

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

CSUSB Faculty Senate records

Arthur E. Nelson University Archives

11-21-2023

Faculty Senate Meeting, 58th Senate Minutes (11/21/2023)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

CSUSB Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Meeting, 58th Senate Minutes (11/21/2023)" (2023). *CSUSB Faculty Senate records*. 547.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/facultysenate/547>

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, 58th SENATE
[Faculty Senate Remote/Zoom Meeting Practices](https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87302338002)
<https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87302338002>

M I N U T E S

SESSION 3 - November 21, 2023 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Claudia Davis, Ann Johnson, Beth A. Steffel, Gwendolyn Brower, Carson Fajardo, Cary Barber, Donna Garcia, Ece Algan, Haakon Brown, Haiyan Qiao, Chad Sweeney, Jackie Coyle-Shapiro, Jacob Jones, Jess Nerren, Jill Vassilakos-Long, Jordan Fullam, Karen Kolehmainen, Kimberly Collins, Kristi Papailler, Lúa López, Matt Jackson, Montgomery Van Wart, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Thomas Girshin, Young Hwang, Zachary Powell, Nicole Dabbs, Fadi Muheidat, Yawen Li, Janelle Gilbert, Rong Chen

Members Not Present: Kenneth Desforges, Mark Groen, Tiffany Jones, Rafik Mohamed, Tomas Morales, John Mumma, John Reitzel, Ho Sung So, Daniel Stahl-Kovell,

Alternate Members Present: Shaoyi He, Angela Louque, Armando Barragán

Guest Presenters: Vice President Robin Phillips, David Hou, Steven Vasquez

Guests Present: Erin Yela, Andrea Schoepfer, Barbara Sirotnik, Bryan Haddock, Gerard Au, Jay Varzandeh, Rose Wilson, Sally McGill, Samuel Sudhakar, Twillea Evans-Carthen, Conrad Shayo, Brad Owen, Breanna Hinckley, Carol Hood, Christine Famega, George Georgiou, Jan Kottke, Jesus Canelon, Rebecca Lubas, Robert J. Nava, Ruben Quinonez, Sandy Bennett, Sastry Pantula, Taewon Yang, Tony Coulson, Kasandra Adams, Lori Palmerton, Esther Lee, Kevin Grisham, Melissa Evans, Sastry Pantula, Chinaka DomNwachukwu, Kelly Campbell, Lesley Davidson-Boyd, HyunKyoung Oh, Jie Yu

1. CALL TO ORDER (2:00 PM)
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
 - 2.1. Senator Kolehmainen made a motion to approve the Faculty Senate agenda for November 1, 2023. Senator Fullam seconded the motion. The agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.1. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes October 24, 2023

3.1.1. Minutes tabled

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

4. COMMUNICATIONS/INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1. FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes October 3, 2023 -
Awaiting from Academic Affairs.

4.2. FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes October 10, 2023 -
Awaiting from Academic Affairs.

4.3. FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes October 17, 2023 -
Awaiting from Academic Affairs.

4.4. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes October 31, 2023](#)

4.5. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes November 07, 2023](#)

4.6. [Title IX and Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation \(DHR\)
Assessment for California State University, San Bernardino](#)

4.7. [California State Audit Report](#)

4.8. [Faculty Trustee Report - Darlene Yee-Melichar September 2023](#)

4.9. Curriculum

4.9.1. [Course Changes 11-20-2023](#)

4.9.2. [Program Changes 11-20-2023](#)

4.9.3. [Miscellaneous Request 11-21-23](#)

5. OLD BUSINESS

5.1. FAM 827.3 "Distance Education Policy" [Second Reading]

5.1.1. [With Markup](#)

5.1.2. [Without Markup](#)

5.1.2.1. Chair Davis called for a second reading for FAM
827.3. Senator Fullam motioned for approval.
Senator Sweeney seconded the motion.

5.1.2.2. Chair Davis stated that this was a second reading, as
Senator Girshin had made a motion and had it
seconded at a previous meeting concerning policy.

5.1.2.3. Senator Girshin withdrew the motion from 10/24 in
regards to section 6E, stating that it amounts to
rescinding Senator Hwang's motion, which is
undesirable.

