



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
JANUARY 26, 2021**

Approved 2-23-21

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

Several of the chairs from our college are very agitated and contacted me to see if the Academic Senate could do something about the decision that any class that was not approved to be taught online must be conducted in person in the fall. It is messing up with their scheduling, and it has some ethical issues in terms of who is left to come to campus. It might not be such a big problem, except all of the requests that went to Curriculog to turn courses into online format last year were backlogged. The college curriculum committee did not get to them, and they are saying they were busy with Area F. The human cry from chairs is also the curriculum committee keeps returning things for really petty reasons, like it showed the date of the exams but not what times the exams were going to be. There was a chorus of people saying, why couldn't they approve it and say "make the necessary changes" instead, they shot it back, so there is a lot of frustration.

- We will be talking with the Provost when she joins the meeting about reopening to bring this up at that point. I would be okay with extending all of that for a semester because that semester will be a transition semester. I have heard different philosophies on what it is like to have a grand reopening and what that's going to be. Part of the concern is you have faculty who have legitimate health issues, and you have some people who are happy not commuting. There is the philosophy of when we have the grand reopening, is it you go back to what it was beforehand and then have more of an online presence based on the thoughtful, deliberate idea of what works and what doesn't? Maybe even put a prompt in for departments to take that up as an agenda item, decide what the online strategy should be for the department, and the mix of courses. Some people say to start that from having as much online as we can and work our way back that way. Some say bring everybody back who physically can get back and have our campus presence that way.
- The other request that came with that was if we consider having that exemption for one more semester online, we also think about the course retirement being extended another semester.
- The department chairs need to look at it the same as we did online. If they do the same thing in a virtual environment for fall, have an online strategy online, which is asynchronous, then they have one for virtual and one in person. The faculty members that have health conditions can always go virtual or online.
- Maybe this could even be a retreat, which would be partial virtual, partial in person. Offer departments to have those conversations and move them past an individual faculty member who doesn't want to be here; therefore, all their courses need to be online, which is not how to approach it.
- It has to be from a student-centered point of view. And I would be against seniority because some of the people with the best pedagogy online are not our senior faculty.
 - But the problem is the course assignment. In a department, the course assignment usually goes by seniority.
 - No, chairs make these decisions; we have been working on this for years from the student perspective.
- There are two scheduling directives, one for part-timers and one for tenured/tenure-track faculty. For tenured/tenure-track faculty, they are all equal, but they go before part-timers. The bigger problem is there is a phrase in the contract that scheduling shall not be punitive. Trying to make someone come back that does not want to go back could interpret that as a corrective assignment.
 - They would have to make a clear argument that it was punitive and based on something else. I would not let that be an obstacle.
 - I agree because student needs drive it, and that's not punitive.

- I get that, but the union won't.
- I think it will be a bigger problem for smaller departments or departments with less flexibility because they don't have freedom. A larger department can move things around to accommodate.
- One of the big picture concerns is how do we develop campus climate again? That impacts service, equity in terms of service, and many different things in the overall student experience.
- One of the things we talked about was improving the student experience by extending virtual, which could be another positive aspect. We are also talking about a lot of services that are developed in virtual and even after hours. You can have departmental services after hours. We should look at how we can make the virtual environment a positive experience for students instead of punitive.
- We also have to be considerate of staff; it has worked fantastic in our department to have some of them not on campus every day. We break them up with a workable schedule.
- Do we need to have more conversations with chairs about how to do this? Sometimes chairs feel they want to keep faculty happy. Some chairs bend over backward to accommodate whatever faculty want. Other chairs work with the faculty to create a shared consensus that we need to approach scheduling from our students' perspective.

