

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

CSUSB Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

10-18-2022

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Minutes (10/18/22)

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 (10/18/22)" (2022). *CSUSB Faculty Senate records*. 398.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/398>

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.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

MINUTES

Tuesday, October 18, 2022 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Claudia Davis, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Thomas Girshin, Mark Groen, Karen Kolehmainen, Rafik Mohamed, Beth Steffel

Members Not Present: Ann Johnson, Tiffany Jones, Jordan Fullam, Tomás Morales

1. Call to Order at 2:00 PM
2. Approval of [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, October 11, 2022](#).
 - 2.1. The FS Executive Committee unanimously approved the FS Executive Committee Minutes for October 11, 2022.
3. Approval of the [October 25, 2022, Faculty Senate Agenda](#).
 - 3.1. The FS Executive Committee unanimously approved the October 25, 2022, Faculty Senate Agenda.
4. Appointments
 - 4.1. [PDC Student Engagement Committee](#) – **3 Positions** (2021-2023), **1 Position** (2022-2024) At-Large
 - 4.1.1. Ryan Keating
 - 4.1.1.1. Ryan Keating was appointed to the committee for the 2022-2024 term. The Faculty Senate Office will notify the appointee.
5. President's Report - President Morales is attending a CSU meeting so he is unable to attend the FSEC meeting.
6. [Provost's Report](#)
 - 6.1. Provost Mohamed held a meeting with President Morales, Kevin Grisham, and Brad Owen regarding the TRC Director position, and the decision was made to make it a full-time position (1.0) for this appointment which will be for 1 ½ years. They are working on the new position description. The goal is to fill the position as soon as possible.

- 6.1.1. Chair Davis thanked Provost Mohamed, President Morales, Associate Provost Kevin Grisham, and Interim AVP for Faculty Development/Chief Academic Technology Brad Owen and Executive Committee and asked if EC will be a part of the interview process.
- 6.1.2. Provost Mohamed will support it, but Kevin or Brad will make that decision.
- 6.1.3. Senator Franklin-Guy asked Chair Davis if the FSEC will have the opportunity to provide additional feedback regarding some of the language for the job description.
- 6.1.4. Chair Davis said yes and that she will send out an email to Brad and Kevin regarding this.
- 6.2. Provost Mohamed shared that the Campus Strategic Plan is underway with Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Kelly Campbell and Senator Nicole Dabbs, Co-chairs of the committee. The appointment letters should be going out within the next week to committee members.
- 6.3. Jennifer Alford (College of Social and Behavioral Sciences), the new Director of Water Resource Institute (WRI), is proposing to rename it to the Institute for Water Resilience (IWR). IWR offers opportunities for collaboration among all constituents locally and with the Forest Service.
- 6.4. Jake Zhu will be transitioning out of the Dean position at PDC but will continue to serve until the end of the 2022-2023 AY. There are discussions regarding the title of the new person.
- 6.5. The budget forum from yesterday can be found on the Budget Office's webpage for those who were unable to attend.
- 6.6. Regarding the flood update, the Faculty Office Building is up and running.
- 6.7. As a result of the flooding, the library will create a new door that is ADA compliant.

7. [Chair's Report](#)

- 7.1. Chair Davis discussed if the EC prefers a special subcommittee to analyze the CAL-GETC data.
 - 7.1.1. Senator Girshin agreed that no subcommittee would be necessary.
 - 7.1.2. Senator Steffel wanted to make sure this topic was on the next FS meeting since it is an action of the Senate.
 - 7.1.3. Senator Steffel wanted to know when the results would be given to ASCSU.
 - 7.1.4. Chair Davis reminded Senator Steffel of the email sent that stated the ASCSU was going to close the survey on 10/26/22. Chair Davis reached

out regarding this and received an email back saying the ASCSU would like it back on 10/25/22. Chair Davis mentioned that we are working diligently to meet that deadline.