- 5.1.2.4. Senator Dabbs asked for clarification in regards to section 5B on 'Face to face instruction,' stating that a course is 'F2F' if the course material is 0%-25% online. Does the faculty have the outright decision to have that 25 percent online whenever they want? Or is that supposed to be in consultation with the department chair?
- 5.1.2.5. Senator Fullam clarified that if a course is approved to be hybrid through our curriculum approval process and by the Chancellor's office, the instructor has the discretion to put up to 25% of that course online. Likewise, if a course is approved as hybrid, less than 50% online, the instructor may put up to 49% of that course online. The course must be approved according to that designation.
- 5.1.2.6. Senator Dabbs asked for clarification and a friendly amendment on section 26.C. Based on the language of the policy, modality in courses seems to be the current norm. However, in reality, every class is face-to-face and the Faculty Senate has to vote for it to be modular.
- 5.1.2.7. Senator Fullam clarified that Part C in section 26 was intended to be a way to resolve potential disputes.
- 5.1.2.8. Senator Dabbs suggests a friendly amendment stating that *if a program wishes to expand the teaching modality, then a vote of the tenure-line faculty in the program must be held.*
- 5.1.2.9. Senator Fullam acknowledged this as a friendly amendment. Senator Girshin seconded the amendment.
- 5.1.2.10. Chair Davis acknowledged there was no one seeking recognition.
- 5.1.2.11. A vote was taken to approve the friendly amendment.
- 5.1.2.12. The results were 85% Ayes, Nays 6%, 11% Abstention. The amendment passed.
- 5.1.2.13. Chair Davis requested a senator to yield their time to Guest Brad Owen.

- 5.1.2.14. Senator Powell yielded their time to Guest Brad Owen, who requested 5 terminology changes to make the terms consistent with current academic technologies.
- 5.1.2.15. Guest Owen suggested the following edits:
- 5.1.2.16. Guest Owen stated, in section 6C move 'unit' to the end of the sentence and deleted 'on'.
- 5.1.2.17. Guest Owen stated, in section 6D, the same suggestion.
- 5.1.2.18. Guest Owen stated, in section 13, there is no longer a department called 'Academic Technology Innovation.' Change Academic Technology to 'Multimedia and Emerging Technologies(plural).'
- 5.1.2.19. Guest Owen stated, in section 28A, to change technology to plural 'technologies'.
- 5.1.2.20. Senator Fullam acknowledged this as a friendly amendment.
- 5.1.2.21. Chair Davis asked for a motion to approve.
- 5.1.2.22. Senator Nerren supported the motion and the motion was seconded by Senator Girshin.
- 5.1.2.23. A vote was taken to approve editorial changes on FAM 827.3. The results were 87% Ayes, 3% Nays, and 10% Abstention.
- 5.1.2.24. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Nerren.
- 5.1.2.25. Senator Nerren discussed the process of creating the accommodation policy.
- 5.1.2.26. Senator Sweeny stated that it is a dangerous predicament when a single professor can decide what alterations are reasonable or unreasonable and what is or is not a fundamental change.
- 5.1.2.27. Senator Chen speaks to this policy, stating that it takes away the right of faculty to determine which modalities are reasonable.
- 5.1.2.28. Senator Chen discussed that remote modality had been requested by the SSD office, despite never having been provided before.
- 5.1.2.29. Senator Qiao stated that the policy advocates for inclusion, however simply putting students online is not an adequate accommodation. While it is the

easiest accommodation, students do not have equal access as their in-person counterparts.

- 5.1.2.30. Senator Hwang asked if the Distance Education Policy was the right place to discuss SSD.
- 5.1.2.31. Senator Kolehmainen asked if the SSD would provide the necessary technology if the instructor did not make use of it. Would SSD be available to do that for evening classes and Saturday classes as well?
- 5.1.2.32. Senator Kolehmainen asked how Zoom attendees would be able to participate in classroom activities such as laboratory or group activities. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that if these questions were addressed concretely, it would resolve some of the concerns that people have about the policy.
- 5.1.2.33. Senator Garcia agrees that reasonable accommodations need to be made, however, well-intentioned people often make mistakes and it is important for multiple perspectives to be included.
- 5.1.2.34. Senator Garcia asks if there is already a process in place and if a failure has already occurred. If so, it may be an HR/Faculty Affairs issue that needs to be addressed, however, it may not be within the scope of the policy.
- 5.1.2.35. Senator Gilbert pointed out that the direction of the conversation had shifted to one of whether or not students with disabilities should be supported and suggested reconstructing the conversation by clarifying that it is not about whether or not we are for or against the statement. It's an understanding of *where* the decision is made on *how* to make the accommodations.
- 5.1.2.36. Senator Gilbert reiterated that it is not appropriate for somebody outside of the classroom to make the decision, nor is it appropriate to leave the faculty member alone and try to understand what would be appropriate for the student.
- 5.1.2.37. Senator Gilbert stated that several examples have been made where distance education wouldn't be the right way to deal with accommodations– not that this

accommodation shouldn't be made, but that there needs to be more of an involvement of the faculty member in the decision-making process so that someone outside of that learning environment can't just make decisions without the faculty voice.

