

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

CSUSB Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

10-25-2022

Faculty Senate Meeting, 57th Senate Minutes (10/25/2022)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Meeting, 57th Senate Minutes (10/25/2022)" (2022). *CSUSB Faculty Senate records*. 415.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/415>

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 MEETING, 57th SENATE
[Faculty Senate Remote/Zoom Meeting Practices](https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87179814033)
<https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87179814033>

MINUTES

SESSION 2 - October 25, 2022 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Helena Addae, Ece Algan, Melissa Bakeman, Cary Barber, Haakon Brown, Rong Chen, Nicole Dabbs, Claudia Davis, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Jordan Fullam, Donna Garcia, Janelle Gilbert, Mark Groen, Gina Hanson, Angela Horner, Young Suk Hwang, Ann Johnson, Tiffany Jones, Jason Jung, Ryan Keating, Karen Kolehmainen, Janet Kottke, Angela Louque, Sailesh Maharjan, Rafik Mohamed, Fadi Muheidat, Kathie Pelletier, Haiyan Qiao, John Reitzel, Brent Singleton, Beth Steffel, Chad Sweeney, Monty Van Wart

Members Not Present: Stacey Fraser, Paola Galvez, Thomas Girshin, Alain Guevara, Tomas Morales, John Mumma, Ho Sung So,

Alternate Members Present: Nicolas Bratcher

Alternate Members Not Present: Erin Alderson, Terry Rizzo, Shannon Sparks, Sharon Pierce, Taline Georgiou

Guest Presenter: Janelle Gilbert

Guests Present: Sam Sudhakar, Paz Olivérez, Rueyling Chuang, Sastry Pantula, Dorota Huizinga, Lori Caruthers Collins, Melissa Evans, Robert Nava, Josephine Mendoza, Rebecca Lubas, Michelle Bell, Andrea Schoepfer, George Georgiou, Andrea Guo, Kelly Campbell, Sonia Otte, Bryan Haddock, Wendy Brower-Romero, Janette Garcia, AJ Hernandez, Christina Hassijia, Tomas Gomez-Arias, HK Oh, Twillea Evans-Carthen

1. Call to Order
2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
 - 2.1 [Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 27, 2022](#)
 - 2.1.1. The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes for September 27, 2022, with an amendment to item 9.2.1 per Senator Kottke seeking clarification if the word “they” meant Cozen O’Connor had provided the template for their agenda or

was it created by administration. Chair Davis responded that the agenda was created by Cozen O'Connor. Senator Chen motioned, and Senator Kottke seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

- 3.1. The Faculty Senate Agenda for October 25, 2022, Senator Kottke motioned, and Senator Kolehmainen seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

2:10PM Time Certain (If preceding items have not been completed)

4. COMMUNICATIONS/INFORMATION ITEMS

- 4.1. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, September 20, 2022.](#)
4.2. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, October 04, 2022.](#)
4.3. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, October 11, 2022.](#)
4.4. Curriculum
4.4.1. [Course Changes](#) 10/12/2022
4.4.2. [Program Changes](#) 10/12/2022
4.4.3. [Course Changes](#) 10/24/2022
4.4.4. [Program changes](#) 10/24/2022
4.5. [Correspondence: IT Decision Making Process](#) [Senator Pelletier]
4.6. [Correspondence: Cozen O'Connor Campus Visit](#) [Senator Chen]
4.7. [Correspondence: Cozen O'Connor Campus Visit](#)
4.8. [Cozen O'Connor's Agenda Title IX DHR Assessment](#)
4.9. [Correspondence: Jean Durr Cozen O'Connor Campus Visit](#)

5. OLD BUSINESS

- 5.1. [RPT - Kinesiology](#) [FAC] (Second Reading)
5.1.1. FAC Chair Kolehmainen moved to approve the Kinesiology RPT for second reading and Senator Chen seconded.
5.1.2. "RPT - Kinesiology". The motion passed unanimously.