Suggestion:

It might be useful to have a chair's and Senate Exec meeting to and Steve talk about what we can do from a policy perspective to help move this forward, and the Provost can speak from an operations perspective to move this forward. Let the chairs bring all their concerns on moving this forward for fall to a better student experience. We can write all things down and start working on them in the spring for next fall.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Stambough) The Irvine announcement went out on Monday; I mostly received positive feedback. I received feedback from one person on whether or not the Senate should have taken a vote on closing it or not.
- (Matz) All 23 CSU campuses had a nominee for the Faculty Board of Trustee member. There are seven finalists, and we have a finalist from our campus.
- (Stambough) Sandra Rhoten will replace Bill Haddad on the Appeals Board.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/P (Walsh/Stohs) Motion to approve all three sets of minutes. Minutes were approved.

- 4.1 EC Minutes 12-1-20
- 4.2 EC Minutes 12-8-20
- 4.3 EC Minutes 12-15-20

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

- I have a meeting with ASI later, and they are having me do a presentation on both options.

VI. STAFF REPORT

- We need to get started with the General Committees (Senate nominees) for AY 2021-22 at the February 9th & 16th Exec meetings. The committee interest form will go out to faculty this week to identify the upcoming vacancies. Faculty names need to go to the AS for approval at the March 11th meeting.
- If we are making Statement of Opinions this year, they need to be ready to go to the AS for the first reading at the February 25th meeting.

VII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

- 7.1 Diversity & Inclusion Committee [Gradilla], T, 12-15-20, 1:00 - 2:00 PM, Zoom
No report submitted.
- 7.2 Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee [Walsh], W, 12-16-20, 1:00 - 2:15 PM, Zoom
No report submitted.

7.3 Writing Proficiency Committee, [Matz], F, 12-18-20, 9:00 - 11:00 AM, Zoom

No report submitted.

7.4 Faculty Affairs Committee, [Kanel], F, 12-18-20, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom

No report submitted.

Q: (Gradilla) You sent UCC the memo about the proposed unit name change for the Library, and can you tell us more?

A: (Walker) The faculty are under Technical Services, so they want to change that from Department of Technical Services to Library.

- (Dabirian) The reason it was like that is you have a department within the Library.

➤ (Walker) Students who were caught early in the semester and had engaged in academic dishonesty changed their grading basis, so they did not receive a GPA penalty. So, a student who was caught cheating and the penalty was failing the class; now, they got an NC instead of failing. They are using the changing of grading basis to get themselves out of being penalized about their GPA.

- (Walsh) We need to fix that so they cannot make a withdrawal or change of grade basis.

- (Kanel) We will be taking this up at Academic Standards Committee at our first meeting on February 19th.

Q: (Stambough) Is this urgent business for Thursday's AS meeting or the February 11th meeting?

A: (Walker) Let's draft something in Exec and do this as an urgent business item at the February 11th AS meeting.

- (Kanel) I will contact the Academic Standards Committee chair and ask her to email the committee to ponder this.

- (Walker) I think this is something that Exec can do, and I don't think we need the committee. This is a one-shot problem caused by an exception that we made as a university, and once we go back to a standard grading basis, we won't have this problem anymore.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

The Provost, Mark Filowitz, and Brent Foster joined the Exec meeting to discuss the GE Requirement proposed changes, Items 8.2 - 8.6 will be discussed at Thursday's AS meeting.

Brent did a quick PowerPoint presentation of the various options of what the deans have seen at the meeting they had with the Provost. He gave an overview of the following:

- Fall 2021 GE Program Changes: Adding Area F and reducing Area D
- The Pros and Cons of Options 1 & 2
- High Unit Majors Immediately Impacted
- Average Graduation Unit Totals (FTF) Per College
- The Tri-Fold and Beyond
- Implementation
- Other Possibilities

Q: (Walker) I understand setting a waiver; we wrote a policy, UPS 411.202, on how that is supposed to work that mirrors sort of what the Chancellor's office wants. We also included waivers; departments need to tell us what they are doing to meet those outcomes. I am wondering how we reconcile this automatic waiver with our policy? I am also a little bit confused; if we have to go to the Chancellor's office, can we send the Chancellor's office a plan that violates AB 1460? I'm concerned about our policy and how we make sure we are not adding units to people, and I want that to be clear.

