California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

CSUSB Faculty Senate records   **Arthur E. Nelson University Archives**

4-23-2024

Faculty Senate Meeting, 58th Senate Minutes (4/23/2024)

CSUSB Faculty Senate

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

FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 58th SENATE

Faculty Senate Remote/Zoom Meeting Practices
https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87302338002

M I N U T E S

SESSION 7 - April 23, 2024 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Ece Algan, Cary Barber, Haakon Brown, Rong Chen, Kimberly Collins, Jacqueline Coyle-Shapiro, Nicole Dabbs, Claudia Davis, Carson Fajardo, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Jordan Fullam, Janelle Gilbert, Thomas Girshin, Mark Groen, Tiffany Jones, Matt Jackson, Ann Johnson, Young Hwang, Yawen Li, Lúa López, Rafik Mohamed, Fadi Muheidat, Jess Nerren, Kristi Papailler, Zachary Powell, John Reitzel, Montgomery Van Wart, Jill Vassilakos-Long.

Alternate Members Present: Angela Horner, Angela Louque

Members not Present: Kenneth Desforges, Donna Garcia, Beth Steffel

Guests Present: Monica Alejandre, Gerard Au, John Binkley, Kelly Campbell, Rueyling Chuang, Lori Caruthers Collins, Khalil Dajani, Chinaka DomNwachukwu, Janette Garcia, Erika Gaxiola, Bryan Haddock, Carol Hood, Jan Kottke, Thomas Long, Sonia Otte, Esther Lee, Rebecca Lubas, Sally McGill, Paz Olivérez, Sastry Pantula, Robin Phillips, Stacie Robertson, Andrea Schoepfer, Samuel Sudhakar, Rose Wilson

1. Call to order by Chair Davis. (2:00 PM)

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   2.1. Senator Groen motioned to approve the agenda. Senator Jones Seconded the motion. The agenda was unanimously approved as presented.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
   3.1. Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes April 09, 2024

3.1.1. Senator Kolehmainen motioned to approve the minutes. Senator Groen seconded the motion. The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes from April 09, 2024, were approved as presented.

4. COMMUNICATIONS/INFORMATION ITEMS
    4.1. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes 03-19-2024](#)
    4.2. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes 03-26-2024](#)
    4.3. [2024-2025 Academic Calendar](#)
    4.4. [2025-2026 Academic Calendar](#)
    4.5. Curriculum
        4.5.1. [Course Changes 04/19/24](#)
        4.5.2. [Program Changes 04/19/24](#)
        4.5.3. [Miscellaneous Changes 04/19/24](#)
            4.5.3.1. The communication items were unanimously approved as presented.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. OLD BUSINESS

7. NEW BUSINESS
    7.1. [FAM XXX MSPA Program RPT Guidelines](#) [First Read-FAC]
        7.1.1. Senator Kolehmainen presented the proposed departmental guidelines for the MSPA program.
        7.1.2. Senator Kolehmainen stated that Dr. Sonia Otte from MSPA and Dr. Carol Hood from CNS made an appearance at the FAC meeting and presented a few suggested changes.
        7.1.3. Senator Kolehmainen stated that the RPT guidelines are very closely based on the Department of Kinesiology, and feels that the guidelines are in good shape.
        7.1.4. Senator Kolehmainen stated that the FAC recommends the approval of the RPT Guidelines.
        7.1.5. Senator Kolehmainen asked Dr. Otte if she had any

additional input and yielded her time.

7.1.6. Chair Davis acknowledged Guest Otte.

7.1.7. Guest Otte noted that the MSPA program is a graduate program in healthcare compared to most programs on campus.

7.1.8. Chair Davis initiated the speaker's list.

7.1.9. Vice Chair Girshin expressed that the RPT guidelines looked good and proposed some suggestions:

7.1.10. Vice Chair Girshin noted that learning outcomes were mapped across a curriculum, so the program's learning outcome does not apply to every class. Vice Chair Girshin suggested adding the word *appropriate* or *relevant* to the statement, otherwise, it might make it seem like it is required to implement every single outcome in every single class.