- 5.1.2.38. Senator Gilbert mentioned that this policy needs to be sent back for complete restructuring on the balance of that decision-making power.
- 5.1.2.39. Senator Nerren addressed the question previously asked about SSD accommodations for after-hours and evening classes. Senator Nerren states that every single hour that there are classes on our campus, SSD is mandated by law to be open and available.
- 5.1.2.40. Senator Nerren also explains a solution that had been previously used for in-class group work, where a paid assistant helped walk a laptop to various group activities within the classroom. This is why the interactive process of the ADA is so important—because not everybody needs this accommodation but it might work for students with unique needs.
- 5.1.2.41. Senator Sweeny stated that the ADA law still applies regardless and that teachers must provide accommodations whether they want to or not. The reason this law exists is because there are people who refuse to provide accommodations at all. Senator Sweeny stated that it is not our place to rewrite the entire ADA law, but rather to open up access to students who really need it. To assume people would take advantage of this system is antithetical and prejudicial towards people with disabilities.
- 5.1.2.42. Senator Algan stated that there is concern over faculty workload becoming a serious issue. There is fear that faculty will be forced to change everything they are doing. Senator Algan proposed a friendly amendment, but a different amendment was already in discussion.

- 5.1.2.43. Senator Chen stated that the policy revokes the option of case-by-case accommodations to be made.
- 5.1.2.44. Senator Chen mentioned that, of the 23 CSU's, CSUSB is the only one trying to push for a change in the Distributive Education policy.
- 5.1.2.45. Chair Davis exhausted the speaker's list and called for a vote on FAM 827.3 "Distance Education Policy".
- 5.1.2.46. A vote was taken, The results were 42% Ayes, 42% Nays, and 16% Abstentions.
- 5.1.2.47. The policy resulted in a tie, and Chair Davis was called to cast the final vote.
- 5.1.2.48. Senator Chen claimed that the motion failed because, in order for the motion to carry, it needed to achieve more than 50%.
- 5.1.2.49. Chair Davis stated that the Robert Rules of Order says the Chair of the Senate should break the vote in case of a tie.
- 5.1.2.50. Senator Dabbs stated that abstain votes should not be included in the final votes, therefore the Chair of the Senate should still have the final vote. Senator Sweeny confirmed this statement, and Senator Girshin furthered this statement by saying a tiebreak is only acceptable if there's a 50/50 tie of all eligible voting members.
- 5.1.2.51. Chair Davis cast her Abstention from the vote, failing the motion. The motion did not pass.

6. NEW BUSINESS

- 7. [CHAIR'S REPORT](#) - No Questions.
- 8. [PRESIDENT'S REPORT](#) - No Questions.
- 9. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#) - No Questions.

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS

10.1. [FAC Report](#)

- 10.1.1. FAM 640.6 "Recruitment and Appointment of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs" [First Read]
 - 10.1.1.1. [With Markup](#)
 - 10.1.1.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 10.1.1.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen motioned to present the policy as a first read. Senator Franklin-Guy seconded the motion.
- 10.1.1.2.2. Senator Kolehmainen reviewed changes in the search policy for the provost:
- 10.1.1.2.3. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 1B, "one faculty member elected from each academic college" was added for clarification. This change would guarantee one member per college elected to the search committee.
- 10.1.1.2.4. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 2, section A was added, which states that "the timing of searches should be initiated and concluded during the academic year to allow for optimal faculty involvement."
- 10.1.1.2.5. Senator Kolehmainen that, in Section 2B, advertisements should be developed with the recruitment committee.
- 10.1.1.2.6. Senator Kolehmainen that, item 2D was moved from section 2E so that it describes the contents of the job.
- 10.1.1.2.7. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 3A, the recruitment should look at all *complete* files of applicants.
- 10.1.1.2.8. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 3B, there should be alternates, if possible, to the list of their 3 finalists.
- 10.1.1.2.9. Senator Kolehmainen that there is a minor labeling error that needs to be cleaned up.
- 10.1.1.2.10. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 3D, language was added to allow the committee to rate applicants as *preferred*, *acceptable*, or *not acceptable*, and their report should be reported to the President.
- 10.1.1.2.11. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 4, 'serving at *the pleasure* of the President' was changed to '*the will* of the president'.
- 10.1.1.2.12. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 5, the language was changed so that the

