

California State University, San Bernardino

**CSUSB ScholarWorks**

---

CSUSB Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

---

3-14-2023

## Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes (3/14/2023)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate>

---

### Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes (3/14/2023)" (2023). *CSUSB Faculty Senate records*. 371.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/371>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Arthur E. Nelson University Archives at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in CSUSB Faculty Senate records by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO**  
**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

<https://csusb.zoom.us/j/84761794289>

**M I N U T E S**

Tuesday, March 14, 2023 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Claudia Davis, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Jordan Fullam, Thomas Girshin, Ann Johnson, Tiffany Jones, Karen Kolehmainen, Rafik Mohamed, Tomás Morales

Members Not Present: Mark Groen, Beth Steffel

Guest Presenters Present: Michael Casadonte, Bradford Owen, Sam Sudhakar

1. Call to Order (2:02 PM)
2. Approval of FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes February 28, 2023 (TBA forthcoming)
  - 2.1. The minutes will be available for the March 21, 2023 meeting.
3. Appointments
  - 3.1. ATI Steering Committee - 1 Position, At-Large (2023-2026)
    - 3.1.1. [Rob Ray](#)
      - 3.1.1.1. Rob Ray was appointed to the committee. The Faculty Senate Office will notify the appointee.
  - 3.2. Committee for Centers and Institutes - 1 Position, CSBS (2023-2025)
    - 3.2.1. [John Reitzel](#), **CSBS**
      - 3.2.1.1. John Reitzel was appointed to the committee. The Faculty Senate Office will notify the appointee.
4. President's Report
  - 4.1. President Morales shared that the men's basketball team won the division championship against Point Loma Nazarene University. The team will head to Indiana for the national championship tournament.
  - 4.2. President Morales mentioned that we are currently in women's history month and there are numerous activities taking place. President Morales encouraged faculty to participate.

- 4.3. President Morales mentioned the Veteran Success Center and Air Force ROTC program volunteered to provide assistance to the mountain regions.
  - 4.4. President Morales mentioned that PDC hosted a gala in support of the hospitality management program.
  - 4.5. President Morales shared that there are three finalists for the chief of police search. President Morales encouraged faculty to consider attending the open forums to provide input on the search.
  - 4.6. President Morales mentioned that Sharon Pierce (Jack H. Brown College) was recognized as Faculty Academic Advisor of the year. She will be one of five faculty members recognized for their outstanding service to students.
5. Provost's Report
- 5.1. Provost Mohamed mentioned how truly surprised Sharon Pierce was.
  - 5.2. Provost Mohamed mentioned that last week was CSU Advocacy Day in Sacramento. Representatives from CSU's met with elected officials who represent parts of our service area. The meeting went well. The representatives were sympathetic, supportive, and very direct about the current budget forecast. The Governor has agreed to honor "the compact".
  - 5.3. Provost Mohamed mentioned that several calls have gone out to solicit feedback on the strategic plan. The survey closes on March 15, 2023.
  - 5.4. Provost Mohamed discussed the challenges and issues mountain community members are facing. Even though the snow has begun to melt, conditions are still bad. Provost Mohamed asked if students need additional support, faculty should consider extending that courtesy.
  - 5.5. Provost Mohamed provided an update on the PDC AVP search committee. PDC staff and faculty requested a strong presence on the recruitment committee. They put forward a list of five names of people who they want to serve on the committee: Ruth Howell- Academic Advising, Gilbert Trevino- ITS, Cecile Dahlquist- Nurse Practitioner, Oscar Fonseca- Career Center, and Avi Rodriguez- Interim Assistant Dean. The committee would be evenly split between faculty and staff. Provost Mohamed asked for the EC's approval to move forward with the proposed committee structure.
  - 5.6. Provost Mohamed mentioned that the FAM stipulates the number of committee members, as long as faculty remain the majority of voting members. The chair of the committee does not vote. PDC staff and faculty requested placement on the committee and Provost Mohamed would like to honor that. Provost Mohamed would like the committee to consist of five faculty members

and five staff members. This is a relatively unique situation as the PDC dean does not operate as a normal dean, thus it merits consideration.