6. NEW BUSINESS

- 6.1. FAM 651.3 "Periodic Review of Academic Deans" [FAC] (First Reading)
6.1.1. [With Markup](#)
6.1.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 6.1.2.1. FAC Chair Kolehmainen mentioned that Monica Wang/DIE

Consultant recommended changes in the review process for examples, constituents should decide on their own representatives e.g., ASI should choose a student representative as opposed to this being decided by the provost. There was consideration for staff council to choose their own representative to serve in the review, but FAC decided to keep the same policy since there was no response from the staff council representative. Monica Wang also suggested improvements regarding DEI and discussed changes in the selection process.

- 6.1.2.2. Senator Hwang requested adding a sentence to section 4 Process of Review letter “e” to read, “The Review Committee selections shall be completed prior to the end of the academic year proceeding the actual academic year the review takes place.
- 6.1.2.3. FAC Chair Kolehmainen said the committee would add this sentence before it comes back for a second reading unless somebody objects.
- 6.1.2.4. FAC Chair Kolehmainen mentioned that the committee discussed the Conflict of Interest (COI) whether faculty should recuse themselves. Regarding the COI, FAC provided a definition of COI from Chancellor’s Office COI handbook in this policy, however it does not address the specific COI issue.
- 6.1.2.5. Senator Pelletier mentioned that with regards to the understanding of HEERA (Higher Educational Employer/Employee Relations Act), no single campus, works to exclude faculty. Further, this sends a message that faculty can’t be trusted, even though the purpose of the review is to provide feedback.
- 6.1.2.6. Provost Mohamed revealed that Monica Wang was asked to review a few policies as part of our broader DEI initiative to ensure that they are equitable and fair. With respect to COI, if faculty members point out a COI with Chairs, or Deans as Administration they are almost always honor those.
- 6.1.2.7. Senator Kottke voiced her disagreement with Provost Mohammed and shared that the reason Monica

Wang/Consultant was hired is that the President remarked to Senator Chen that he wasn't signing policies because they were racist. Senator Kottke further elaborated that if she (Monica Wang) is doing DEI work that's lovely. Regarding COI, if administration perceived bias e.g., if someone is married, they should not be the direct supervisor and should find a way to remove that person. However, if no other CSU is doing duly removing faculty, then we (CSUSB) are going down a slippery slope.

- 6.1.2.8. Senator Chen remarked that the dean's review committee has several members, they conduct survey and write reports, but it is different for faculty. The Chair and Dean are writing a report and they have a direct impact on faculty.
- 6.1.2.9. Senator Keating mentioned that we've been debating this issue for a while and there's no clear example. It makes more sense to have a committee e.g., a Committee of Peers to determine if there's a COI or not.
- 6.1.2.10. Senator Haiyan Qiao offered her counter argument; it makes good sense for faculty not be removed since Deans are reviewed by a large committee. We should trust the committee to review the Dean. It is not a wise decision to exclude faculty and deprive them their right. Regarding RPT faculty reviews, faculty would not ask for COI recusal of a Department Chair or Dean without a well-documented proof.
- 6.1.2.11. Senator Donna Garcia appreciates Senator Keating's response but acknowledged that it won't work because of confidentiality. She mentioned the large literature on how to reduce bias, however, there is no literature to remove faculty from committees. Just because a person has the potential of bias, one may not know if it will be actualized. Changing the composition of a committee is a problem. It is important to look at the process in place. Are there checks and balances in place?
- 6.1.2.12. Senator Chen mentioned that they were examples, one faculty filed a grievance against the administration and when asked the faculty said yes, however it was filed against

someone else. Additionally, a faculty member was shut out of the Zoom meeting on a COI allegation

- 6.1.2.13. Senator Keating mentioned that its dangerous to make policy without a clear understanding of the facts.

- 6.1.3. [Review of COI's at other CSUs](#)

- 6.1.4. FAC Chair Kolehmainen mentioned that a review of all 23 campuses showed that none has a COI policy, only CSU San Francisco has COI on regarding hiring.

