California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

4-4-2023

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes (4/4/2023)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

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

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

https://csusb.zoom.us/s/84761794289

M I N U T E S

Tuesday, April 04, 2023 – 2-4 PM

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

Members Not Present: NA

1. Call to Order (2:02 PM)

2. Approval of FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes March 14, 2023
   2.1. The FS Executive Committee unanimously approved the FS Executive Committee Minutes for March 14, 2023.

3. Approval of FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes March 21, 2023
   3.1. The FS Executive Committee unanimously approved the FS Executive Committee Minutes for March 21, 2023.

4. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda, April 11, 2023
   4.1. Senator Fullam mentioned FAM XXX "Credit for Prior Learning Acquired Through Experience" should be a second reading.
   4.2. The FS Executive Committee unanimously approved the agenda with the above amendment.

5. Appointments
   5.1. Associated Students Inc. Board of Directors- 1 Position, At-Large (2023-2025)
      5.1.1. Mariam Betlemidze, **(CAL)**
         5.1.1.1. Mariam Betlemidze was appointed to the committee. The Faculty Senate Office will notify the appointee.

6. President's Report- None

7. Provost's Report

7.1.   Provost Mohamed shared that the PDC AVP recruitment is well underway and will be conducting first round interviews this week. All other Academic Affairs open positions have been posted. In addition, Dorota Huizinga, Associate Provost for Academic Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, is retiring next academic year. The intention is to appoint an interim and complete that recruitment next academic year.

7.2.   Provost Mohamed mentioned there have been several meetings with respect to Follett. More information is being gathered to see the impact on students. If the program is adopted, there will be larger conversations and safeguards for students. The adoption date has been pushed and will not go into effect Fall 2023.

7.3.   Provost Mohamed mentioned the 'Choose CSUSB' event for prospective students was well attended and a success.

7.4.   Provost Mohamed mentioned the 'Brain Bowl' will be Friday, April 7, 2023 and the event is at capacity. Provost Mohamed also shared that about fifty faculty and staff members participated in the Sweet 16 March Madness bracket and winners will be announced at that time.

7.5.   Senator Girshin mentioned that he attended the High Impact Practices pedagogy forum. There was an event on undergraduate research and on how CSUSB provides special opportunities for students to do mentored research with faculty. Senator Grishin asked if this was highlighted at the 'Choose CSUSB' event.

7.6.   Provost Mohamed mentioned this was discussed with prospective students. Two speakers mentioned that in contrast with the UC system, undergraduate students at CSUSB have direct access to faculty.

7.7.   Vice Chair Jones asked if the call for research releases for next year was sent.

7.8.   Provost Mohamed stated they are waiting for sabbatical announcements to be sent prior to submitting the call for research releases. He will check on the status.

8.   Chair's Report

8.1.   Chair Davis mentioned all faculty retirees have received their frame resolutions and were very appreciative. Chair Davis shared that she will be meeting with Kevin Grisham along with Karla Gonzalez in preparation for the upcoming retirement resolutions.

8.2.   Senator Girshin asked if there are any updates on the Cozen O'Connor report.

8.3. Chair Davis mentioned she has not received anything with regard to that report. However, she did receive an email about the Cozen O'Connor implementation committee.

8.4. Provost Mohamed mentioned he has not seen it, but it is coming soon.

8.5. Senator Steffel mentioned the final report will be presented at the May Board or Trustees meeting. The campus reports will be released at the same time. Campus presidents have been asked to form implementation committees. There will be a PowerPoint with preliminary reports by the end of April. The full report will be available at the end of May.

9. [FAC Report](#)

9.1. FAM 652.2 "Evaluation of Lecturers"

    9.1.1. [With Markup](#)

    9.1.2. [Without Markup](#)

        9.1.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned additional changes have been made since the FAM was last discussed. The policy now clarifies the process. Additional time was added to the timeline due to previous concerns. FAC wanted to ensure lecturers have time for a rebuttal, but the California Bargaining Agreement (CBA) is vague about when the rebuttal occurs. To parallel the process for tenure line faculty, the rebuttal should take place after the department evaluation but before the dean's final decision. The deadline is now ten weeks from the start of the term. Senator Kolehmainen also mentioned the process was split for three-year lecturers and other lecturers to coincide with the CBA.