- appointment is at the *rank* of the professor.
- 10.1.1.2.13. Senator Kolehmainen that, in Section 6, the statement regarding the timing of interim appointments was added.
- 10.1.1.2.14. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that consultation from Provost Mohammed was received and some of the language was revised in response to those suggestions.
- 10.1.1.2.15. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Li on the speaker's list.
- 10.1.1.2.16. Senator Li questioned why, in section 1G, there is no number limit to how many faculty members may be appointed by the President of the University. Additionally, Senator Li expressed concern that this could disrupt the balance between elected and appointed members of the committee.
- 10.1.1.2.17. Senator Kolhemainen explained that section 1G states the committee should be composed mostly of faculty members and clarified that the majority is over 50%.
- 10.1.1.2.18. Senator Girshin asked for clarification on language in section 6– if “interim or acting” is meant to be synonymous with the use of the word “interim” used in the rest of the section.
- 10.1.1.2.19. Senator Kolehmainen clarified that, yes, it was the intent and the language would apply in either case.
- 10.1.1.2.20. Senator Qiao mentioned that, in regard to Senator Li's statement on the ambiguity of section 1G, the language allows for flexibility in the statement due to the word “normally.”
- 10.1.1.2.21. Senator Li suggested that the language should be revised to “the *majority of the committee* should consist of faculty members,” and “the *majority of the members* of the committee should be elected members.”
- 10.1.1.2.22. Senator Van Wart mentioned that ‘elected’ is a significant term.

- 10.1.1.2.23. Senator Qiao stated that the majority of the committee should be elected faculty members.
- 10.1.1.2.24. Senator Kolehmainen agreed and the language will be clarified so that it is clear that this refers to committee members.
- 10.1.1.2.25. Senator Kolehmainen stated that all of the elected members are faculty members, and so elected members are already the majority of the members.

10.1.2. FAM 641.3 “Recruitment and Appointment of Academic College Deans and Associate Deans” [First Read]

10.1.2.1. [With Markup](#)

10.1.2.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 10.1.2.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen explained the changes for the first reading of FAM 641.3:
- 10.1.2.2.2. “Associate deans” was added to the title, and associate deans are now included in the policy itself.
- 10.1.2.2.3. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 1B, the old policy was clarified, stating that committee members should be of senior rank, meaning associate or full professors. Associate deans were also added to the policy.
- 10.1.2.2.4. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 2A, a significant change was added so that timing allows the search to be initiated and concluded during the academic year.
- 10.1.2.2.5. Senator Kolehmainen that section 2B specifies that recruitment advertisements for an Associate Dean would be developed by the dean, in collaboration with the recruitment committee. It also clarified that the search for a Dean should be an open search, whereas a search for an Associate Dean may either be an open search or an internal search.
- 10.1.2.2.6. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 2D, it is specified that the position should be

- advertised for at least a month.
- 10.1.2.2.7. Senator Kolehmainen said that, in section 2E, files are to be kept in the HR office.
- 10.1.2.2.8. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 3A, files need to be complete and the criteria and standards should be determined in advance of the review of any files.
- 10.1.2.2.9. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 3B, some language was added about the number of finalists that is expected– if it's a search for a dean, there should be at least 3 finalists with qualified alternates. For the associate dean, there should be at least 3 finalists if it is an open search or 2 finalists if it is an internal search.
- 10.1.2.2.10. Senator Kolehmainen that, in section 3D, language was added for the ability of the committee to rank candidates as *preferred*, *acceptable*, or *not acceptable*. Language was added about the report being sent to the provost, who would then present the recommendations and any additional recommendations, if appropriate, to the president.
- 10.1.2.2.11. Senator Kolehmainen that sections 4 and 5 have been moved so they appear new but do not contain new material. Some language was changed from serving at the *pleasure* of the President to serving at the *will* of the President.
- 10.1.2.2.12. Senator Kolehmainen that section 5, which deals with retreat rights, addressed the question of what rank those retreatments should take place. For a dean appointment, it should be at the rank of professor. For an associate dean, It could be either at the rank of professor or rank of associate Professor.
- 10.1.2.2.13. Senator Kolehmainen stated that there was a consideration of including Assistant Deans in

the Dean search policy. However, it was consistent that Associate Deans are part of MPP positions, while Assistant Deans are not. The decision was made not to include Assistant Deans in the current policy. Instead, MPP positions, including Dean and Associate Dean, are to be grouped under one policy. Non-MPP positions are to be covered by a new, separate policy that is currently in the crafting process in FAC.