- 6.1.5. Senator Chen mentioned that the request for consultant Monica Wang to review some policies that were deemed racist, he would like to know whether she did identify any racism in the policies.

- 6.1.6. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that FAC carefully reviewed and studied Monica Wang's report and Monica Wang did not identify any policies as racist. Monica Wang made some suggestions on DEI issues, for examples she suggested that students and staff choose their own representatives to serve on the Dean's Review Committee.

- 6.1.7. Senator Chen asked why the policy wasn't signed and asked if this revision would be signed by the president. If it is repeatedly rejected, then why are we working on it?

- 6.1.8. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that we were not given a reason why it was not signed. We are just being responsible, and we will see.

- 6.1.9. Senator Chen appreciates how hard FAC is working. He asked what is the point of doing a policy like this, getting feedback and not get signed.

- 6.2. FAM 832.4 "Policy on Final Exams" [EPRC] (First Reading)

- 6.2.1. [With Markup](#)

- 6.2.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 6.2.2.1. Senator Jones moved, and Senator Kottke seconded the motion to accept FAM 832.4 "Policy on Final Exams" for a first reading.

- 7. [CHAIR'S REPORT](#)

- 8. [PRESIDENT'S REPORT](#) - President was unable to attend because he is traveling.

- 8.1. Chair Davis told the Senators if they have any questions for the president please let her and she will share them with President Morales.
9. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#)
 - 9.1. Latino Advocacy was a huge success, and thanks to the COE, volunteers, and Enrique Murillo.
 - 9.2. President Biden has appointed Dr. Enrique Murillo/Professor/College of Education to the President's Advisory Council on Advancing Equity Excellence and Economic Opportunities for Hispanics. This is a major accomplishment to have one our own to serve in this capacity.
 - 9.3. Strategic planning is underway with Co-chairs Associate Vice Provost Kelly Campbell and Senator Nicole Dabbs.
 - 9.4. Provost Mohamed pointed out that we are actually recruiting for 42 new tenure line positions, not 39 as mentioned previously.
 - 9.5. Chair Davis offered congratulatory remarks to Dr. Murillo on his appointment to the advisory council from the White House.
10. COMMITTEE REPORTS
 - 10.1. [FAC Report](#)
 - 10.1.1. FAC Chair Kolehmainen that FAM 035.4 With the "Committee for the Exceptional Time" at times they were sometimes given late, we plan to adjust the timeline for faculty. The CBA language has been changed and affords more time for faculty to adjust their schedules and chairs to plan accordingly.
 - 10.1.2. Provost Mohamed mentioned that the university doesn't receive the CEAT allocation from the Chancellor's Office until the beginning of the academic year and we might not know how many CEAT awards will be allocated to our campus.
 - 10.1.3. Senator Rong Chen requested that FAC consider changing the name of CEAT to reflect the true meaning of exceptional service to students.
 - 10.2. [EPRC Report](#)
 - 10.3. ERPC Chair Fullam remarked the online Centers and Institutes (C&Is) tracking procedure is complete and sent to all C&I directors. The reports will be due on October 30, 2022.
11. STATEWIDE/ASCSU (ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU) SENATORS' REPORT
 - 11.1. [October 2022 ASCSU Chair's Report](#)

12. SENATORS' REPORTS (INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT'S REPORT)
 - 12.1. [ASI President Report](#)
 - 12.1.1. Chair Davis asked if there were any questions for ASI President Galvez.
13. DIVISION REPORTS
 - 13.1. [Vice President for Information Technology Services](#)
 - 13.2. [Vice President for University Advancement](#)
 - 13.3. [Vice President for Student Affairs](#)
 - 13.4. [Vice President for Administration and Finance](#)
 - 13.5. Academic Affairs/Deans' Reports
 - 13.5.1. [PDC Senate Report](#)
 - 13.5.1.1. Chair Davis asked if they have any questions for Dean Zhu.