- 5.7. President Morales asked what is the possibility of the EC assigning a member to the committee.
- 5.8. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that CNS has already sent out a call.
- 5.9. President Morales mentioned his only concern is to expedite the search, so the committee has someone by the end of the academic year.
- 5.10. Vice Chair Jones mentioned the CNS rep on the committee stepped down. There are currently only four faculty members who have been appointed, however they are in the process of putting out an urgent call for the committee. If only one person shows interest, they will get the position. If there is more than one, it would require a vote.
- 5.11. Chair Davis mentioned that because of the unique entity in which it is structured, she would not have an issue with the proposed representation.
- 5.12. Vice Chair Jones mentioned that PDC is very unique and connected to their community. It makes sense to have staff representatives.
- 5.13. The EC was unanimously in support of having additional staff members on the PDC AVP recruitment committee because of the uniqueness of the campus.
- 5.14. Chair Davis mentioned she watched the strategic planning video and also received feedback regarding 1) the language implies faculty are staff and staff are faculty and they are considered employees; some faculty stated the term employees diminishes their role as a faculty member. 2) the outcomes for faculty and staff should be separate because they both have different metrics and it is hard to delineate when they are lumped together. Chair Davis asked if there can be something regarding tenure density as this was included in the previous strategic plan.
- 5.15. Provost Mohamed mentioned more specific outcomes can be included (that are more quantifiable). Provost Mohamed encouraged the EC to complete the survey, so the input is received.
- 5.16. President Morales mentioned that the idea that faculty are diminished by being lumped with staff is unbelievable. The amount of money this institution has spent on faculty development doesn't come close to what is spent on staff development. We are all considered employees.
- 5.17. Senator Girshin mentioned that the question about employees came up in the strategic planning meetings. That is something the strategic planning committee is looking for feedback on. If that feedback is seen multiple times, it may be considered.

- 5.18. Chair Davis mentioned there are differing outcomes for faculty and staff as they should not be combined. The faculty outcomes should be clear. Chair Davis encourages everyone to complete the survey.
- 5.19. Senator Kolehmainen would like to encourage “faculty and staff” instead of “employees”.
- 5.20. President Morales mentioned he does not see an issue using “faculty and staff”.

6. [Chair's Report](#)

7. [FAC Report](#)

- 7.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned the FAC is working on two policies, one regarding lecturer evaluation, the other awards. The FAC wants to consult with the individuals affected by the policies before bringing them forward.
- 7.2. Senator Kolehmainen also mentioned the RPT policy was a first read item at the last senate meeting. There will be few minor changes made before the second reading.

8. [EPRC Report](#)

- 8.1. FAM 105.4 “Guidelines for the Formation and Review of Institutes and Centers”
  - 8.1.1. [With Markup](#)
  - 8.1.2. [Without Markup](#)
    - 8.1.2.1. Senator Fullam mentioned he had the opportunity to share background information on distance learning both with the EC and FS. The EPRC is now working on revisions.
    - 8.1.2.2. Senator Fullam mentioned the Credit for Prior Learning policy had a first reading. Kelly Campbell has facilitated a process to get feedback from key stakeholders on campus.
    - 8.1.2.3. Senator Fullam mentioned Bryan Haddock reviewed the previously approved FAM 105.4 and found some formatting errors, which have been corrected. This requires approval from the EC, faculty senate and then the President’s signature. Senator Fullam motioned for a second reading at the next FS meeting. Vice Chair Jones seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. [Statewide/ASCSU \(Academic Senate of the CSU\) Senators’ Report](#)