10.2. [EPRC Report](#)

10.2.1. FAM XXX “Coyote Accelerated Post-Baccalaureate Education (CAPE) Blended Programs Policy” [Second Read]

10.2.1.1. [Coyote Accelerated Post-Baccalaureate Education \(CAPE\) Blended Programs Policy](#)

10.2.1.1.1. No questions asked.

10.2.1.1.2. Senator Fullam motioned to accept the CAPE Blended Programs Policy for a second read. Senator Girshin seconded the motion.

10.2.1.1.3. Senator Fullam explained minor revisions to the policy:

10.2.1.1.4. Senator Fullam stated that the language “4+1” was removed from the Purpose and Scope section and also from the Definition section.

10.2.1.1.5. Senator Kolehmainen stated that the word “GPA” was added in section 13.B.iii where 3.0 refers to a 3.0 GPA.

10.2.1.1.6. Chair Davis motioned for a vote on the policy seconded by Senator Girshin.

10.2.1.1.7. A vote was taken on the motion for “Coyote Accelerated Post-Baccalaureate Education (CAPE) Blended Programs. The results were 75% Ayes, 7% Nays, and 5% Abstentions. The motion was approved.

- 10.2.2. FAM 105.4 “Policy Guidelines for the Formation and Review of Institutes and Centers” [Expedited Review]
 - 10.2.2.1. [With Markup](#)
 - 10.2.2.2. [Without Markup](#)
 - 10.2.2.2.1. Senator Fullam motioned to accept the Policy Guidelines for the Formation and Review of Institutes and Centers for an expedited review, despite being the first time it is presented. A vote was requested to approve the motion due to it being a time-sensitive matter. Senator Gershin seconded the motion.
 - 10.2.2.2.2. Senator Fullam explained some minor revisions to the policy:
 - 10.2.2.2.3. Senator Fullam stated that, in section 9, An ex-officio was added to the committee as a non-voting member of the committee for Centers and Institutes to support the work of the committee.
 - 10.2.2.2.4. Senator Fullam stated that, in section 9F, it was added that the report submitted to the Faculty Senate should be prepared by the chair of the committee.
 - 10.2.2.2.5. Chair Davis conducted the vote on the motion. The results were 81%, Ayes 7% Nays, and 3% Abstention. The motion for FAM 105.4 “Policy Guidelines for the Formation and Review of Institutes and Centers” was approved.
- 10.2.3. Proposed Jack H. Brown College School of Cyber and Decision Sciences [First Read] - Not discussed at this time.
 - 10.2.3.1. [JHBC School of Cyber and Decision Sciences Proposal](#)
 - 10.2.3.2. [JHBC School of Cyber and Decision Sciences Recommendation](#)
 - 10.2.3.3. Senator Fullam moved to accept the first reading of the JHBC School of Cyber and Decision Sciences Recommendation. The motion was seconded by Senator Van Wart.

- 10.2.3.4. Senator Fullam explained that the Executive Committee received a proposal to establish the new School of Cyber and Decision Sciences in Jack Brown. The proposal was strong, and EPRC recommended its approval.
 - 10.2.3.5. Senator Hwang stated that the proposal should be discussed at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- 11. STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU SENATORS' REPORT - Not Discussed at this time.
 - 11.1. [ASCSU Chair's Report to the CSU Board of Trustees \(Video\)](#)
 - 11.2. [ASCSU Chair's Report to the CSU Board of Trustees on Educational Policy \(Video\)](#)
- 12. SENATORS' REPORTS - Not Discussed at this time.
 - 12.1. [Senator Fajardo](#) (ASI President)
 - 12.2. [Senator Van Wart](#)
- 13. DIVISION REPORTS - Not Discussed at this time.
 - 13.1. [Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for Finance, Technology and Operations](#)
 - 13.2. [Vice President for University Advancement](#)
 - 13.3. [Vice President for Student Affairs](#)
 - 13.4. [Vice President for Human Resources](#)
- 14. DISCUSSION ITEMS