3:30PM Time Certain (If preceding items have not been completed)

14. DISCUSSION:
 - 14.1. AB 928/Cal-GETC Proposal and Survey [Discussant: Senator Gilbert]
 - 14.2. Senator Gilbert mentioned many people are concerned about general education (GE) reform. Senator Gilbert held two forums on campus and solicited feedback from the campus community regarding the Cal-GETC proposal. A survey link was provided.
 - 14.3. Senator Gilbert provided the survey link [Survey link](#).
 - 14.4. Senator Gilbert sent out a survey to the campus with an explanation of what the three options on the feedback are that the CSU is asking about. The preliminary results of that survey from the 25 faculty that responded is 9 faculty support option "a", 13 support option "b" to recommend with changes, but there was no pattern on specific changes, and 3 faculty were unable to come to a consensus which is option "c".
 - 14.5. Senator Gilbert and Chair Davis will be writing the report to send to the ASCSU and at this point CSUSB will be supporting the Cal-GETC and forwarding the individual faculty recommendations.
 - 14.5.1. Vice Chair Jones asked if there was a way to give feedback as to what those specific changes would be and if recommendations had been made.

- 14.5.2. Senator Gilbert responded there's a mechanism to give feedback and that was done. The questions were specific for transfer students.
- 14.5.3. Senator Kolehmainen asked if these new rules only apply to transfer students would we have a situation where transfer students who had completed these calculation requirements have fewer GE courses than students who start CSUSB as freshmen?
- 14.5.4. Senator Gilbert said yes, they would have six units less than students who are here on campus.
- 14.5.5. Senator Kolehmainen expressed her concern that this might disadvantage transfer students compared to non-transfer students. Specifically, these transfer students may not have acquired the knowledge or background compared to other students and might be disadvantaged in some way.
- 14.5.6. Senator Gilbert agreed and pointed out that category E is incredibly valuable, particularly on our campus. It's where we have our foundation seminar. They would miss their choice in Arts (C1) Humanities, (C2 Humanities) and C3 an additional choice.
- 14.5.7. Senator Steffel mentioned the bill requires students can transfer in right now doesn't include lifelong learning.
- 14.5.8. Vice Chair Jones asked about the process specifically if Cal-GETC looks at the suggestions from the various senates, and then makes recommendations based on that? If that's the case, if we're putting forward option B are we going to be forwarding any specific suggestions other than what was proposed?
- 14.5.9. Senator Gilbert stated based on the feedback that is coming in now, it does seem like our campus recommendation will be area A since the senators have been filling out the survey, but all of the feedback will be included.
- 14.5.10. Vice Chair Jones suggested if we do put forward some sort of resolution on this can we put forward some sort of statement emphasizing the curriculum should be coming from faculty rather than from legislators.
- 14.5.11. Senator Gilbert agreed with Vice Chair Jones and believes our feedback report should have a statement on our disappointment in the State Legislature for being involved in the curriculum.

- 14.5.12. Chair Davis asked Senator Gilbert for an update on the survey.
- 14.5.13. Senator Gilbert reported 16 in support of the proposal and 4 unable to come to a consensus.
- 14.5.14. Chair Davis asked if it can be affirmed that all Senators have voted, either electronically or physical thumbs up.
- 14.5.15. Senator Gilbert and her GE committee, we will get this information over to Chair Davis to be entered via the ASCSU portal.
- 14.5.16. Senator Steffel wanted to clarify that the position of the Senate is in support and will submit all of the comments that came in through the form.
- 14.5.17. Chair Davis mentioned there is support for the Cal-GETC proposal.
- 14.5.18. Senator Sweeney asked if we have four people who voted no consensus, and then fourteen who voted not to support, and sixteen to support then we actually don't have a majority that supports. Senator Sweeney suggested it might be a good idea to continue the talk or take another survey that just has A and B.
- 14.5.19. Senator Gilbert said we are putting forward all the information and what they're asking for is a feedback report, and that's exactly what they're going to get. The majority is A and comments, and feedback will be included in the report.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

16. ADJOURNMENT Of THE MEETING Senator Louque motioned and seconded by Senator Sweeney at 3:37 PM.