A: (Stambough) From what I understand, the amendment isn't an amendment as much as it is a resolution that says the Senate encourages and approves automatic waivers for any high unit major requesting out of Area C. It is a direction from the Senate on the front end and the GE Committee to approve Area C's waiver for any demonstrated high unit major.

- (Provost) The waiver issue is an issue. If that is the option we go with and it goes to the President for signature, if it is not clear there is a path by which we know before it goes to the Chancellor's office that those waivers will be granted, he is likely in a position not to sign it.

Q: (Kanel) I am concerned about setting a precedent. If we base our unit requirements on external accrediting bodies, aren't they pretty much running our university policy? What happens if accrediting bodies continue to add more standards and then we have to reduce more GE requirements? What if the Legislature passes guidelines and demands more classes to incorporate into our policy? We have standards from our accrediting body but put in a lot of effort to ensure those standards are met in courses that exist and within university policy. We might meet three criteria in one class, and we would love to have a class or each one of the standards. We are struggling with that now. I had to create a whole module for a class and figure out a way to put that in, rather than adding another class. If everybody gets just to do this, I want to do it too. I don't want to incorporate modules into existing courses, so we don't go over; I want to add another class to make our students take more. I find this to be objectionable that we allow and permit specific majors to continue to do this. The excuse is accrediting bodies require it when other departments like ours put a lot of effort into adhering to accreditation and university policy. What happens if accrediting bodies come up to the point where there are 120 units of just pure major that you have to take to meet accreditation? So, they don't have any GE, so what does a bachelor's degree mean from Cal State Fullerton if there is no GE? How is that even a bachelor's degree?

A: (Provost) It's such a good point, and we have a lot of good points right now. 1) We have a lot of GE, we have a lot of units in our GE, and it's not clear we need that many units in our GE, 2) We don't have a way on campus to refresh the GE, we don't have a way to have critical conversations about what's in the GE, and 3) we get these things that come down for the Chancellor's office, which lead our high unit majors that have accreditation issues to say something like we can't take anymore because of accreditation and accreditation, is based on skills, not on classes. It's a lot of hard political work for faculty to sit with each other and work it out. I am committed to getting us to a better place, and we are not there right now. I am grateful to everyone doing all this work to think through.

- (Wood) As our campus has transitioned from more liberal arts to something that offers more degrees, that are applied, and that is focused on preparing people for jobs, we have suffered through that transition, and we are not in the same place. One of the consequences to our GE program is we as a campus have clung towards the more liberal arts approach; what has happened is as the Chancellor has rolled out these things like double counting, one college, the largest college, can double count across all kinds of categories. The more applied degrees do not have that opportunity, and they cannot double count in the same way, and there is less flexibility for all those other colleges. I feel there is a lot of overlap in areas of expertise, and there are more opportunities for GE than we allow. This is the differential; the ability to double count affects our colleges' graduation rates differentially. It affects the freedom students have to explore different classes, involving students who negatively affect majors.
- (Walsh) We need to put on our agendas for the future to rethink the whole GE. We have played way too many moving pieces around, and it's been driven by FTEs and local interest. We need to get a task force or the right people in the room to think about a smaller number of units that genuinely meet GE's real intent.

(Stambough) Switching to a different topic. Questions were coming from faculty and chairs about reopening, particularly what this is going to look like.

- (Walsh) The feedback I am getting from several department chairs in HSS demands that any class that has not been approved to be taught online must be conducted on the ground in the fall. What we would like to propose is that we extend for a semester the extenuating circumstances that say we are going to have courses online in the fall because that is practical, ethical. It's a better way to schedule.
- (Provost) Today is the faculty forum that I am hosting, and tomorrow is the staff forum. I met with the deans yesterday, I met with the AVPs this morning, and I was going to come to you today to say, please help us extend the special dispensation for fall; the fall needs flexibility.