7.1.11. Vice Chair Girshin asked for clarification on the term 'remedial instruction' on page 4.

7.1.12. Senator Kolehmainen yielded her time to Guest Otte.

7.1.13. Guest Otte addressed why that remedial language was used; the language was coming from MSPA's accreditation standards, particularly the remedial instruction. That line assures the availability of remedial instruction as a requirement for all principal faculty members within an accredited PA program.

7.1.14. Senator Kolehmainen stated that FAC suggested adding the phrase 'as appropriate,' to not go overboard with how much is provided to each student. In terms of the approved program learning outcomes, the goal is to ensure the students understand that, while they were taking these courses, they knew how they were integrated into the overall purpose of the program since it is a cohort-style program. All students will be taking the same set of courses at the same time. The intention was for students to understand what they were working towards no matter

what class they were in.

7.1.15. Chair Davis noted that page 7 contained many abbreviations, and suggested writing the acronyms out to afford everyone an understanding of what they mean.

7.1.16. Senator Kolehmainen emphasized that if anybody has suggestions, to direct them to herself, Dr. Otte, or Dr. Hood, as the FAC is not primarily responsible for this document.

7.2. FAM 652.4: "Evaluation Of Tenure-Line Library Faculty" [First Read-FAC]

7.2.1. [With Markup](#)

7.2.2. [Without Markup](#)

7.2.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen presented the changes made to FAM 652.4 and noted that they were done primarily by Librarian Bonnie Petry from the library. Senator Kolehmainen noted that Librarian Petry had done such a good job in her suggested revision the FAC did not feel like they had to change very much.

7.2.2.2. Senator Kolehmainen stated that language was added at the very beginning of the policy to clarify the differences between the evaluation of libraries and the evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Clarification was added for levels of review, which are: the library evaluator, library evaluation committee, library dean, and finally the University Evaluation Committee serving as a final level of review for all cases. The levels of review have not changed, but the language that describes them has been clarified.

7.2.2.3. Senator Kolehmainen stated that changes were made to align this document with changes made to other FAMs, including a reminder that FERPers can serve on the Library Evaluation Committee as well as the University Evaluation Committee. Other changes

included: a statement encouraging training for evaluators and a clarification that early tenure and promotion is only possible after the fourth year.

7.2.2.4. Senator Kolehmainen verbalized that a major change was made in the section referring to the evaluation of non-tenure-line librarians. The section was removed, which is consistent and parallel to the policy for instructional faculty.

7.2.2.5. Senator Vassilakos-Long thanked Senator Kolehmainen for her kind words and mentioned that Bonnie is an amazing, ruthless, and thoughtful editor.

7.3. FAM 871.4 Teaching Resource Center [First Read-FAC]

7.3.1. [With Markup](#)

7.3.2. [Without Markup](#)

7.3.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen stated that this policy came to FAC as a result of a request from the Executive Committee for more detail to be added about the selection of the TRC director, which led to a whole separate policy being created that would govern not only the selection of the TRC director but also the selection and review of several non-MPP administrative positions.

7.3.2.2. Senator Kolehmainen stated minor revisions were added, such as point 3 under purpose and scope. One other change included language that mentions diversity, equity, and inclusion. DEI activities were added to the purview of the TRC. Under the organizational structure, the language about the selection of the director of TRC was removed and replaced with a reference to the new policy.

7.3.2.3. Chair Davis noted that no one sought recognition on the speaker's list.

7.4. FAM 803.65: "Student Grade Grievance Policy" [First Read-EPRC]

    7.4.1. [With Markup](#)

    7.4.2. [Without Markup](#)

        7.4.2.1. Senator Fullam stated that this policy was originally referred to EPRC with the request that the academic grievance form be made more friendly for use with Adobe Sign. When EPRC reviewed the policy, it was noticed that the procedure described in the policy was not aligned with the form itself, so revisions were made to reformat the form and update the procedure described in the policy so that it's strongly aligned with the form. In addition, the policy originally covered grade grievances and other academic grievances, but in EPRC's conversations around the policy, it was determined that other kinds of academic grievances are handled in other ways, so they were excluded from the policy, and the policy is now specific to only grade grievances.