- 7.1.5. Senator Steffel asked for clarification. There is a survey out and the results are going to be shared and then we are talking about it at our Senate meeting next Tuesday.
- 7.1.6. Chair Davis said we will discuss it at our Senate meeting on Tuesday.
- 7.1.7. Senator Steffel asked when will the survey results come back?
- 7.1.8. Chair Davis said by 6 pm. What do you mean when will the survey results come back?
- 7.1.9. Senator Steffel said my thinking was the survey results were being shared with the Senate or that the Senate is moving on this. Maybe I don't quite understand the plan.
- 7.1.10. Chair Davis indicated that she sent notification to all Faculty Senators, including Senator Steffel, and explained what AB 928 and Cal-GETC are and informational links to that as well. Senator Janelle Gilbert had open forums on campus. Senators are encouraged vote and once we have that data, we'll provide the results of that survey. Chair Davis reminded Senator Steffel that she (Senator Steffel) requested that the survey data be reported via the portal on October 25th. Chair Davis indicated that the results will be provided by the date and in the manner requested. Results will be shared with the EC.
- 7.1.11. Senator Steffel responded she is still unclear and asked if the Senate would be voting on what to do during the meeting.
- 7.1.12. Chair Davis reiterated that the matter will be discussed first during the Senate meeting. Chair Davis reminded Senator Steffel that Senator Janelle Gilbert said during the forum that she had on campus, faculty had questions about it and so forth and we are going to discuss it further and then every Senator can vote. Chair Davis repeated to Senator Steffel that the survey results will be sent prior to the deadline. Chair Davis reiterated that after the Senate meeting, during which Senators can vote, the information will be sent.
- 7.1.13. Senator Steffel responded by saying Janelle sent out a survey to the campus to weigh in so that survey went out to the whole campus. Senator Steffel indicated that there is a survey from the ASCSU that came from her (Senator Steffel) because she is the chair, but it is asking for one response from the campus senate. So, that's going to be turned

in. When is that decision made, you're not quite clear on that? So, the senate is going to vote at the senate meeting next Tuesday?

- 7.1.14. Chair Davis said Senator Gilbert absolutely sent out a survey to the campus to solicit feedback to ensure input from a broad constituency specifically to accept, accept with recommendations or not able to come to a consensus. Once the feedback has been collected this will be shared with the EC, and then it will be sent over to the statewide chair, yourself as this is the recommendation from CSUSB, by 10-25-2022.
- 7.1.15. Senator Steffel asked so the decision isn't going to be made by the senate it's going to be made by the consensus of the survey that's been sent out to the whole university.
- 7.1.16. Chair Davis reiterated that we have feedback from the senators as well as from the members of the university. The senators do vote but we also have feedback from individuals, for example, Humanities as an example might want to chime in and their feedback counts. This is really important.
- 7.1.17. Senator Girshin said it seems in this discussion that something we may want to consider is whether or not we need to have a separate ratification vote of the results of the survey at the 10/25 senate meeting or if we can simply bring up at that senate meeting that whatever the results of the campus wide survey, the binding decision of the senate that we are going to forward to Statewide. Seems like those are the two options to either have a separate ratification based on the results of the survey or we can just say ahead of time whatever the results of that survey are that's what we're going to forward to Statewide.
- 7.1.18. Chair Davis said it is important to get feedback from faculty when Senator Gilbert sent it out to be inclusive of everyone on campus.
- 7.1.19. Senator Kolehmainen said she was a little bit confused also about how we're going to decide between these 3 options if we base on the results of the survey. I think I can pretty much guarantee you that not everybody on the survey is going to agree so what percentage of agreement do we need for example to decide whether we're going to support the proposal? If 60 percent of the people respond saying they support it, is that enough to make us choose number 1 here or do we need a bigger percentage than that? In terms of this it almost seems like to me like it guarantees almost that number 3 is going to be the option because probably not everyone will agree so will that be interrupted as not being

able to come to a consensus? So, I'm a little bit confused on how we're going to make the final decision between these three options.

- 7.1.20. Chair Davis said she would defer that over to Senator Gilbert and her GE committee.
- 7.1.21. Senator Steffel stated the ASCSU didn't want to tell senates how to come to a consensus or how to make this decision, but it's the senate's decision. I have a little bit of concern about basing it just on the survey and also, I think it is useful to have the surveyor's feedback, but I'm not clear on how that feedback is going to be routed back on that. I would also say that I have been to I think 5 or 6 campus senates at this point and it's a really confusing issue with a lot of things and it's actually not GE. There is no proposal and Cal-GETC has nothing to do with changing GE. It's what students need to take at the community college to complete their lower division transfer requirements before they transfer. So, it has nothing to do with changing CSU GE. This has basically turned into my whole life for the last month, and I can appreciate how complicated and nuanced it is. I would just speak strongly that this needs to be a senate decision and the senate moves on this in some way. I didn't see the senate agenda in our agenda today to approve but I would strongly speak to having this as a discussion and an action for our senate meeting next week and to have the feedback that's coming back to you on this proposal come back sooner rather than later. I was only able to make it to one of the open forums last week because of my schedule, but the open forum I went to only had 9 attendees. So, I'm not sure how widely understood this is.
- 7.1.22. Chair Davis stated there were definitely a lot of folks on the first day and she had a lot of discussions with individuals. I think what I hear you say is that your concern is about whether or not there is adequate time, is that what your issue is?
- 7.1.23. Senator Steffel said no, my concern is making sure this is a faculty decision.
- 7.1.24. Chair Davis said you want to make sure this is a faculty decision and so what was sent out to the campus was to obtain faculty input. A survey was sent out and we're getting feedback from faculty. If they have questions Senator Gilbert will answer them. Let's be very clear specifically, that it is a singular transfer pathway. In my communique to the senate, I indicated that there was some discussion about the impact on the GEs at the lower level and that is why I included the discussion

from Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Sylvia Alva that she wanted to make it very clear that the current focus is transfer pathway. Right now, we are just voting on the singular transfer pathway. That is the reason why I phrased it in that manner, so everyone is aware. Give us an opportunity to do that on the 25th. The vote is sent out to senators to get their feedback as well as faculty because it has to be their feedback as well. It's not just us as Senators, it's everyone, it's the faculty.