10. Old Business

- 10.1. [FAM 035.3 University Level Awards](#) (Refer to FAC)
  - 10.1.1. Chair Davis mentioned she shared the policy with FAC chair Karen Kolehmainen and awaits their recommendations.
- 10.2. Election Updates (Vice Chair Tiffany Jones)
  - 10.2.1. Vice Chair Jones provided an update on numerous searches. An urgent call for the PDC AVP committee was sent.
  - 10.2.2. The recruitment committee for the AVP of Faculty Affairs and Development has been filled. The individuals selected were: Matthew Poole (CAL), Nicole Klimow (COE), Sara Callori (CNS), Deirdre Lanesskog (CSBS), and Taewong Yang (JHBC).
  - 10.2.3. The committee for the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs was finalized as well. The individuals selected were: Kristi Papailler (CAL), Jacqueline Romano (COE), Amanda Rymal (CNS), Ryan Keating (CSBS), and Monty Van Wart (JHBC).
  - 10.2.4. Vice Chair Jones shared that a call for the AVP for the College of Extended and Global Education (CEGE) was put out. Some colleges expressed more interest than others.
  - 10.2.5. Vice Chair Jones mentioned the call for next year's vacancies should be out by next week.
  - 10.2.6. Provost Mohamed mentioned there may be some indifference about serving on the committee for the CEGE recruitment. Only two colleges have degree programs through CEGE, JHBC and CSBS.
  - 10.2.7. Vice Chair Jones shared that nothing has been received from CAL, COE or JHBC thus far for the search committee.
  - 10.2.8. Chair Davis requested the names be added to the committee book.

**3:00PM Time Certain (if preceding times have not been completed)**

**11. [Campus-Wide Appointment Scheduling System](#)**

Sam Sudhakar, Vice President for ITS and Chief Information Officer  
Michael Casadonte, Director of Digital Transformation  
Bradford Owen, Interim AVP Faculty Development and Chief Academic Technologies Officer

- 11.1. Chair Davis introduced this topic as an email she received from ITS about the implementation of Conex ED and request for a faculty representative. Chair Davis questioned whether shared governance was included in the selection and

decision-making process for this product and invited ITS for further understanding.

- 11.2. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned that feedback from students indicated they used several different platforms to make appointments. The goal is to look for a single point solution. The consultation process kicked off in June 2022. Several vendors were considered. ConexEd was unanimously selected. Throughout the process, the faculty senate was kept apprised through ITS reports submitted to the senate. Several faculty members along with students and staff across the University were involved in the process.
- 11.3. Vice Chair Jones asked if ConexEd will only be used for scheduling or other services as well.
- 11.4. Guest Sam Sudhakar answered yes, only for scheduling.
- 11.5. Chair Davis stated that the monthly ITS reports are informational items. Where is the shared governance in choosing this product? Is it just for staff appointments or faculty as well?
- 11.6. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned that the consultation process involved several faculty members. About eight or nine were active in the consultation and selection process. They looked at a comprehensive list of solutions and selected ConexEd. It is primarily for departments that serve students such as advising, tutoring, and the writing center. It does not preclude faculty from using it.
- 11.7. Chair Davis stated that there were no actionable items that the faculty senate took a part of. Providing info does not mean the faculty senate was consulted. Chair Davis asked if faculty have the choice to opt in to the program?
- 11.8. Guest Sam Sudhakar stated that faculty are not mandated to use ConexEd. It is primarily for student support departments to schedule appointments with students. That is the primary area that is being focused on, at the moment.
- 11.9. Chair Davis echoed "at the moment".
- 11.10. Guest Sam Sudhakar answered yes.
- 11.11. President Morales mentioned CSUSB may be the only CSU campus that receives reports from the President and Provost each month. It is a part of shared governance. President Morales asked Guest Sam Sudhakar if he ever received feedback from the faculty senate meeting.
- 11.12. Guest Sam Sudhakar answered he did not receive feedback.
- 11.13. President Morales stated he does not receive feedback either. President Morales asked how many times information about the process was included in the reports.
- 11.14. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned they were included from February 2022 through March 2023.