        7.4.2.2. Senator Fullam noted that the reformatted form is at the bottom of the policy, with different levels of the grade grievances, and different sections that would need to be filled out by the different parties. A description of the procedure for each stage of the grievance is embedded in the different stages of the form.

7.5. FAM 803.5 "Policy And Procedures Concerning Academic Dishonesty" [First Read-EPRC]

    7.5.1. [With Markup](#)

    7.5.2. [Without Markup](#)

        7.5.2.1. Senator Fullam stated that this policy was brought to the EPRC to include new language regarding the use of generative AI. The policy was updated to state that it is the instructor's discretion to set their policies

on the use of AI and guidance is provided in the policy. In addition, EPRC updated the relevant Chancellor's Office executive order and linked Executive Order 1098 to the policy.

7.5.2.2. Chair Davis initiated the speaker's list and acknowledged Senator Dabbs.

7.5.2.3. Senator Dabbs mentioned that, in section 2A if faculty do not permit any AI to be used in class, how will they know? Mechanisms to detect AI are not always accurate. Senator Dabbs expressed concern over what would happen to students if they were accused of using AI and were unable to prove it.

7.5.2.4. Senator Fullam stated that it was discussed by EPRC but was left out of the policy because there is nothing that can be included to guide faculty in this situation. AI will be changing rapidly over the next several years.

7.5.2.5. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Nerren.

7.5.2.6. Senator Nerren noted that there are a lot of different kinds of AI besides generative AI, and was wondering if this policy applied to other types of AI apart from generative AI.

7.5.2.7. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Fullam.

7.5.2.8. Senator Fullam stated that when they originally developed this language, the word generative was not included and it referred to AI in general. The word generative was added because generative AI is the kind that produces products such as text, images, and audio-visual products, and would be most relevant to plagiarism.

8. CHAIR'S REPORT
   8.1. Chair Davis entertained any questions.

8.2. No questions noted.

9. [PRESIDENT'S REPORT](#)
   9.1. President Morales was not present.
   9.2. No questions noted.

10. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#)
    10.1. Provost Mohamed entertained any questions.
    10.2. No questions noted.

11. COMMITTEE REPORTS
    11.1. [FAC Report](#)
        11.1.1. Senator Kolehmainen stated that most of the report deals with policy revisions that were previously mentioned. Furthermore, the FAC suggested the creation of an RPT task force and suggested to the Executive Committee that this task force be created.
        Senator Kolehmainen noted that she is in the process of writing a call for nominations for the Executive Committee to send out.
    11.2. [EPRC Report](#)
        11.2.1. Senator Fullam stated that his report summarizes the revisions to the two policies previously mentioned.

12. [STATEWIDE/ASCSU (ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU) SENATORS' REPORT](#)
    12.1. Senator Steffel was not present.
    12.2. No questions asked.

13. SENATORS' REPORTS (INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT'S REPORT)
    13.1. [Senator Fajardo](#)
        13.1.1. Senator Fajardo noted that the ASI Board of Directors is still seeking a Faculty Senate representative.

14. DIVISION REPORTS
    14.1. [Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for Finance, Technology, and Operations](#)
        14.1.1. No questions noted.
    14.2. [Vice President for University Advancement](#)
        14.2.1. Guest Monica Alejandre thanked faculty for participating in the faculty staff campaign.
    14.3. [Vice President for Student Affairs](#)
        14.3.1. Vice President Olivérez mentioned that several affinity graduations are coming up in addition to formal commencement. The end-of-the-year community dinner for undocumented students is taking place in the Success Center and resources and information on how to support our undocumented students will be shared.

