



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
MARCH 26, 2019**

Approved 4-16-19

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Brusckhe, Dabirian, Fitch, Gradilla, Perez, Powers, Rodriguez Shahi, Stohs

Absent: Stambough

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stohs called the meeting to order at 11:35 am.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Stohs) There is a Master Plan Committee meeting on April 4th, 9:00 -11:00 am in SGMH 3230. I have been invited but I will be out of town, can anyone cover that meeting for me?
 - (Gradilla) Ask Scott Hewitt to attend.
 - (Brusckhe) I can attend if no one else is available. I do like the idea of having Scott Hewitt attend as a former AS chair. Email me the meeting information.
 - (Dabirian) I would feel better if a current member of Exec can attend the meeting. If I am in town I could go if you can't make it Jon, but I would prefer for you to go because you were at the open forum.
- (Dabirian) To follow up on Jon's email regarding Duo Authentication. Duo Authentication is supposed to do Duo Authentication in a public setting when you are using wireless, it will not do it from your office. Some of the rules we are putting on in Duo Authentication is what the Chancellor's office is doing across all campuses. When you do it from your machine, any device you only have to do it once within 24 hours if you check the "don't ask me again" box.

Q: (Brusckhe) For lecturers, that is all they do, what about when they go into the classrooms?

A: (Dabirian) When you go to the classrooms, you have to do it.

- (Fitch) I think this is going to severely effect faculty communicating with students for a while if not for a long while.
 - (Dabirian) What is the problem? Once you log into Duo and get it right it is not that bad because it uses your device.
 - (Fitch) What if you don't have your device with you? This means you have to take two devices with you everywhere you travel in the world? People are just going to ignore CSUF emails.
 - (Brusckhe) My concern is if your phone goes offline for a while, and if you had the foresight to have everything set up in advance there is a work around. But if you lose your phone and you didn't have everything set up in advance, that is a really black hole.
 - (Dabirian) One of the things is we can give you a fob device that you can use for five years without any problems. You press the button on the fob and it will give you the code to login.
 - (Stohs) Is this required, do we have to do this?
 - (Dabirian) Yes, this is a requirement that is from the Chancellor's office throughout all the campuses.
 - (Brusckhe) Do you have to roll it out during finals week?
 - (Powers) Is there any chance you can delay it until early June? Here is why, I understand my role as the chair with 52 lecturers some of whom never come to campus, I will have to help each and every one of them understand why we are going to do this and I feel overwhelmed.

- (Dabirian) How we roll it out is up to us. If the training is not working out, if the approach doesn't work out, or if the timing doesn't work out, we can work on that. But ultimately we have to do this.

IV. TIMES APPROXIMATE

11:45 AM - 12:00 PM

Kristin Stang to Discuss Revisions to UPS 102.001 - Faculty Development Center (FDC)

Kristin came to answer questions Exec had regarding changes the committee made to UPS 102.001.

Q: (Stohs) We wanted to understand the rationale better, was there an issue we were trying to resolve?

A: (Stang) This has been a labor of love for a couple of years. They were sent the document to update, and it did not get out of committee last year, so they continued and revisited it this year and finally got it out of committee. A lot of it was updating and moving things around to have them in the right spot.

I thought the key change you were going to ask me about was the issue of who was able to serve. What I said on the Floor as ex-officio, was I think it is an important thing for the Senate to consider that it does not necessarily have to be a tenured faculty member. That's probably what I find is the biggest change, the rest of it is a lot of reorganization. The group talked about it for a while, over multiple sessions, at the system-wide level many of the leading FDC Directors are actually out of the full-time lecturer ranks, with terminal degree and the right kind of specs. At the current moment Kimberly McGruder who is the Chancellor's office person who oversees all of the Faculty Development Centers was out of the lecturer rank.

So Erica's point was if Senate wants to consider a wider pool of potential people to lead the work in more of an 8:00 am - 5:00 pm five day a week job that might widen the pool. We have some very talented folks in our sister campuses who are doing really good work nationally as well as on their campuses that came out of lecturer ranks.

- (Dabirian) We talked about the fact this person would be in charge of RTP, training of the RTP, involved with a lot of tenured faculty and professional development for tenured faculty, as well as lecturers.

Q: (Powers) For me personally, my first instinct is to keep it tenured. Have we seen it be a problem yet? Do we have too small of a pool?

A: (Stang) We have small pools of people willing to do 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

Q: (Stohs) To broaden Katherine's questions, how many other positions like that are there on campus? I'm thinking for example of the Honors Director that has always been a tenured person.

A: (Stang) OET both people were full-time lecturers. This is one of those times it's a true shared governance. The group talked about it for a long time and they felt they could see both ways having some benefit and wanted another set of eyes to think about it.

Q: (Rodriguez) In regards to the discussion that occurred around this issue and also whatever is going on elsewhere at sister campuses in the system, is one of the issues being raised about whether lecturers or part-time faculty perspectives or whatever their needs not being address by FDC. Was that part of the conversation?

A: (Stang) It was not part of the conversation in FDC. It just happens to be that some of our really strong high quality folks are, like that person that happens to be at Cal State LA, who partnered with POD and AAC&U to do an actual huge document about how do we validate and measure outcomes in FDC work. I don't think this would be a deal breaker if you were to send it back to committee and say you want it to stay tenured or preferred tenured.

Q: (Perez) Are they all doctorate holders?

A: (Stang) Usually its terminal degree.

- (Perez) Aside from the issue of who is qualified to be the director, you are saying it is kind of a wash to argue you have to be tenured because you have to have gone through the experience of the evaluations that you are overseeing the logistics of.
- (Dabirian) When you look at tenured you have excellent teaching, excellent scholar activity, and service that proves you have all three. If you didn't do that you cannot understand what our comprehensive understanding of what faculty needs to have. So they might have a great FDC center that focuses on teaching but may not be a FDC that looks across all three pillars. I would rather have a smaller pool and have the right person.