        9.1.2.2. Senator Kolehmainen motioned for a first reading at the next faculty senate meeting. Vice Chair Jones seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

10. [EPRC Report](#)

Senator Fullam mentioned EPRC has started working on the grade grievance process with ITS. The current online submission for grade grievance forms is not appropriate. The forms for grade grievances follow multiple pathways and are used infrequently, therefore an online submission form would not be maintained. EPRC will bring that revision forward at the next EC meeting.

10.1. [FAM 827.3 "Distributed Learning Policy"](#)

    10.1.1. [With Old Markup](#)

    10.1.2. [With New Markup](#)

10.1.3.   With Sources
  10.1.3.1.   Senator Fullam shared the additional revisions made to the policy. Based on a previous suggestion, a change was made to clarify how students will be notified about technology requirements. A change was made to replace "appropriate administrator" with "college dean or their designee". There was an addition stating class size between face to face and distance education classes should be consistent. Certain titles were changed to be consistent with the campus. Faculty are also now expected to complete a self-review of the course.
  10.1.3.2.   Provost Mohamed asked if colleges can adopt higher standards with respect to training. Two colleges have adopted their own policies already, which came from faculty and chairs. Provost Mohamed mentioned he is concerned that the will of the faculty will not be recognized by a policy that does not allow them to have what they had originally requested in their policies.
  10.1.3.3.   Senator Fullam mentioned standards of training are strong expectations and not appropriate for all the colleges. Whether or not colleges want to create different standards, it is out of his purview as EPRC Chair.
  10.1.3.4.   President Morales mentioned he would be reluctant to sign the policy unless faculty are required to take the professional development course to ensure students are receiving quality instruction online.
  10.1.3.5.   Senator Fullam mentioned the only place where the policy says "strongly encouraged" is where it asks faculty to take specific courses. The term "strongly encouraged" was used instead of "required" because those courses may not be appropriate for all faculty. If faculty are going to teach online, they should have prior pedagogical experience or appropriate training. The training does not have to be these specific courses.
  10.1.3.6.   President Morales asked who determines if faculty have appropriate pedagogical experience to teach online.
  10.1.3.7.   Senator Fullam stated it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to determine if they have training or experience.
  10.1.3.8.   Provost Mohamed mentioned this seems like a loophole. If it is to the discretion of faculty members, they can circumvent training

expectations. Anyone who has taught online in the past would say they do not need training.

10.1.3.9. Senator Fullam mentioned students are requesting more flexible learning, but not performing as well in these classes. His understanding is that if we are serious about improving our capacity to teach online courses, simply requiring faculty to take online courses will likely not improve teaching.

10.1.3.10. Provost Mohamed mentioned training is only one part of the comprehensive approach to improve instructional quality. If there is a pedagogical experience exception, there has to be some demonstration of instructional efficacy such as including syllabi and assessments that would be evaluated by an external body. The idea that faculty are expected to go through training to ensure a baseline as part of an overall strategy is different than saying that is the only thing.

10.1.3.11. Provost Mohamed mentioned section 3b states instructional modality is within the purview of faculty support section. Modality is not exclusive to faculty. It is shared between faculty, department chairs, and appropriate administrators. This could serve as a precedent for future policies and be problematic.

10.1.3.12. Vice Chair Jones mentioned her department initially was not very supportive about online policy and had a strict online learning policy. The department decided as a whole whether classes be offered online or not. It was always within the purview of the department and faculty. Vice Chair Jones mentioned that while she was completing her QLT training, she was told it was not the best training for online learning. Therefore, she likes the language of suggested and strongly encouraged rather than required. Vice Chair Jones mentioned she is very weary of the requirement of a specific type of training because training may not always be available or can change.