    14.4. [Vice President for Human Resources](#)
        14.4.1. Vice President Phillips mentioned that CSUSB recently hosted Student Employment Appreciation Day, and many faculty members were present.

15. DISCUSSION ITEMS

16. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 3:30 PM Time Certain: Vice Chair Girshin - Referendum concerning the SPT Instrument
    a. [SPT Referendum](#)
        i. Vice Chair Girshin thanked the SPT Committee for their work on the Student Perceptions of Teaching Instrument, as it represents a significant improvement and will be more useful to faculty as they respond to student feedback and continue to improve their teaching.

ii. Vice Chair Girshin motioned to use the referendum text that has been updated to initiate a referendum on the faculty on the SPT instrument.

iii. Chair Davis initiated the speaker's list and acknowledged Senator Fajardo.

iv. Senator Fajardo asked Vice Chair Girshin how students were involved in the surveying of this process.

v. Vice Chair Girshin stated that students were involved in multiple ways in the past through surveys and pilot studies, and asked Senator Powell if he had more information.

vi. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Powell on the speaker's list.

vii. Senator Powell stated that, in brief, when the survey was first developed candidate items were discussed with students and the goal was to see how students responded to certain questions. Before the SPT pilot, the SPT Committee had a test run in their classrooms to improve the clarity of questions. Student feedback was always taken into consideration.

viii. Senator Fajardo asked if ASI was involved in the past year.

ix. Senator Powell stated that there are ASI representative positions available on the SPT Pilot committee but the position was not filled this year.

x. Chair Davis yielded her time to Guest Jan Kottke, the former SPT committee chair.

xi. Guest Kottke mentioned that over 150 students were previously involved in the early think-alouds, not to mention the countless students involved in the surveys. It was a deep dive to make sure that the students would understand what was being evaluated or was being requested of them.

xii. Chair Davis acknowledged Vice Chair Girshin on the speaker's list.

xiii. Vice Chair Girshin mentioned that he received an email from a faculty member who had suggestions for the instrument and wished to propose them. First, In the last paragraph for instructions for the SPT, the recommendation was that the term 'per week' be added to clarify hours per unit.

xiv. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Algan on the speaker's list.

xv. Senator Algan asked why faculty asked students the number of hours dedicated to their classes.

xvi. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Powell on the speaker's list.

xvii. Senator Powell mentioned that it provides an opportunity for instructors to observe how students prepare for class, as well as an opportunity to communicate expectations with students.

xviii. Senator Powell yielded his time to Guest Kottke.

xix. Guest Kottke noted that one of the goals around the new instrument was to have an opportunity for the faculty to get formative feedback, and therefore there is an option to administer the instrument earlier in the term.

xx. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Li on the speaker's list.

xxi. Senator Li asked if the committee has any recommendations on how to use this for the RPT process.

xxii. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Powell on the speaker's list.

xxiii. Senator Powell noted that the instrument was different from the SOTE and was meant to be used differently. In this case, the use of the average score is discouraged and individual rates and answers are taken into consideration. Part of the guidance in the instrument is how faculty look at that feedback to seek professional development and better engage students in the classroom.

xxiv. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Hwang on the speaker's list.

xxv. Senator Hwang noted questions 7-19 are open-ended questions, and asked if they would be separated from the scale rating questions.

xxvi. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Powell on the speaker's list.

xxvii. Senator Powell stated that questions without a text box would be placed on a rating scale. Open-ended questions would provide students with more of a voice with particular questions and provide more feedback for faculty.

xxviii. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Algan on the speaker's list.

xxix. Senator Algan asked if this survey would completely replace SOTE's, and was confused about whether it would take place

earlier in the semester. Further, Senator Algan asked if some language should be changed so that students could ask if students felt that they learned a lot rather than how helpful the professor was.

xxx. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Powell on the speaker's list.

