



**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 23, 2021**

Approved 3-23-21

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 11:35 AM.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- There is a statement that recommends people take the Covid-19 vaccine when they get the opportunity to do so. I'm going to put it in the chat. The Provost wasn't comfortable with it coming from the university level because she felt it would appear to be racist, potentially if folks didn't have access to it at the same time. The statement's idea is to get increasing demands, but I know it's complicated, and there is resistance to vaccines in our community. If this is useful to you in any way, and you want some arguments for vaccines, it's here as a resource. We will try and send it out through our college; we will talk about it anyway. I'm just sharing the document with you.

- If it can't be sent from a campus level, perhaps the Senate could send something out.
- There can be a resolution on the Senate floor.
- I know our political environment is interesting here in Orange County. I am supposed to work with VP Oseguera on maybe something for the students, but I don't know what will be possible. I will think about how to share with the Senate.

- We received revisions to UPS 300.164 Posthumous Degree and Recognition from the Academic Standards Committee. The revisions deal with tightening the posthumous degree policy and creating a new option. The main focus is that students who passed away in good standing after completing 75 percent of the units are eligible for a posthumous degree. For those who are not, there would be a creation of a new certificate. This was coming up in our old policy, and this one too, there is an exception.

The committee's instructions were, take a look at what's going on, see if we can handle this type of situation. One model was anybody who completed a semester was eligible for it. They ended up coming up with a different model, the 75 percent and having this idea of a certificate for those who aren't. There is still the exception part.

- A posthumous degree is an Executive Order, so whatever we do, it has to align with that.
- This is huge for people who are the first in their family to attend college and pass away.
- I think student deaths are pretty rare, and I think being able to give this recognition is very good for the families and is also suitable for our campus. If I was going to error on what side, I would error on being more generous. I also think that a certificate of completion sounds a little bit like a participation award; I don't have an excellent reaction to the language used. For graduate students, I am concerned about the 75 percent marker. Our master students in a two-year program typically have completed all of their coursework at the end of semester three, and they are doing all the other, tying it all up. We had a student who passed away during semester three, she got through just about everything, but technically she doesn't meet that threshold. For the graduate students, I think after that first year in summer, that's a compelling case, and I don't see what we have to lose by distinguishing between a certificate of completion and a degree. It's rare, and the impact is potentially so favorable for the family's grief and our university's relationship.

- Fundamentally this action is about the closure, and we have to position that first. I think we can consider this a different type of degree to have a Cal State Fullerton Degree and a Posthumous Degree. Those degrees aren't competing, and this will not go on a cv or a resume. This person is not going to get a job or claiming they have a degree. I think we have to disentangle. I would like to see something that offers closure to the families. There are kinds of things that universities can do because we are public citizens. And we forget that CSU Fullerton is also a citizen in the community. This degree is going to go on a parent's wall, not somebody's office.
- To distinguish between a degree and a certificate seems to undermine what we are trying to do. We have an opportunity for kindness and empathy and the goodwill that it will present. It's our opportunity to give back to a family. It's the end of the life of the student, but we could have it extend longer with giving that degree. If they can't make it to commencement, maybe we could deliver it to their home.
- We should talk to the bookstore to give them a cap and gown along with a posthumous degree and a frame for their wall. This could have such a significant impact on the community.
- This document could be substantially shorter because the guidelines are the same. We could say guidelines for awarding a posthumous degree with two paragraphs, one with the path for an undergrad degree and one for a grad degree, and delete the redundancy. What everyone struggles with on this is what does substantial portion of the requirement for graduation means.
- I would prefer to complete one year at Cal State Fullerton; then there's no distinction between first-year students and transfers; it would just be the one semester or one year.

Suggestion:

Have Senate Chair talk with President to see how he feels.

We will continue the discussion on this document next week and will invite Sarah Hill, the chair of Academic Standards Committee chair to come next week

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M/S/P (Matz/Walker) Motion to approve EC Minutes 1-26-21. Minutes approved.

- 4.1 EC Minutes 1-26-21
- 4.2 EC Minutes 2-2-21 - *forthcoming*
- 4.3 EC Minutes 2-9-21 - *forthcoming*
- 4.4 EC Minutes 2-16-21 - *forthcoming*

V. CHAIR'S REPORT

No report.

VI. STAFF REPORT

- There needs to be a decision if there are going to be Statements of Opinion this year. If so, we need to get them done today to go on a revised AS Agenda for Thursday's AS meeting.
- If you have not completed the Doodle poll to meet with the CBD Dean Search Candidates, please complete it so the results can be sent to the Provost Office. If you have already completed the poll, you can release the March 10th date; that date is no longer needed.

VII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

7.1 Diversity & Inclusion Committee [Gradilla], T, 2-16-21, 1:00 - 2:00 PM, Zoom

No report submitted.

7.2 Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee [Walsh], W, 2-17-21, 1:00 - 2:15 PM, Zoom

- I called to order at 1:03 without a quorum.
- Minutes for December approved by acclamation.