10.1.3.13. Senator Girshin emphasized a principle of faculty development is that self-motivation is key. Once faculty development is required, it loses efficacy. Therefore, he likes the language of encouragement and expectation instead of requirement. It is appropriate to encourage faculty development opportunities that are specific to the course. Senator Girshin mentioned it makes sense to have the decision be at the department level where we

10.1.3.14.	President Morales mentioned a significant percentage of FTEs are taught by new faculty. How will this policy assure new faculty have the ability to teach courses online? Additionally, students should be required to demonstrate proficiency to learn online. President Morales stated he is comfortable with the term "strongly encouraged". However, he would ask that this policy address the ability for the University to ensure every faculty member is prepared to teach online.
10.1.3.15.	Provost Mohamed mentioned he appreciates Senator Girshin's comment about motivation and is concerned this policy does nothing to facilitate that motivation. This policy does not actively drive cultural shifts in terms of improving distance education. While not trying to stall this policy, it may be useful to consult with ASI or whoever will be working with students for training.
10.1.3.16.	Vice Chair Jones mentioned the beginning of the policy nicely states the mindset of this policy and emphasizes quality expectations. The policy does a good job at setting up expectations. We have a rigorous evaluation system which helps keep standards up. It does not matter what language is used, there will still be problems. Vice Chair Jones mentioned she strongly supports the policy.
10.1.3.17.	Senator Girshin recommended using the term "demonstrated efficacy" instead of "prior experience".
10.1.3.18.	Senator Fullam mentioned EPRC considered that term and was addressed by having faculty who are teaching online include descriptions of their past pedagogical experience in their FAR.
10.1.3.19.	Chair Davis referred to section 5, which addresses workload. There is a policy on faculty workload (EP&R 76-73) which should be linked. Chair Davis mentioned CNS and CSBS have their own policies and is concerned that having different policies will confuse faculty. Her understanding was that this would be the policy for the entire university. Maybe what needs to be done is ensure that everyone is aware this is the policy for distributive learning across the board.

have best knowledge of instructors, policies and procedures are already in place to do those evaluations and evaluation processes are rigorous.

10.1.3.20. Provost Mohamed agreed that this FAM should supersede college level policies. Does the policy state it supersedes those policies? Provost Mohamed brought up communicating and receiving input from the faculty as a whole. During his time as dean, there was not a uniform way that the senate communicated with faculty and the college. We need to ensure the senate is communicating and receiving input from constituents.

10.1.3.21. Chair Davis mentioned the policy will have to be further discussed.

10.1.3.22. Senator Fullam mentioned he is open to the feedback of the group. If the consensus is the policy is not ready, then it is not ready. If it is ready, he will bring it as a first reading.

10.1.3.23. A vote was taken to determine whether the policy was ready for a first reading. The results were 7 Ayes, 2 Nays.

10.1.3.24. Chair Davis expressed concern because more discussion is needed.

10.1.3.25. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned she voted to send it to the senate so the senate could provide valuable feedback.

10.1.3.26. Senator Franklin-Guy mentioned she would like more time to review the various documents.

10.1.3.27. Senator Girshin mentioned he is not strongly in favor but agrees with Senator Kolehmainen about senate feedback being useful.

10.1.3.28. Senator Johnson stated she also did not feel strongly about her vote. If the EC thinks it is ready for the senate, that is fine.

10.1.3.29. Senator Steffel mentioned if the policy was approved for a first reading, it would give an opportunity for input and still give EPRC time to revise.

10.1.3.30. Vice Chair Jones mentioned her understanding is that the first reading is just for feedback. Normally the debate takes place before the vote. Are the votes still valid?

10.1.3.31. Chair Davis mentioned there will be a revote.

10.1.3.32. An additional vote was conducted on whether this policy should be a first read, with the amendments Senator Girshin suggested. The results were all in favor.

10.2. [FAM XXX "Credit for Prior Learning Acquired Through Experience"](#)

10.2.1. Senator Fullam mentioned one of the requests at the last faculty senate meeting was to include examples of when this policy would be applicable. Those examples have been included.

10.2.2. Senator Fullam met with Tony Coulson who suggested removing the section that excludes apprenticeships and internships since the university does not have universal standards on those. Students may now receive credit if the relevant work experience is complete at the time the request for credit is evaluated.

10.2.3. Senator Fullam mentioned the policy has been changed to allow students to receive credit for military service if they have not already used it to obtain credit.

10.2.4. Senator Fullam also shared that Kelly Campbell, Interim Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, would prefer EPRC create an umbrella Credit for Prior Learning policy which would include credit for prior experience, military service, and standardized testing. He would be open to creating an umbrella policy, but it would take time.