- (Rodriguez) There has always been discussion about the role of FDC and the shape of its work and if I think about where we are moving as a campus, it might be more beneficial to both the role and the center if the person was tenured. I think historically the role of the Center maybe a little different on this campus than other campuses where their structure may be different in terms of other types of support or lack of support.
- (Dabirian) Maybe we can say a proven record of all three teaching, scholar activity, and service.

Q: (Stohs) Is the Director full-time in the Center?

A: (Stang) Yes, it's a full-time appointment.

- (Bruschke) The language in lines 20-22 and line 26 need some wordsmithing. It seems unusual all the other things are really broad but those lines are specific.

(Stohs) We will have to talk about this more here and then figure out what to do.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 EC Minutes (Draft) 3-12-19

M/S/P (Dabirian/Shahi) Minutes were passed unanimously.

5.2 EC Minutes (Draft) 3-19-19

M/S/P (Dabirian/Shahi) Minutes were passed unanimously.

VI. CHAIR'S REPORT

- We have been discussing the IRA fees and one of the questions was now that Jessica Stern is an associate dean is it appropriate for her to stay on the committee. There are only two meetings left of the year, is that a problem for her to stay on the committee?
 - (Gradilla) We did the same thing for Sean Walker, we set precedence and we can follow precedence for Jessica.
- There is Student Fee Advisory Committee that meets once a month and they are scheduled to have a meeting on April 5th, which is the Friday during Spring Break. At that meeting they will be discussing the IRA fees. I sent an email to the person coordinating the meetings suggesting them to move the meeting.
 - (Dabirian) I would suggest you send something to VP Eanes also.
- Today I have three interviews for the AVP of Central Development and cannot go to ASI, so Amir will attend part of that meeting for me unless someone else can attend.
 - (Perez) I can attend the ASI meeting.

VII. STAFF REPORT

The election for CSUF Statewide Senator ends Thursday, March 28th at 4:00 pm.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 ASI Board [Stohs], T, 3-19-19, 1:15 - 3:45 PM, TSU Legislative Chambers

No report submitted.

8.2 Diversity & Inclusion Committee [Gradilla], T, 3-19-19, 1:00 - 2:00 PM, PLS-260C

- We primarily discussed the role for D&I with the Strategic Plan. The committee realized its charge according to the By-laws is bigger than faculty issues. Hence they selected extra areas relating to diversity and students.
- They continued to work on UPS 210.001.

8.3 Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee [Bruschke], W, 3-20-19, 1:00 - 2:15 PM, MH-141

No report submitted.

8.4 Planning, Resource & Budget Committee [Rodriguez], F, 3-22-19, 1:00 - 2:30 PM, CP-1060

No report submitted.

8.5 General Education Committee [Fitch], F, 3-22-19, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, MH-141

- PORT 301 approved for GE C3 (Old C4) with minor revisions. [This is the last of the new GE courses the committee received for this semester.]
- The committee discussed advice to College Curriculum Committees when they receive new course proposals that will ultimately go to GE. One of the most important suggestions was to recommend that it would be good for College Curriculum Committees to advise faculty proposing new courses to consult with other departments at the new course proposal level,
- The rest of the meeting was spent discussing different members' reactions to the GE retreat. The main issues discussed were the Title V (American Institutions and Values) requirement, the standardization of GE across the system, the undermining of the study of scientific reasoning in the GETF report, the possibility of different kinds of funding models, and the issue of DFW rates in GE classes, some of which are very high. The committee also discussed different ways of meeting GE objectives and models of how the campus might better find out how students view GE. Finally the committee discussed the need for support for curricular innovation and the need to incentivize being proactive instead of reactive in developing new GE ideas.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9.1 Strategic Plan

1. Strategic Plan Spreadsheet

This will be added into the AS Bylaws. We will work on the wording to have it ready for the April 11th AS meeting.

9.2 Resolution on Arboretum

We will remove this from the agenda for now.

X. NEW BUSINESS

10.1 New Course Proposals - Spring 2019

This will go on the April 11th AS agenda.

10.2 Revisions to UPS 100.001 - Academic Senate Bylaws

We will have this as a first reading at the April 11th AS agenda. We can make the suggestions regarding the hand/roll call voting and possible the electronic voting at that meeting.

10.3 Revisions to UPS 300.004 - Policy on Syllabi: Course Outlines

This document will go on the April 11th AS agenda.

10.4 New UPS 210.XXX - Nepotism & Conflict of Interest in Employment

➤ (Bruschke) My question is on lines 57-60, it include the phrase "...withdraw from debate, voting, or other decisions making process..." and that seems broad enough that it could include policy discussion. Is there a way to clarify the language so it doesn't include policy debates or discussions about UPS documents?

➤ (Dabirian) There is a Chancellor's office Nepotism Policy, can we just adopt that?

Q: Is there an EO?

A: I think there is an EO or a Code of Memorandum that talks directly about nepotism. I would ask HR if we adopt the CSU Nepotism Policy, do we need to go beyond that?

We will continue discussion on this document at the next Exec meeting.

10.5 Revisions to UPS 300.022 - Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes at CSUF

10.6 Revisions to UPS 320.020 - University Writing Requirements

10.7 End of Semester Recognition Ceremonies (could we make them on Fridays so that students don't have to miss classes during the last three weeks of semester and lose points)

10.8 Commencement - Senate Chair's Role

10.9 CSUF AS Library Committee ECC Resolution

10.10 CSUF AS Library Committee ORCID Resolution

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Perez) Meeting adjourned at 12:52 PM.