- Su Swarat gave a presentation on how the assessment of programs operates at CSUF. There were a few questions about why the assessment was not done of individual courses. Su explained the rationale behind tying evaluation of learning goals to the degrees.
- At the end of her presentation, one member suggested that he see templates for assessment. Another indicated that departments standardize the assessment process. Other members explained the difficulties of getting an agreement to do so.
- Su noted that the CSUF culture values privacy; she mentioned that all professors' SOQs were public at her previous institution. She was surprised to come to CSUF, where there was such an adverse reaction to sharing department assessments publicly. Nonetheless, the CSUF culture is resistant to a standard, open assessment process. The discussion continued past 2:05 while I and several others had to leave for other commitments/meetings.

7.3 Writing Proficiency Committee [Walsh], F, 2-19-21, 9:00 - 11:00 AM, Zoom

- The meeting opened with a quorum and considered three student petitions. Two were seeking credit for a 2-unit Nursing course from CUSLB. The committee has previously approved for another student. There was a lengthy discussion about consistency and about the extreme variation in content from the CSULB courses. Most agreed it did not meet our UWR. To be consistent, however, the committee voted to approve these two nursing petitions, tell Nursing that there will be no further approvals for a 2-unit course after this semester.
- The CSUCI petition for a sociology student was approved. The CSUCI petition for a psych student was rejected for having too few written assignments.
- The committee reviewed the work of the subcommittee on revisions to UPS 320.020. Their purpose of revisions is to remove racial inequities. Much discussion about "standard" American English and how much additional teaching should be required on changing contexts of language and dialects. Some agreed that the emphasis on "Englishes" should be in the assessment of student work, not in a requirement that faculty teach about the evolution of English idioms, grammar, and dialects.
- The meeting adjourned at 10:50, and the subcommittee convened.
- The subcommittee will continue to revise based on the discussion today.

7.4 Faculty Affairs Committee [Kanel], F, 2-19-21, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM, Zoom

- FAC met today with total attendance.
- We discussed meeting with D And I, definitions of terms, not entirely done yet with this part of the document related to recruitment and hiring, still in process.
- Discussed service in 210.002, and the place of service-learning/internship duties, not double counting, incentivizing. I didn't have a chance to make any revisions to this.
- Discussed the need for CAPS to write up something to be included in UPS 210.002 about CAPS. Kanel will work with them to write up something to be included in the UPS 210. 002 Deadline March 19th.
- Also discussed library DPS to include language in ups 210 as well. They are still working on changes. A big issue in getting these done is the lack of understanding about how documents are revised/ processes in terms of approval by various levels.
- Should have library document by next week.
- Evaluation of lecturers 210.070 discussed, changes to peer observations were revised, the definition of the evaluation was revised, a few minor changes to clarify time frames, and that it is electronic, that DPRC includes at least two tenured faculty members, clarified evaluation of lecturers for fall and spring issue, explained when lecturers shall apply for range elevation, included in the revision was a statement about not overusing SOQ scores in evaluations, but to look at them in the context of other evidence. Evidence-based practices and guidelines, should faculty be penalized for incomplete files?
- 210.080 will be looked at next meeting, March 5th, regarding observations, some debate about whether there should be a consultation process after the observation.
- Plan to wrap up both 210.070 and 210.080 by March 5th to send to Exec.

7.5 Academic Standards Committee [Kanel], F, 2-19-21, 1:00 - 2:00 PM, Zoom.

No report submitted.

VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8.1 General Committee Senate Nominees

Exec continued working on filling general committee vacancies. An email will be sent out to faculty asking them to serve. Once we receive an acceptance, the faculty member's name will be added to the consent calendar for Senate approval to be added to the all-university election ballot as the Senate Nominee. These committees need to be finalized and on the AS agenda by the March 11th meeting for Senate approval.

8.2 Statements of Opinion

Exec worked on questions, pros, and cons.

- (Stambough) Sean and I will write up the questions to be added to the February 25th AS agenda for a first reading.

8.3 GE Task Force (restart)

- (Stambough) We will put this off and devote some more time. I will put together a time to discuss what we want this to be, whether it's a task force or whatever process we want, and what we want it to look at. The Provost is talking with the deans. When they are done, and when we are done, we will all come together and figure out what we need to do.

8.4 Revisions to UPS 210.002 - Tenure and Promotion Personnel Standards

- (Stambough) Waiting to hear back from Faculty Affairs Committee on the revisions based on the Internships & Service Learning Committee.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

9.1 Revisions to UPS 411.101 Policy on Courses: Numbering and Requisites, Standard Codes, and Controlled Entry

1. LJB to Provosts - Update to Federal Definition of the Student Credit Hour

- (Walker) Why are we defining something that we don't have to define in a policy that we will have to rewrite everytime they redefine it?
- (Dabirian) Define what CSU credit hour is before sending the document to the Senate floor.
- (Walker) Add language to say "the CSUF credit-hour definition in the Catalog", the document needs to tell us where to find it.
- (Dabirian) Let the committee chair know we are adding the language "the CSUF credit-hour definition in the Catalog" to the document, and if he doesn't object, then we can make the change and send the document to the Senate for approval.
- (Stambough) I will let Fred know about the change, and then we will add this to the AS Agenda for the March 11th AS meeting.

9.2 New Course Proposals - Spring 2021

This will be added to the AS agenda for Thursday's meeting.

X. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Wood) Meeting ended at 12:45 PM.