10.2.5. Provost Mohamed mentioned Kelly's request is rooted in the CO's directive to campuses to create a credit for prior learning policy. It might be useful to create a singular umbrella policy, not have different policies coming from different offices. This would avoid confusion and questions about which policy supersedes.

10.2.6. Senator Fullam mentioned FAMs are administered by faculty. The procedures for military service and standardized testing are administered by the admissions department and the registrar department. It could confuse faculty to see policies that are not in their purview.

10.2.7. Provost Mohamed mentioned a singular policy could remove confusion and be an effective strategy. It might be more of an administration policy than a FAM.

10.2.8. Senator Fullam mentioned the information in the policy is from article 2 of Executive Order 1036 which is the one article of the EO that describes procedures that are in the purview of faculty. There are some campuses with umbrella policies.

10.2.9. Vice Chair Jones mentioned some faculty were confused about this policy which is why they asked for examples. This policy seems to be something that departments would decide. If the goal is to have this done by the fall, there may need to be a statement added stating it does not reference the policies addressed elsewhere. Then when there is an umbrella policy, it could reference this FAM.

10.2.10. Senator Fullam mentioned EO 1036 states campuses must have policies for credit for prior learning for standardized tests, military, and prior

experience. Faculty and departments would decide what qualifies as prior life experience. What is in the FAM is what EO 1036 requires.

10.2.11. Chair Davis mentioned the policy is in line with EO 1036- which EPRC developed. The request for an umbrella policy that covers admissions and the registrar should be developed by representatives with expertise in those departments.

10.2.12. Senator Fullam motioned for a second reading at the next faculty senate meeting.

10.2.13. Senator Girshin mentioned if the current policy is to give military service credit to individuals when they enroll, faculty are not familiar with the circumstances under which an individual would not have received credit. Senator Girshin also mentioned the policy states the work experience and professional development should be specific to the student's field of study. Later in the policy, it states students can also get credit for general education. Will this cause confusion?

10.2.14. Senator Fullam mentioned it is okay to allow students to apply this for military service. Admissions will have their own criteria and it may be limited. Departments are looking at experience and comparing it to the requirements of a specific course. Students cannot get credit in two places. Also, the experience has to be relevant to a specific course and is open to changing it before the policy goes to second reading.

10.2.15. Chair Davis asked Senator Girshin to clarify his amendment.

10.2.16. Senator Girshin recommended changing "a field related to the student's program of study" to "a specific course the student is requesting credit for".

10.2.17. Senator Fullam motioned for a second reading at the next faculty senate meeting with the above amendment. Senator Girshin seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

11. [Statewide/ASCSU (Academic Senate of the CSU) Senators' Report](#)

11.1. Assembly Bill 1390 (Graduation Requirements: Service Learning)

11.1.1. Senator Groen mentioned there has been some concern from faculty about this bill that is currently pending in Sacramento. It is unfunded and adds a barrier to students for graduation.

12. Old Business

12.1. [CNS Course Delivery Mode Template](#)

12.1.1. Chair Davis mentioned this was brought to her attention because there were questions if it should be approved by the EC and senate. CNS faculty said it was part of a delivery mode template that was created for a particular course. The descriptions have not been approved by the senate.

12.1.2. Vice Chair Jones asked who is requiring this form.

12.1.3. Chair Davis answered CNS. It was for a course on Scientific Perspectives on Global Challenges.

12.1.4. Vice Chair Jones asked if it was specific to this course.

12.1.5. Chair Davis answered it was the only one brought to her attention.

12.1.6. Vice Chair Jones mentioned it might be used for other courses as well.

12.1.7. Chair Davis mentioned there is a delivery mode template that faculty can fill out, yet it has not gone through the senate for approval.

12.1.8. Vice Chair Jones mentioned this looks like a form individuals are filling out for approval at the dean level, but it is not necessarily going through the curriculum level. The original course forms have options about modality. Perhaps the dean's office requested it. It does not abide by the policy discussed earlier.

12.1.9. Senator Groen mentioned he has seen this template in the past. It came out very early during Covid. It was never intended as a course template or to be included in the C-Form.