xxxi. Senator Powell stated that the intent was to replace the SOTE and there was a suggestion that faculty present the survey in this way if they chose to get early feedback. Further, the SPT was written to focus on instructor behavior rather than the student's attitude, because faculty can only control their own behavior.

xxxii. Chair Davis acknowledged Vice Chair Girshin on the speaker's list.

xxxiii. Vice Chair Girshin noted that question 11 went under a lot of revision and the trickiness of it was how to address the diversity of classroom environments. The goal was to keep the phrasing broad so as to be inclusive in different settings. Further, the referendum asks if faculty approves of replacing the SOTE with the SPT.

xxxiv. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Jones on the speaker's list.

xxxv. Senator Jones mentioned that the SPT is desired to allow faculty the ability to administer the survey earlier in the semester for feedback. Senator Jones noted that they are advocating for this change but it may be delayed due to technological restraints. Senator Jones added that it would be helpful to include in question 11 that to add that the instruction *helps* facilitate the learning rather than just facilitates, and that language could address the concerns of students having ownership of their learning.

xxxvi. Senator Powell yielded his time to Guest Kottke.

xxxvii. Guest Kottke mentioned that Senator Powell did a great job in developing the SPT and it would be a great shame if technology would impede the faculty from using this for this purpose.

xxxviii. Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Sweeney on the speaker's list.

xxxix. Senator Sweeny stated that he found trouble with the wording of question 11; it is a very teacher-centric question that implied the purpose of the class is for the professor to disseminate information, whereas, in classes where students thrive the most,

they are often teaching each other. In this case, the professor is facilitating learning, and Senator Sweeny suggested the wording "the professor or the organization of the class helps facilitate *or empowers* the learning process."

xl.   Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Kolehmainen on the speaker's list.

xli.   Senator Kolehmainen stated that in question 12 the word "explanation" was used which implies the professor is explaining information to the students, and wondered if the word "facilitates" would be better.

xlii.   Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Nerren on the speaker's list.

xliii.   Senator Nerren agreed and stated that if one question uses the word "facilitates," the language should be kept consistent throughout the SPT. Furthermore, the last phrase in question 11 "doing so clearly" could be an entirely different question.

xliv.   Chair Davis acknowledged Senator Powell on the speaker's list.

xlv.   Senator Powell addressed Senator Sweeney's point, noting that a lot of faculty have invested a lot of time in different teaching modalities and different formats, and a general-purpose instrument could not capture all the different experiences that faculty and students bring to the classroom. Senator Powell noted that the phrase "help facilitate" felt effective. The suggestion to add "facilitates or empowers" may cause uncertainty or lack of clarity to students who are taking the SPT.

xlvi.   Senator Powell agreed with Senator Kolehmainen's suggestion to keep the language consistent throughout the SPT and to use the word "facilitates" throughout the survey. Senator Powell addressed Senator Nerren's point about the word "clearly," stating that the simple solution is to delete the word "clearly" and replace it with "facilitate"

xlvii.   Senator Powell stated that there was the possibility for faculty to add their own questions and for departments to create their own teaching evaluation instruments. Senator Powell noted that this is

voting on a general-purpose instrument, and is to be used by most faculty in most disciplines.

xlviii. Chair Davis acknowledged Vice Chair Girshin on the speaker's list.

xlix. Vice Chair Girshin proposed an amendment to questions 11 and 12 so that faculty could weigh in as soon as possible. Vice Chair Girshin suggested revising the questions to:

1. 11. The instructor helps facilitate the learning of course material (e.g., theories, concepts, or ideas)

2. 12. If you wish to give more detail on the instructor's facilitation of learning in the course, feel free to explain here: (comment box)

l. Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion.

li. Chair Davis restated the motion to approve the changes to question 11, stating, "The instructor helps facilitate the learning of course material (e.g., theories, concepts, or ideas.)"

lii. A vote was taken with 23 Ayes. The motion passed.

liii. Vice Chair Girshin motioned to approve the changes to question 12, stating, "If you wish to give more detail on the instructor's facilitation of learning in the course, feel free to explain here: (comment box)" Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion.

