, means, budget, etc. Reducing our enrollment is one way of dealing with this issue, but I don't think it's equitable for our campus. Re-examining the targets and recognizing that our target was provided to Cal State Fullerton at a different time and place and should be re-examined as are the targets for all other CSUs under-enrolled, for example, and re-allocating or re-assessing that I think is the right thing to do. It's what we've been suggesting ought to be happening when we're talking to the CSU about this issue.

That's one way in which we can approach that issue. Another is as enrollment is granted to us by the state, now there's no money for additional registration this year, but when there is additional enrollment, if you have universities that are over-enrolled for a reason like we are, then maybe you ought to emphasize giving the additional enrollment to those campuses where there is the demand for it and not automatically giving it to those campuses that are under-enrolled. There is also work that's being done to help encourage and increase enrollment to those campuses that are under-enrolled. Right now is important because things change in the economy, and those happen to be our campuses in Northern California. Still, those are destination campuses, and it's a lot harder for students who might go to a four-year university to go there if they're replace-bound like many of our students are.

Part of this is also strategic enrollment management we are dedicated to; Carolyn and I talked about since the day she got here. The Academic Senate has been talking about, and we all have been talking about how we strategically enroll at Cal State Fullerton. And a commitment with the Chancellor's Office for revised strategic enrollment for the entire CSU system. I recognize, and I'm pushing, and it's something I think is beginning to be recognized at the Chancellor's Office.

Q: (Casem) In general, given the news we have for the May revise, what are some of the things you see as potential changes and positive outcomes?

A: (Virjee) As I said when we last met, I don't want to count those chickens right before we get them because this is the May revise and if you read the LA Times today, the discussion at the legislature is that our governor is overly optimistic with the actual size of the surplus. The Legislative Analyst Office has said that the surplus is about half the size of what the governor has suggested because the other half of it is already encumbered for commitments. How this all works out is to be seen.

That said, I'm a lot more optimistic today than I was two weeks ago, and we will be able to use those resources to better leverage the campus when those resources come. The first of the things we're doing is pushing at the legislative level and with the governor not to take their foot off the throttle. We're asking for more one-time money for deferred maintenance, etc., on the campuses.

Then when it comes to the Chancellor's Office, to push fairly straightforwardly and openly for our campuses' fair share and reward good behavior.

We're making sure we talk about if we have great success with GI 2025, which we are in the green as we talked about for all areas. That shouldn't mean that you don't give us resources, and you provide resources for those campuses that are have fallen behind because you're then just not rewarding us for the work we do. It's like what we did with tenure density. We were told to increase tenure density, and we did and then gave money to campuses that didn't increase tenure density. I don't want to call it bad behavior, but we don't want to reward bad behavior. We want to reward good behavior. So, we'll be pushing on those fronts as well, and the more we can get the legislature and the Chancellor's Office to give us one-time money for what I would call one-time expenses, deferred maintenance, and investment in our laboratories and our spaces, the more that frees up baseline money that's coming to actually to use for ongoing expenses like additional tenure lines, additional benefits, additional compensation. I know we have to stop and wait because CFA and all the unions are in the mid-beginning of negotiations. As you saw, we need to make sure we have the funds to pay for whatever agreement is reached. What we don't want to do is expend a bunch of funds and then find out that the Chancellor's Office imposes an obligation on us to pay something that they negotiated that we don't have the resources for. The good news is that we're getting money, but there are lots of complications. I'm delighted we got a new CFO. Ron Coley will be terrific, and he's working with Danny as we speak, and I think there's good stuff to come together as we all do this together.

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

13.1 ASD 21-74 Revisions to UPS 300.000 - Student Rights and Responsibilities

M/S/P (Fidalgo/Shoar) Motion to approve ASD 21-74 Revisions to UPS 300.000 - Student Rights and Responsibilities. Motion passed as amended.

- (Casem) Line 121: Add the language "staff, and other students." considered friendly.
 - M/S/P (Casem/Walsh) Line 147: add the following sentence at the end. "Students have the responsibility to familiarize themselves with grading standards and expectations as set forth by faculty." Motion passed as amended by acclamation.
 - (Jarvis) add the wording "for their courses" to the end. Considered friendly.
 - (Kanel) We should make this additional sentence letter b in this section. Considered friendly.
 - M/S/P (Bruce/Wynants) Line 172: change should to shall. Motion passed as amended by acclamation.
 - (Bruschke) change the language so that it reads "Students shall have the opportunity to participate". Considered friendly.
 - M/S/P (Gradilla/Casem) Line 174: add the sentence "Participation is defined as direct involvement or through supporting representational forms of participation such as ASI". Motion passed by acclamation.
 - (Bruce) Line 179: delete "be" and add "remain" so that the sentence reads, "Students who serve on university committees shall remain fully informed about their duties and relevant issues. Considered friendly.
 - (Bruce) Line 273: change "withdrawals" to "withdraws" in both places. Considered friendly.
 - (Bruce) Line 429: add the word "for" before "opposing discrimination." Considered friendly.
 - (Childers) Line 237: add a comma after instructors. Considered friendly.
 - (Kanel) change all "must" throughout the document to "shall." Considered friendly.
 - (Jarvis) remove all unnecessary capitalization throughout section 10 of the document. Considered friendly.