12.1.10. Chair Davis mentioned that the language is not on the C-Form, yet it was included. The form has specific guidelines for instructors in regard to discussion boards, offering prompts to refocus students, providing multiple options to be contacted by students, and providing feedback within a certain number of weeks. It is very prescriptive.

12.1.11. Senator Groen mentioned it may have been an attempt at a policy when Covid began. That was the only time he saw the form, until now.

12.1.12. Chair Davis mentioned this form was included as an attachment on a C-Form in the curriculum committee. When things are done in that manner, it removes faculty input. There was no approval. It is important to have one policy, not multiple policies. Chair Davis mentioned she will inform CNS to cease and desist.

12.1.13. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned it will create confusion for students if classes are labeled in different ways. It should be as clear as possible for the sake of students.

12.2. Faculty Survey for Follett Access Program

12.2.1.   Chair Davis mentioned the faculty senate requested that the EC create a subcommittee to develop a survey for input on adopting the Follett Program. Chair Davis asked Provost Mohamed for clarification regarding a delay in the initiation of Follett.

12.2.2.   Provost Mohamed answered yes, the decision was made to not change the working relationship with Follet in Fall 2023. The earliest it could be implemented would be Spring 2024.

12.2.3.   Chair Davis asked for volunteers for a subcommittee to work on the survey consistent with the faculty senate's request to form a subcommittee consisting of EC members.

12.2.4.   Provost Mohamed asked to involve Cary Barber in the creation of the survey.

12.2.5.   Vice Chair Jones volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

12.2.6.   Senator Girshin volunteered to serve as well.

12.2.7.   Chair Davis mentioned she will also serve.

12.2.8.   The subcommittee consists of Vice Chair Jones, Senator Girshin, and Chair Davis.

12.3.   Curriculum

12.3.1.   [Course Changes 3/17/23](#)

         12.3.1.1.   The changes were unanimously approved.

12.3.2.   [Program Changes 3/17/23](#)

         12.3.2.1.   The changes were unanimously approved.

13.   New Business

13.1.   Proposed Truncated Summer Session

13.1.1.   Chair Davis mentioned she received an email from Interim VP of Academic Affairs Kelly Campbell proposing a four-week summer session starting summer 2024. This would match winter intersessions and also address calendar issues, solve some issues with regard to financial aid, and help payroll. Kelly Campbell would like the EC to discuss this topic and provide feedback.

13.1.2.   Senator Kolehmainen asked if the calendar committee was consulted.

13.1.3.   Chair Davis mentioned she sent Kelly an email with this question and awaits her response.

13.1.4.   Vice Chair Jones asked if there would be no change to start and end dates. Would it just be an extra week for grade calculations?

13.1.5.   Chair Davis mentioned she asked that question as well in her email to Kelly. The other questions were 1) how does this proposed truncated

summer session impact the days faculty have to grade during the finals examination period 2) have other CSU's made this summer session switch and 3) is there any information on how the shorter summer session affects student learning.

13.1.6. Senator Girshin asked if the EC was discussing whether to make that decision or have Kelly submit a proposal.

13.1.7. Provost Mohamed mentioned that in terms of decision making, the senate does not have jurisdiction over the calendar. There was an issue with faculty teaching over summer and pay being negatively affected with the current calendar. It would be best to have Kelly and Kevin come in and discuss the issue.

13.1.8. Senator Franklin-Guy mentioned that by moving from a five-week session to a four-week session, 20% of instructional time would be removed. How might this impact the quality of instruction and student learning? Students may be able to engage in more superficial learning.

13.1.9. Senator Kolehmainen classes have the same number of hours of instruction, just in a condensed period. Senator Kolehmainen expressed concern over this possibility. One of the advantages when switching from quarters to semesters was that it gave students more time to digest material and engage in in-depth learning. Now we are moving in the opposite direction. Even though we have the same number of hours total, in-depth learning may not take place.

13.1.10. Chair Davis mentioned she will reach out to Kevin and Kelly and follow-up with EC's questions.

13.2. Curriculum

13.2.1. Course Changes 3/28/23

13.2.1.1. The changes were unanimously approved.

13.2.2. Program Changes 3/28/23

13.2.2.1. The changes were unanimously approved.

14. Adjournment- The meeting adjourned at 4:06 PM.