- 11.15. Chair Davis asked President Morales if there was a question.
- 11.16. President Morales mentioned that if there was concern from the senate about the process, one would think that over a six-month period, there would be feedback from senators. Faculty participated in the process. We are responding to a need and asked Same to clarify. The faculty senate were informed and not kept in the dark.
- 11.17. Guest Brad Owen mentioned he was speaking for himself and that he was sorry to be blunt, however, he was surprised by the email from the senate chair that shared governance was violated. He was surprised by the tone; it was like “stop you’re violating shared governance”. Guest Brad Owen asked where the boundaries for ITS are. Does EC want oversight. We should set boundaries. One thing that can arise from this interaction is where exactly are the boundaries with the faculty senate. ITS makes decisions on several products. Does the faculty senate want input on all these?
- 11.18. Chair Davis informed Guest Brad Owen she wants to give others the chance to speak but will circle back to address him.
- 11.19. Provost Mohamed mentioned this is a student facing adoption for interaction with administrative offices. While he is all in favor of shared governance, this does not fall under that umbrella. It is an ITS adoption. It is different from something like Canvas that affects how faculty teaches. In his view, it was acceptable because it is a student facing tool. This is about how students communicate with departments.
- 11.20. Senator Girshin stated that it was not clear in the original email that ConexEd was only student-facing as the writing centers were also mentioned. Senator Girshin asked if the directors of the writing centers were part of the evaluation process.
- 11.21. Senator Sam Sudhakar answered yes.
- 11.22. Senator Girshin mentioned there is a concern on campus about the cost of some of these technologies. There are some technologies that are underutilized. What is the cost of ConexEd? Is there an opportunity to do a more comprehensive review about costs and benefits?
- 11.23. Guest Sam Sudhakar stated that the cost is \$100,000 per year. In terms of evaluating software, ITS does that constantly. ITS is constantly seeing where to cut costs. If a software is not useful, it is discontinued. Every dollar spent is carefully evaluated in terms of what value it brings to the campus community and the outcomes it produces.
- 11.24. Senator Girshin asked about the status of Campus Labs and Portfolio.



- 11.25. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned that Portfolio was not renewed after the first year. Campus Labs is currently being used by several areas on campus. It is an institution wide assessment tool used by strategic planning and has a large footprint on campus.
- 11.26. Vice Chair Jones mentioned there is a burnout by faculty and staff about having to learn new systems consistently. In terms of faculty consultation, do we know which faculty was consulted? Were they through committees that were appointed through the faculty senate or were they individual faculty members? Who was involved in this? Were department chairs included?
- 11.27. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned that they did not ask the senate to appoint faculty members. He is willing to send a list of names of those involved.
- 11.28. Guest Michael Casadonte mentioned that Carolyn McAllister was involved.
- 11.29. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned Mike Chao and Kim Cousins were also consulted.
- 11.30. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that a potential reason why some faculty members were upset is because they were under the impression faculty had to use it. Also, a student could schedule an advising meeting and faculty would have to block out time or a student could schedule a meeting during a faculty class time, creating additional workload for faculty to block out time to meet student needs.
- 11.31. Guest Sam Sudhakar mentioned that from the beginning, it was a student-facing initiative.
- 11.32. Chair Davis asked will faculty have any responsibility with ConexEd now or in the future. Do we have the option to use it or not?
- 11.33. Guest Sam Sudhakar answered yes. However, faculty are welcome to use it.
- 11.34. In response to Guest Brad Owen's earlier statement, Chair Davis mentioned that she has a responsibility as chair of the faculty senate to ensure there is shared governance and mentioned that if Guest Brad Owen was uncomfortable, there is nothing she can say, and she will question each and every item that questions shared governance. This product is a touch point for students, and we were asked about faculty representation. However, if faculty will be required to interact with the platform, then faculty should have been included in the decision making. Chair Davis mentioned that faculty must have a voice on issues that pertain to the university and faculty.
- 11.35. Guest Brad Owen stated that the initial email sent by ITS was misleading as it did not mention ConexEd being a student facing app and thus walked back some of his earlier outrage. Guest Brad Owen mentioned he appreciates and

values Chair Davis's role. This is a helpful opportunity to define what kind of things the faculty senate should give input on.