Back to the main motion

13.2 ASD 21-75 Revisions to UPS 210.002 - Tenure and Promotion

M/S/P (Barros/Kanel) Motion to approve ASD 21-75 Revisions to UPS 210.002 - Tenure and Promotion. Motion passed as amended.

➤ M/S/P (Fidalgo/Kanel) Line 714: change "Affairs" to "Personnel". Motion passed.

Q: (Walker) The reason this was written this way is because the Faculty Personnel Committee is set to implement the standards to make a judgment on folks, and the Faculty Affairs Committee changed this to be the Faculty Affairs Committee so that those who implemented the standards were different from those who evaluated the criteria. The issue here is that there's only one department in the library, and I think that may be the same issue for counseling faculty, so changing that as the CPRSC for library faculty to in that role changes what that sentence means. It implies that a college could technically have no committee, and then the Faculty Personnel Committee or Faculty Affairs Committee would have to evaluate that. I think removing the library faculty and the addition of the absence of a CPRSC are the two issues. I'd like to hear from the committee as to why that was changed.

A: (Barros) I think it was a concern about workload for the faculty personnel committee, and that's the reason why we kind of moved away

A: (Kanel) There's not going to be that many standards that the FPC would have to look at. If it's just one or two here and there, I don't believe that's a significant workload. Tell me if I'm wrong. The FPC would appreciate that because they want the standards to be so clear and clean that they can make appropriate evaluations.

- (Jarvis) Line 351: change "quantified" to "evaluated." Considered friendly.
- (Bruce) Line 282: add "effective LMS pages" to rows 1, 2, 5, and 6. Considered friendly.

Q: (Nair) There used to be a section which said scholarly and creative is the second most important. Is that still going to be the case, or is scholarly and creative going to be treated on par with service?

A: (Kanel) The reason we changed it and say that teaching is preeminent is that we're a teaching university. One of the things that we were trying to do is keeping an eye on equity issues and diversity and inclusion. Some of the research has shown that some of our faculty of color and women are more prone to doing more service, mentoring, and being available. And what that does is unfair bias. It gives them an unfair workload, and we felt that service should be equal. It should not be this kind of throwaway category for people. This is not about diminishing research but about elevating service.

Back to the main motion

13.3 ASD 21-83 Revisions to UPS 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturers

M/S/P (Kanel/Walker) Motion to approve ASD 21-83 Revisions to 210.070 - Evaluation of Lecturers. Motion passed as amended by acclamation.

- (Bruce) Line 246: add "effective LMS pages" to rows 1 and 2. Considered friendly.

13.4 ASD 21-76 Revisions to UPS 100.700 - Formation and Review of Campus Centers and Institutes

M/S/P (Walker/Casem) Motion to approve ASD 21-76 Revisions to UPS 100.700 - Formation and Review of Campus Centers and Institutes. Motion passed by acclamation.

Q: (Fidalgo) I just want to understand the reason for these changes.

A: (Walker) My impression was that many folks on campus didn't feel that the Assessment Office was the appropriate place for the centers and institutes to be evaluated. So that is why these are moving to the Research and Sponsored Projects Office and the Faculty Research Committee.

13.5 ASD 21-80 Revisions to UPS 106.000 - Campus Selection Committee for Conferring the Honorary Degree

M/S/P (Kanel/Walsh) Motion to approve ASD 21-80 Revisions to UPS 106.000 - Campus Selection Committee for Conferring the Honorary Degree. Motion passed by acclamation.

13.6 ASD 21-77 Revisions to UPS 261.000 - Faculty Emeritus Status

M/S/P (Matz/Fidalgo) Motion to approve ASD 21-77 Revisions to UPS 261.000 - Faculty Emeritus Status. Motion passed.

Q: (Bruce) I would like to hear some rationale for why we would exclude full-time lecturers from this status?

A: (Fidalgo) They're not. It's at the end of the document starting at line 81.

- (Walker) Do we need to strike tenured on line 17? Or refer to the end of the document to indicate that lecturers are included?
- (Jarvis) I wonder if we might consider passing what we have and then instructing the committee to revisit it with an eye towards that egalitarianism throughout it. I recommend that we proceed because I see tenured appears in a few other places.
- (Stambough) So passing this would allow for a process that works, and the committee could do a little wordsmithing and rearranging to make sure it's the proper signal.

➤ M/S/P (Brown/Fidalgo) Motion to call to question. Motion passed by acclamation.

The Executive Committee agreed to have the Executive Committee look at this UPS again in consultation with the Emeriti Association over the summer.

Back to the main motion

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Fidalgo) Meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.