This week I am working on doing a series of consultations and getting input to communicate to all faculty next week. What I have seen happening is we have been waiting for information. Each dean has a different approach to the conversations they are having with their chairs. I know the chairs have been working on the fall schedule for some time now because that is our practice; that's how the timing works. Mark and I and others have gone back and forth about maybe delaying registration. Some other campuses have delayed registration. We have decided not to, and it is confusing for students. We have gone through a lot in the past years to move registration earlier, it would be wrong probably for our social well-being, and honestly, we may not still know what we need to know for August in a month or two. By the end of February, we need to have the instructional plans, and I know the Chancellor's office will not help us. Chancellor Castro articulated again to the Board of Trustees that we would be 50 percent-plus in person as a system this morning.

Here are the things we have to deal with, 1) we do not know if we will have the vaccine available to everyone in August and 2) we have a campus that has proven itself capable of keeping people safe, we have had no incidents of classroom transmission of Covid 19. So, the foundational thing is we can plan for fall optimistically because we know we can pivot. I do not want us to prepare for fall with six feet of social distancing, maximizing our classroom capacity for the world we live in now, because we can't reverse that course. If the vaccine is distributed and we are at a place where we can make real pedagogy choices, we could have a fall we kind of want. If we don't build that now, we won't have it in that optimistic scenario. If we get to a place where the vaccine is not distributed, where there are inequities among our students and inequities among our faculty and access, we will pivot to virtual. It is against our fabric to have anything where those who have can come in person and those who have not will be at a distance; we will stick to those values. With those things in hand, I think what we do is we ask ourselves what courses should be in person for the student? Where is the pedagogical value of the courses for the student? Each department needs to ask that. Is it your senior seminar, is it your lab, is it your first-year introductory course in that sequence, is it our FYE's? What course is it? What classes are taught well, and if are they suitable for students virtually and online? Virtual is the key, and we have to be able to offer virtual courses.

What's useful for the student? You might have seen that faculty survey that about 93 percent of the 40 percent of faculty who responded feel generally competent teaching virtually. We have some things we are doing that are good for students. We have students who enjoy the virtual environment. I don't want to be a virtual campus; you don't want to be a virtual campus; that is not the idea. But for fall, when we have to have the flexibility of not knowing, let's let our guiding star here be the right modality for that course given our students, and let's trust our departments to come to those conclusions.

And the third thing is let's stretch, have some hybrid courses, and incentivize the summer with some resources to have a higher percentage of our classes where Tuesday you come in person and Thursday your students learn remotely. The stuff that is hard for them you put asynchronous, and they have access to it, and they get into it, but then you come into class, and you have discussions about it. We need to be on that campus in the future anyway, and we cannot keep building bricks and mortar in the way we have. We have to think more about when we are together and why and we are using virtual tools; our students will want it. All of that leads us to ultimately having a certain percentage in person, a certain percentage online, and a specific percentage hybrid; maybe it is 40/40/20; I don't know what it is. I don't want to be on a campus that is talking about showing me 50 percent virtual. I want to be on a campus that is articulating our core principle of being okay with multiple modalities, knowing we might have to pivot to stay safe, but launching into a fall that is exciting where we can say that our students are going to come to learn with us in the best ways we can present. And quite frankly, our faculty will show up for it. We're not going to start with which faculty wants to teach in person and which faculty want to be remote because the whole scenario depends on us having access to the vaccine. If we don't have access to the vaccine, faculty are not coming back. So, let's start with the right course modality for the student, and then let's match our faculty to that modality, with their skills, with what they bring to those courses. Let's build something that we are proud of optimistically that we can always back away from if we have to.

- (Wood) Early on in the pandemic, it was articulated that faculty could teach hybrid courses. They could break the classroom in half, teach the lecture twice on both days to half the class, and provide online content for the second day. I just want to remind everyone the faculty heard that it is doubling my workload for one class and would be perceived as a tremendous burden to faculty to do two lectures and create another days' worth of content online.