- 11.36. Provost Mohamed mentioned he has seen many conflicts arise over shared governance. He understands mixed message can cause misunderstandings. To help avoid that, it might be a good opportunity for the senate to make some recommendations in areas where shared governance ought to exist e.g., map out those areas.
- 11.37. Guest Michael Casadonte provided additional details on the product.
- 11.38. Vice Chair Jones asked if the program will be integrated into Canvas or be a separate entity.
- 11.39. Guest Michael Casadonte mentioned they are exploring what integration into Canvas looks like. It is an option.
- 11.40. Senator Girshin asked how you prevent this from just being another option. How do you make sure this takes the place of everything else?
- 11.41. Guest Michael Casadonte mentioned procurement was receiving numerous requests from departments about buying software for appointments. Hopefully students like the new system and encourage departments who are holding on to old systems to switch.
- 11.42. Guest Brad Owen mentioned this will become the standard solution.
- 11.43. Provost Mohamed mentioned that it doesn't do much good to adopt this system if we are still paying for other solutions. Waiting for students to demand this system might not be the best way to go about it and should find other ways to eliminate other programs.
- 11.44. Senator Fullam asked if they envision this replacing traditional office hours in the future.
- 11.45. Guest Michael Casadonte answered yes. It would be up to faculty members to display their hours for office hours.
- 11.46. Senator Fullam mentioned that if this system was explained to faculty, they may be more inclined to use it. The system may give faculty more flexibility in terms of office hours.

## **12. New Business**

### **12.1. [FAM 822.5 Curriculum Guidelines](#)**

- 12.1.1. Chair Davis mentioned it has been several decades since this policy has been updated. Chair Davis noted that it is an admin policy but questioned whether it should be an EPRC and/or curriculum policy.

- 12.1.2. Senator Kolehmainen pointed out that the policy was abandoned in the early nineties. It is a very old policy. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned the policy should come from EPRC or the Curriculum Committee.
- 12.1.3. Provost Mohamed mentioned that it seems like this was missed during the quarter to semester conversion. In terms of why it is an admin policy, he does not have an answer for that. Regardless of who has jurisdiction, it is important to have people who are well versed on Title V.
- 12.1.4. Senator Fullam mentioned he was not sure who has jurisdiction on this policy, however it is within the wheelhouse of EPRC.
- 12.1.5. Chair Davis mentioned that this is a policy the faculty senate can work on versus administration.
- 12.1.6. President Morales mentioned the University would be well served to make the necessary changes to this policy. President Morales agreed that this policy seems to be a FAM not an admin council policy.
- 12.1.7. Chair Davis made a motion to adopt FAM 822.5 to be revised by EPRC and the Curriculum Committee. Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- 12.2. [C-Form \(Current\)/ C-Form \(Old\)](#)
  - 12.2.1. Chair Davis mentioned the language on the C-Form stating “language for note forthcoming” and “language to be determined” was not approved by the senate. Where is this language coming from? If this is curriculum, the document should be approved by the faculty senate and be in FAM 822.5.
  - 12.2.2. Senator Fullam mentioned the C-forms don’t have definitions for course modality. Once the FAM gets approved, those definitions will be put on the C-Forms.
  - 12.2.3. Chair Davis mentioned what the senate approves is the final policy. It is important this form be included in FAM 822.5.
  - 12.2.4. Vice Chair Jones mentioned another thing being discussed in HIPS is having those documented on C forms, which would ultimately end up on PeopleSoft.
- 12.3. [P-Form \(Current\)/P-Form \(Old-possibly incomplete\)](#)
  - 12.3.1. Senator Fullam mentioned that the P-forms already have definitions for program modality. In the proposal, the document will have definitions on P-Forms and definitions for course modalities.
  - 12.3.2. Senator Franklin-Guy made a motion to attach the P and C forms to the FAM 822.5. It is important to do so to safeguard documents from any revision.

- 12.3.3. Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion. Senator Kolehmainen also suggested the EPRC and Curriculum Committee look at these forms and provide feedback.
  - 12.3.4. The motion passed unanimously.
  - 12.4. [CNS Course Delivery Mode Template](#)
  - 12.5. Faculty Survey for Follett Access Program
- 13.** Adjournment- The meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM.