



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 3, 2020**

Approved 12-8-20

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

ZOOM Meeting

Present: Dabirian, Gradilla, Kanel, Matz, Stambough, Stohs, Walker, Walsh, Wood

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-chair Walsh called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

I know it is important to have critical voices, diverse arguments, and it's so important to have in our meetings. My concern is when we have respected and valuable, Senators are taking too much time with their comments. Some of the comments are redundant, and some of them are going into personal statements. That can be very helpful in understanding people, especially people we have known for a long time, but for other people, if it goes on too long, they are hesitant to say their voice because it has gone on too long, and I think it can discourage some people from their voices. I think a fair resolution for that is to have maybe a two-minute limit and if people want to continue, allow them to get on the second time speakers list, so that way we are hearing everyone. We are not dismissing or silencing them, but we are keeping with the main points. We could run a more efficient meeting if we have some kind of time limit on the speakers.

- It would also make it easier to call the question.
- We have tried through the years a lot of things and talked about a lot of things. The simplest thing to do would be to adopt the Statewide Senate's rules, a limited number of speakers for and a limited number of speakers against. There has been a lot of resistance to that; our Senate's culture has been let people talk. Doing something would be great, but the Senate has to want it.

Q: How would that be implemented? Would we have to change the Bylaws, or would it be a vote on the floor for the year, or is it a procedural change? At the Statewide Senate, I'm pretty sure it is not in the Bylaws to have three speakers for each side; it is practice. So, if we are going to change the practice, we need to do it carefully.

A: The body adopts the rules.

Q: Would it be any different to what we have established now with saying if you want to get on the speaker's list, you have to do it chat? Would it be kind of the same standard?

A: This would be more serious. We are doing that speaker's list change primarily for technical reasons. I think it would require discussion among the members.

Q: If we got a majority to favor time limits, then it would work. Do we have to do it every year, or if we do it once, does it become practice and we don't worry about it after that?

A: I would suggest before we bring it to the Senate floor for a vote that we informally find out if the body is in favor of it or not.

- We might want to think about the purpose of limiting conversation and duration and what we want to accomplish by doing that. If it's to keep one or two people from talking all the time, then is the cost to that the price we might pay in keeping people quiet. If our purpose is to ensure we have time to get our business done, then there might be other ways, not necessarily limiting time, but other ways we might structure the debate so that it moves along.
- If an academic cannot make their point in two minutes, we have a problem. Most can make their point in two minutes, and if they can't, they need to think through their comments and make it in two minutes. Suppose we frame this to the body to get all voices heard, so other people have an opportunity to speak without one or two people dominating. In that case, I think that is an easier sell than saying we are trying to squash voices or only limit it to three on either side. I think people want to be heard, but people have got to be a little bit more concise in their comments.
- For almost all topics, two minutes is enough, but some topics do take time to provide context and explain, so whatever we do, we should keep that in mind.

- We should also make sure people speak to, speak against, or make a motion, not do all three.
- We should think about this and maybe bring it up at our next Exec meeting.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(Walker) Faculty Affairs Committee and Diversity & Inclusion Committee met and discussed revising UPS 210.001 after the first reading, the workflow is all set, and everybody is good to go.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4.1 EC Minutes 10-20-20 - *forthcoming*

4.2 EC Minutes 10-27-20 - *forthcoming*

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

I think the Provost will be interested in our thoughts on CR/NC because it is moving relatively quickly.

(Walsh) Several of us have weighed in as opposed to the idea of extending CR/NC. If anyone wants to speak in favor of it, I would like to offer that opportunity.

- (Wood) I have concerns about students taking the immediately relieving approach and later hurting themselves. I would say the only thing in favor of it is if we could somehow find a solution for students who haven't used the option yet, put some cap on the number of courses or semesters where they use it.

Q: (Walsh) What about the issue of extending the deadline on withdrawals?

A: (Kanel) I would be ok with that.

Q: (Stohs) Do we know what the deadline is right now? Have we passed it already?

A: (Walker) The deadline is November 13.

Q: (Kanel) Are we going to do it again next semester? That's the point people were making about the CR/NC. If we do it this semester, then we have to do it again next semester; that's why people were saying they didn't want to do the CR/NC, because when does it ever end? Is there a difference between that reasoning of CR/NC and allowing the extension of withdrawals?

- (Wood) I know it's problematic for budgets, and I know we will have a challenge with shifting the culture back one day.

VI. PROVOST REPORT – 12:30 PM

CR/NC:

I know that students have reached out to Chair Stambough and President Virjee. The Daily Titan has contacted me, and I am working on a response today. I know this is a topic system-wide, so as I have touched base with some folks, Chair Stambough, Mark Filowitz, Karyn Scissum Gunn, Su Swarat, and the Provosts at Northridge, Pomona, San Jose State, and Long Beach. My inclination is not to extend the CR/NC, but I want to do the community's right thing. All those Provost, all those campuses, none of them intend to extend the CR/NC. I know there are at least three campuses San Francisco State, Fresno, and Humboldt, that have already said they will extend the CR/NC.

When I look at it, there are three things: 1) the eligibility issues that come up around financial aid benefits, veterans benefits, and athletics, 2) there is a course that we want our students to have a future, and some of them will want to go to grad school, and grades are important and cater to things they might not predict they might wish to later, and 3) the question of when will it end? We know we had this pivot in March, and that was the unexplainable, unexpected thing. I have used that rationale in thinking through the SOQs, and it makes sense to think about it this way if we were to extend CR/NC, and then we come back, fall will not be 100 percent in person, there will be a significant virtual element to fall. We could end up with transfer students who were here almost the entire two years and never had a grade. They could make that choice for themselves to not have a grade.

I asked Su Swarat to take a look at the data, and she reminded me that last Spring, roughly 8.3 percent of students before they chose the CR/NC, the GPAs were already higher than they were in the previous Spring. Of course, another jump from that, but even the baseline conditions our students were in was not one of poor academic performance.

I incline to look to faculty governance and say what you want to do. Wearing my Provost hat, I have to say whatever we do, it is precedence, making it difficult for us down the road to do anything differently if we were a one-time decision right now.

- (Walsh) We've been discussing this via email, and we had a little discussion before you got here today, and the majority of us are not in favor of extending CR/NC. But as an offering of generosity, we are thinking of extending the deadline for students choosing to withdrawal from a class to perhaps right after the Thanksgiving break. Hence, they know how they are doing, and they still have a chance to make up any work they have missed because of Covid.
- (Kanel) As the liaison of the Academic Standards Committee, I spoke with the chair of the committee, and she was pretty adamant that in the spirit of collegial governance, we do need to listen to the students and at least let the committee discuss the feedback she has received from students and faculty. I was opposed to it, but she felt very strongly that you have to let the committee discuss it and see what they have to say about it, then she could report to the Executive Committee.
- (Provost) The longer it takes for us to decide, the harder it will be for our students. Do they need a fast decision? Is it better for this to run slow?
- (Walsh) They need to know, and the sooner they know, the better. Michele had another thought in our discussion earlier that is worth considering. Perhaps we could offer CR/NC one semester limit so students who do not take it in Spring and are sinking this fall may decide this is the semester I will do CR/NC.
- (Kanel) There is also the option of taking an incomplete. If they have done enough course work up to this point, something happens now, preventing them from finishing in the right way. Maybe they can finish it within the next year. They have a whole year to complete an incomplete. They need to be educated about the use of an incomplete.
- (Wood) If the argument is we don't want students to have too many classes with no grades, and maybe it's a unit max, perhaps it's a semester max. We could explore and find a way to give some relief while limiting the number of CR/NC courses.
- (Provost) When I talked with Karyn and Mark, their experience last time trying to implement the CR/NC, it wasn't easy because of how our systems are set up to do this. My guess would be if we tried to go with something like if you never took CR/NC last time and want to use it this time, you can use it, that would be something we could say, and then the people would go try to make that happen. Our systems are so localized, so distributed, and so imperfect in data that I think maybe extend the withdrawal deadline because that's clear and that is for everybody and that is the empathy point and not go to any kind of unique CR/NC for people who did not use it.
- (Matz) Last semester, they could choose what classes they wanted, CR/NC, so if we offer another semester, would there only be how many courses they could choose? That might get complicated, trying to figure out how many classes they took CR//NC. And are we going to set a limit on that?
- (Walker) On the ground, trying to implement the CR/NC is challenging because of the credit definition. Credit is C- or higher, and credit for most majors is generally C or higher, and for four categories of GE, it's C or higher, so there is so much complication with this.
- (Wood) I think messaging is essential, and we are going to have to be careful. I think how we explain the decision is going to matter. The difference is we started this semester knowing what we are getting into, and students signed up knowing what they were getting into. So, it was a little different from last semester, and I think we need to pay a lot of careful attention to how we explain it so that students feel that they are being listened to and cared about.
- (Gradilla) I would like to see us do something much more embedded, more permanent. I imagine with Covid; there may be another evacuation two or three years down the road. I don't think no one is going to be happy with developing something quick and immediate. I believe this has revealed some weaknesses that we know have been there in terms of advising. Advising tends to be so clinical and transactional without thinking about the workload. If a student is taking a capstone, that is a different workload than taking the intro class. At the main level and the GE advising, this whole crisis reveals a weak spot in our advising, and I think we need to think about reinforcing that. I don't know if it's at the Provost level or the dean's level. There needs to be some spring note as students are enrolling in classes, and we can stick it in the Titan Online saying, please be aware we are returning to normal on academic policies and list their options. We need to be directing the students so they can get better information about the choices they are making. A small percentage of students are at the 18-unit level and 21-unit level, and I would like to see some permanent practices we could use in these instances.

- (Provost) I would work on a joint statement that will come from Steve and me on your behalf that contextualizes this and is written with the right communication style of the ways that students could be supported now and the decision not to extend CR/NC.

Q: (Kanel) When were you planning to write this?

A: (Provost) If we could get something out by Friday, that would be wise. We should all be aware that sending out a message to our students, regardless of how well it is written, will not be the end of this.

Fall Planning:

I would like to give you a slight revision of what we discussed last time for the fall plan. I was having some conversations about the idea on how we would 1) survey faculty, 2) have the reentry leadership team think about fall scenarios, and 3) have a forum, and some chairs gave me a swift education that they need right now to have a scenario or two that they can be running for fall. I would like to make a quick edit and see what you think. I think I should be letting the deans and chairs know that right now, they should be running two scenarios for fall. We would have 1/3 in person and 2/3 virtual, and one is that we would have 50 percent in person and 50 percent virtual. This does not mean we have decided. It means I know chairs have to work with their faculty to start coming up with some plans, and telling them nothing is not helpful. If we do that and tell them that they can be working on that with their college's timing, then I think we should also have a couple of forums, and I think we should survey our faculty. I think we are surveying our faculty about their experiences, feedback, and ways we could improve. We are not surveying our faculty to ask them what they think the plan should be for teaching. As chairs, you probably would know that having all your faculty decide they want a particular way of teaching in a survey and now you have to deliver it will create dissatisfaction on all sides.

To be clear, I would like to let the deans and chairs know they can run a couple of scenarios, and then I would like us to survey the faculty about climate experience lessons learned since we know we still are part virtual probably in fall. Then I would like us to have some forums in late November or early December, then back again so I can get in a space with faculty with you, and we are talking about what is coming. We don't know what we are going to do in February, but we have to be making some plans to make the best decision possible.

Q: Does this sound like a reasonable plan to have the chairs work on a couple of scenarios at this point?

A: (Stohs) Good to work on scenarios.

Q: (Stohs) Are you saying Fall 2021?

A: (Provost) Yes.

Q: (Stohs) Do we know anything about summer?

A: (Provost) That's a separate conversation. I will talk with you about that.

Q: (Provost) Any caution you want to throw me?

- (Gradilla) In terms of helping faculty come back, I think it would be good to have the university have your understanding of what it is to be healthy enough to go back to campus so that we can take something and have our doctors or health care providers verify you are indeed safe enough to go back. Not so much anything legalistic, but in terms of that core faculty who in their 40's or 50's to know what is it we need to be in terms of our health status to be able to come back safely. That will help families decide in terms of if they would rather stay online.
- (Walker) If we told people to plan as if we will be on campus, even though we know we probably won't, because it is easier walk that back then try and schedule a bunch of classes when we already made them virtual.

VII. STAFF REPORT

- We received seven applications for the Outstanding Lecturer Award.
- We received eight nominations for the L. Donald Shields Excellence in Scholarship & Creativity Award. The applications are due December 11, 2020.
- We will have a special election because the faculty member representing Social Sciences on the Faculty Personnel Committee stepped down, and we have to fill that vacancy. We are hoping to find someone from ARTS so that vacancy could be included in the special election. We need names of faculty to serve to reach out to them. We want to have the names on the November 12 AS agenda for Senate approval.