Also, I hear faculty report a lack of information and a communication gap around how they will get their vaccine. They want the campus, their employer by which they are in education. They want some guidance about how that will happen from the campus and looking anxiously for more information.

- (Provost) I am pondering how the campus can give that communication to faculty. A big part of the barrier is faculty don't have confidence they are going to be safe. They don't have faith the campus has a plan for them.

Q: (Matz) Could faculty teach from their offices and not their home offices?

A: (Provost) we intend to get faculty back in offices.

- (Filowitz) I wanted to remind you the Senate laid the groundwork for switching over without going to UPS 411.104 if the President declares an emergency. The Provost is confident that WASC will follow along, but that is a consideration. We have to remember if over 50 percent of a program or unit is virtual, it needs to be accredited through WASC.

We are also exploring the possibility of having Kaiser do vaccination on our campus, it's a way off, but we are investigating it vigorously. Testing is also something we can do now for our students, and we are looking to expand that to have anyone that comes to campus get tested if they need to at the Health Center through an appointment. That is something that requires some funding that people have committed to putting forward too. For example, you have a nurse practitioner, RN, and a few other folks to accomplish that.

The point about faculty using their offices has not escaped us, and we certainly want to push forward with that. We will run a pilot with COTA to see how the mechanics work to go, full board, when it comes to the fall.

As the Provost said, a lot depends on the availability of the vaccine. The mechanics of all this can be awkward, but I think they are doable. If everybody is willing to understand the only sure thing we know about fall, it will follow summer. We do have a timeline, and we have to get the schedule in place for the students to see in April and start registering.

- (Gradilla) One of the things we talked about last March about coming back or not coming back was around student policy issues. One of the student policy issues that doesn't exist is the faculty being able to kick out students who present a cold, a cough, or appear to be sick, making students uncomfortable because clearly, the student has something. As we look at state law as well as campus guidelines, there is nothing we could do. We can't kick out a student who appears to be sick. These are some of the things that may cause panic. I think we will need some guidelines, and I don't know if it goes up to the Chancellor's office to say students aren't comfortable with you here. I don't know if that enables civil rights issues around ADA. Still, we need clarifications around how we manage a situation where a student presents as sick and disruptive to the class.
 - (Provost) We cannot require the vaccine, and I don't know any legal team that says we can. We have to understand there will be people who are not vaccinated, and they are with us and are in person. Herd immunity is not the benchmark for coming back. Therefore, it opens up many questions about how we walk into a class, what we can and can't do in a class. I think we will have help from the Chancellor's office because all the CSU's will have a substantial in-person component, assuming there is complete vaccine access. We do with individuals in the community who are not vaccinated, which will be a question for all of us. I have every bit of faith that we will have guidance on that.
- (Kanel) Interestingly, you can't require a vaccine, but you can need a TB test and other immunizations.
 - (Provost) The reason is that the way the vaccine was put onto the market. We will require in probably 18-24 months, and we can't do it now.

8.1 PRBC New Programs Proposals

This will be added to the AS agenda for Senate approval.

8.2 Revisions to UPS 411.200 General Education Guidelines and Procedures: New and Existing Courses

8.3 Revisions to UPS 411.201 General Education: Breadth Objectives and Course Development - Proposal 1

8.4 Revisions to UPS 411.201 General Education: Breadth Objectives and Course Development - Proposal 2

8.5 Revisions to UPS 411.202 General Education Program: Unit Requirements Academic Standards - Proposal 1

8.6 Revisions to UPS 411.202 General Education Program: Unit Requirements Academic Standards - Proposal 2

8.7 Revision to UPS 100.001 Academic Senate Bylaws (High Impact Practice Committee) - *forthcoming*

IX. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Walsh) Meeting ended at 1:00 PM.