liv. Chair Davis restated the motion to approve the changes. A vote was taken with 26 Ayes, 2 Nays, and no abstentions. The motion passed.

lv. Vice Chair Girshin motioned to amend the language to some idea of how much preparation is expected for a college-level class, for a 3-unit course, 6 hours per week of outside work is expected (i.e., the standard for college-level work is 2 hours per week of work outside of class session, per course unit). Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion.

lvi. Chair Davis restated the motion to make amendments to clarify that units are measured in hours "per week."

lvii. A vote was taken with 26 Ayes, no Nays, and no Abstentions. The motion passed.

lviii.   Vice Chair Girshin motioned to revise the language in question three, rewriting it to " How many hours did you prepare for this course, outside of class, per week? Preparing for class could include reading course material/textbook, reviewing slides, looking at notes, completing homework assignments, rehearsing, etc."

lix.   Chair Davis restated the motion and held a vote. The results were 27 Ayes, no Nays, and no Abstentions. The motion passed.

lx.   Vice Chair Girshin motioned to revise the language in the preamble before question 7 to state "The feedback you give can be used to assess teaching practices, improve the course in the future, and evaluate an instructor's teaching performance. All feedback is anonymous and will not affect your grade in the course."

lxi.   Chair Davis restated the motion and held a vote. The results were 22 Ayes, no Nays, and no Abstentions. The motion passed.

lxii.   Vice Chair Girshin motioned to vote on whether or not to pass all the changes in the language on to the faculty as a whole, to propose the referendum on the instrument so that faculty can provide their input.

lxiii.   Senator Algan suggested revising the language in the preamble before question 7 to change the wording from "the feedback can be used" to "the feedback will be used"

lxiv.   Senator Jones noted that it is better to use the word "can" because professors have the option to opt-out of student evaluations, so not all of the data is used all of the time.

lxv.   Vice Chair Gishin motioned to initiate a referendum of the faculty on the SPT Instrument.

lxvi.   Chair Davis restated the motion and held a vote. The results were 25 Ayes, no Nays, and no Abstentions. The motion passed.

lxvii.   Senator Vassilakos-Long noted that from the beginning the SPT was very much seen as an opportunity for faculty to get feedback so they could do a mid-course correction, but it has now morphed into the idea that it will place the SOTEs, which would be at the end of the semester. Senator Vassilakos-Long noted that a question to be included in the referendum should be "Do you

approve of this instrument" and "How would you prefer to see it used?"

lxviii.   Senator Powell stated that the SPT was intended to replace the SOTE, and there would be the option for faculty to use the SPT in two waves if they chose to. The ability to do so depends on the university resources and IT issues, but at its core, this is the intention.

lxix.   Senator Jones agreed and stated that faculty have to be clear that they are voting for SPT to replace the SOTE, and there may or may not be an opportunity to release it earlier, based on university resources and its restrictions. Faculty cannot be expected to vote on the assumption that they may have power as to when it could be released.

lxx.   Chair Davis clarified that the Executive Committee met with Chief Information Officer Gerard Au and the IT team to discuss this, and the understanding was that they have a mechanism using Class Climate, and are looking into how these needs can be met.

lxxi.   Senator Vassilakos-Long withdrew her suggestion.

lxxii.   Guest Samuel Sudhakar stated that Class Climate can accommodate any change in questions or formats, and has a lot of flexibility in the types of questions and types of formats that can be used. It does not allow faculty to open and close the surveys at the time of their choosing. Unfortunately, no software has been found that will allow that flexibility.

lxxiii.   Senator Gisrshin asked Guest Sudhakar if this was specific to the new version of Class Climate.

lxxiv.   Guest Sudhakar confirmed that this was for the new cloud version of Class Climate.

ADJOURNMENT (Time Certain 4:00 PM)

Chair Davis motioned to adjourn the meeting. Senator Chen seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 PM.