- From the doodle poll I sent out with dates for the Provost's Faculty Forum, everyone who completed it said you were available on both dates. Please hold January 26th & 27th on your calendars until the Provost office sends out the forum's official date.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

- 8.1 Campus Beautification Committee [Dabirian], F, 10-30-20, 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom
- Minutes approved.
 - Mo Sami brought detail about the changes to CDC and sharing them with the committee
 - Emil reported website the safety and guideline for campus COVID safety
 - VP Oseguera joined the meeting to talk about Indigenous group involvement and how we can support land recognition via CF&B
 - Construction report
- 8.2 Planning, Resource & Budget Committee [Walker], F, 10-30-20, 1:00 - 2:30 PM, Zoom
Report submitted.
- 8.3 Graduate Education Committee [Wood], F, 10-30-20, 2:00 - 4:00 PM, Zoom
- AVP Frey: GVAR – There is an update from the CO that is anticipated in the Spring that will impact our UPS 320.020, III.B. We will need to move EWP out of our policy, and students may need to take an additional course. Filowitz/Wood recommended that the Chair update the Writing Proficiency Committee and make suggestions for updating the UPS. The goal is to make the requirement more understandable and do this in concert with the WP committee.
 - AVP Frey: Graduate Student Success is planning to conduct a comprehensive Grad Student Survey, perhaps an exit survey focusing on barriers and needs.
 - AVP Frey: Curriculog Writing Status Form – For undergrad classes, new course proposals are separate from writing certification proposals. Do we want to follow this approach in Grad Ed? This approach could make things easier and more precise and has helped move undergrad courses through Curriculog more quickly. Weismuller will work with Frey to consider options/impacts.
 - Civil Engineering EGCE 551 – Review of Graduate Writing Requirement. Syllabus review: The committee recommended friendly suggestions about the numbering of student outcomes and the schedule; some members felt the new language about the writing requirement was sufficient. Some wanted more details; Motion to approve the course as meeting the Graduate Writing Requirement: Approved 5/1.
 - Edits to UPS 410.200 – Edits presented for review at a subsequent meeting. No further edits. Motion to submit to Senate Exec: Approved without dissent.
- 8.4 Student Academic Life Committee [Stohs], T, 11-3-20, 9:00 - 10:00 AM, Zoom
- Presentation by CAPS (Naji Shtayyeh) – a basic overview of services and student issues.
 - UPS 300.000 next time (December).

IX. NEW BUSINESS

- 9.1 Revisions to UPS 430.000 Campus Process for Projecting a New Degree to the University's Academic Master Plan
- Q: (Walsh) Would this apply retroactively? H&SS did a pilot project that's an online degree program, and they got a waiver from the Chancellor's office to have a pilot for two years. In year two of the two-year pilot, will it have to go through this process if they wanted to make it a degree program?
- A: (Gradilla) Check with Brent Foster.
- That is This document will be added to the November 12 AS agenda.
- 9.2 Program Discontinuance – Fall 2020
- This document will be added to the November 12 AS agenda.

9.3 CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

1. LJB to Presidents feedback on CSU General Education Executive Order
2. CSU General Education Breadth Requirements Draft - EO Revised 10-8-20
3. Form - Feedback on the Executive Order on CSU General Education Breadth

Exec had no additional comments from what Chair Stambough sent out.

(Stambough) Update from the General Education Advisory Committee, it sounds like they will be bound by a lot of the restrictions and some of the law's contradictions. Everybody is recognizing all the resolutions coming from campuses. The majority of campuses have sent resolutions asking for everything to be pushed back. Within the law, it is going to be hard to do that. I think we will end up with something very similar to what we had at the beginning. There are not going to be a ton of changes to the memo.

At that point, it gets us to what we need to do next. One of the things from the GE Committee is that we will have to streamline or waive some of the processes to get the course approvals into the right categories and get them in quickly, accelerate when a course can move into the class and put into the catalog. We are going to have probably to do things by the December meeting, maybe by the last January meeting, but that would be pushing it.

Everybody recognizes the frustrations and contradictions with it, but it doesn't seem like a lot they can do, and it's because of the hardline of AB 1440 combined with the way AB 1460 was written.

Q: (Walsh) Since the new Chancellor doesn't start until January, it doesn't seem like he will weigh in on this.

A: (Stambough) Probably not. I think he would Chancellor White to handle all of this.

Q: (Walsh) I assuming the UCC and the GE Committee will be working heavily on this? It appears despite the resolutions, we are going ahead with an Area F and follow the guidelines of the Chancellor's office because there is no other alternative.

A: (Stambough) Correct. This means we have to figure out our two different choices outside of GE graduation requirements versus moving into Area C.

X. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Walker/Matz) Meeting ended at 12:55 PM.