- 7.1.25. Senator Girshin said one thing I am thinking about, and Karen raised this as well as there are three choices in that survey. What happens in the event that we get the data back and it shows 34, 33, 32 and that's the distribution of support across those? Without senate deliberation, I don't think any of that is enough, right? That day it wouldn't be enough to suggest any kind of consensus. We would need senate deliberation on that data to come to a joint agreement. Even if ultimately, we say based on that data we can't agree, therefore it's option 3. I think that should come as a result of the discussion in the Senate. I apologize to Chair Davis that this didn't occur to me sooner to maybe raise this possibility if we could close the survey prior to that meeting on the 25th and then share the results of that survey in the senate meeting on the 25th and have time for us to as a senate body to decide. Using that data but ultimately, it's a motion that is seconded and voted on by the Faculty Senate.
- 7.1.26. Senator Girshin moved that we close the survey that Senator Gilbert sent out prior to the full senate meeting on the 25th, and that we share the results of that in the meeting and we vote on the question of Cal GETC at that Faculty Senate meeting.
- 7.1.27. Senator Girshin motioned, and Senator Kolehmainen seconded that the survey for Cal GETC is closed before the FS meeting and the results are shared during the meeting.

8. [FAC Report](#)

- 8.1. Provost Mohamed said he thought the Exceptional Service to Student Awards (CEAT) needed to be used in the year it was awarded.
- 8.2. FAC Chair Kolehmainen said the wording in the CBA is a little confusing. There are two sentences that seem to contradict each other. The first sentence says something like, "awards can be banked for the following year", but then it says, "the goal should be to use the award in the year it was given". The CBA

language has changed, the 2014-2017 version is when the award was established. There was a special language that was used to cover the awards in that CBA. The first year the awards were delayed because they were brand new so there was a different timeline used. The language has changed in the new contract and contains the language I stated earlier that says, “the goal should be to use the award in the year it was given”. The committee will check with Kevin Grisham to make sure that his interpretation agrees with ours. At this time, we are going with the statement that says, “awards can be banked for the following year” until we speak with Kevin Grisham.

8.3. FAM 651.3 “Periodic Review of Academic Deans”

8.3.1. [With Markup](#)

8.3.2. [Without Markup](#)

8.3.2.1. Senator Girshin will be sending FAC Chair Kolehmainen some suggestions for the FAM.

8.3.2.2. Senator Franklin-Guy asked Provost Mohamed what the timeline is for the Dean’s review this year or if there is a timeline.

8.3.2.2.1. Provost Mohamed responded by saying that he believes the timeline is that they have to be done by the end of the AY. Provost Mohamed’s understanding is there are two Deans up for review one is Dean DomNwachukwu from COE and the other is Dean Pantula from CNS. One has begun and the other is just beginning.

8.3.2.2.2. Senator Franklin-Guy asked Provost Mohamed a follow-up question for clarification. She asked if both Deans scheduled for regular periodic reviews this academic year have already begun.

8.3.2.2.3. Provost Mohamed said he believes Dean Pantula’s is almost done, but the chair of the committee for Dean DomNwachukwu was just appointed and it will be Dean Chuang.

8.3.2.2.4. Senator Franklin-Guy asked Provost Mohamed if a previously elected committee for a review that did not occur can be permitted to proceed as the standing elected committee for that Dean’s review.

8.3.2.2.5. Provost Mohamed said we would request a new committee to launch the review of the Dean. So, to answer your question, no.

8.3.2.2.6. Senator Franklin-Guy asked Provost Mohamed if that information would be shared with all constituencies within that college.

8.3.2.2.7. Provost Mohamed said yes it would just be a call for them to create a review committee. That doesn't mean the previously elected people can't apply for an appointment on the committee.

8.3.2.3. This will be placed on the next FS meeting for a first read.

9. [EPRC Report](#)

9.1. [CAFM Recommendations](#)

9.2. Did not discuss

10. Statewide/ASCSU (Academic Senate of the CSU) Senators' Report

10.1. Did not discuss

11. New Business

11.1. HEERA Resolution [HEERA Resolution](#)

11.2. Did not discuss

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

12. Cozen O'Connor Campus Visit

12.1. The FSEC had a closed-session discussion.

13. Adjournment Time 4:07 PM (closed session)