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

- 15. [Presentation: Title IX and DHR Implementation Team Update](#)
(Vice President Robin Phillips, David Hou, Steven Vasquez)
 - 15.1. Guest Phillips introduced the guest speakers.
 - 15.2. Guest Hou states that there have been updates to the CSUSB Title IX and DHR Program. A year-long assessment was conducted, providing insights into our campus culture and climate, and its strengths and challenges related to the Title IX and DHR programs. Throughout multiple meetings, 5 categories of recommendations were provided in the Cozen O'Connor report:

Infrastructure and Resources, Strengthening Internal Protocols, Communications, Prevention, Education, Professional Development, Training and Awareness, and Responding to Other Conduct of Concern.

- 15.3. Guest Hou stated that The implementation team is looking at ways to improve upon these recommendations. There was an update on what the implementation team has completed and what is to come(as follows):
 - 15.3.1. The Communications plan details the campus strategy and how the DHR will communicate with the community about updates within Title IX NDR.
 - 15.3.2. Grand River Solutions assisted CSUSB with the development of the Multi-Year Campus Plan to address all of the recommendations, some of which the institutional Equity and Compliance office has already started.
 - 15.3.3. Revision of the IEC website took place as of November 1st. It will assist in effective communication with the campus community moving forward. Recruitment and hiring are also currently taking place. Many positions have been filled.
- 15.4. Guest Phillips stated that the communication plan is still a draft. Grand Rivers was engaged to assist in filling vacancies and also to provide resources.
- 15.5. Chair Davis opened the presentation for Q&A.
- 15.6. Senator Van Wart thanked Guest Phillips for their work, as well as for bringing it to the attention of the Faculty Senate.
- 15.7. Guest Phillips mentioned that they tried to anticipate some of the needs, such as with the Education Prevention position. They work with Grand Rivers to build the job description in terms of the responsibilities of that position.
- 15.8. Senator Van Wart stated that keeping people is the largest problem at the moment. Senator Van Wart suggested that a good strategy is sacrificing positions to allow workers to be in higher-level positions.
- 15.9. Guest Phillips explained that, in terms of hiring and keeping workers, they are with the 22 CSU campuses due to the high demand and scarcity of applicants. Guest Phillips considered offering a more competitive package and noted that the team is hiring from the same group of applicants for the southern California region.

- 15.10. Senator Garcia noted the IEC website changes and proposed some questions about when the team was formed, and how the members were selected in relevance to the faculty voice.
- 15.11. Guest Hou explained that the Initial guidance for creating an implementation team came from the chancellor's office. The Chancellor's Office provided guidance to President Morales, who then put together the implementation team. This team includes Chair Davis and Senator Carson, who are senate representatives in the implementation team. Members of the Institutional Equality team are the primary makeup of the Title IX team and the DHR, as they are essentially the experts on the subject matter. That is, in a nutshell, how the implementation team is made up with guidance from the chancellor's office.
- 15.12. Guest Phillips added that they deeply considered representation in the implementation team and stated that if anybody feels key positions are missing, they may suggest them on their website.
- 15.13. Senator Steffel asked if some high points of the communication plan could be shared with the Faculty Senate, and when a first draft of the implementation plan would be provided.
- 15.14. Guest Phillips mentioned that an advisor was assigned to each campus from the Chancellor's office. The advisor received communication plans and provided feedback, which was then shared with the implementation team and published on the website.
- 15.15. Guest Hou added that the procedure was provided by the CEO/advisor/Liaison. Once the Implementation plan is drafted, it is submitted to the CEO for the initial review and the president is allowed to review the plan. So the plan is primarily drafted by the implementation team.
- 15.16. Guest Phillips provided an update that the date of the initial draft is to be shared with the CSU by December 15th for review. The draft includes 152 recommendations that need to be organized coherently for the development of an actual plan. There is a lack of funding for certain positions and how no funds have been distributed. Plans from different campuses within the CSU system are similar, and some adjustments have been made by reallocating resources. Feedback is anticipated at the beginning of the year.
- 15.17. Chair Davis thanked the guests for their presentation.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

17. ADJOURNMENT (Time Certain 4:00 PM) Chair Davis entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Senator Powell motioned to adjourn the meeting.