

Senate Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 1, 2020

Attendees:

Greg Wood, Virgil Adams, John Yudelson, Jason Miller, Alison Perchuk, Melissa Soenke, Elizabeth Say, Genevieve Evans-Taylor, Marie Francois, Mark Patterson, Monica Pereira, Janet Pinkley, Dennis Downey, Ivona Grzegorzczuk, John Griffin, Nancy Deans

Meeting **Call to Order** 2:32pm

Approval of the **Agenda**

(Wood) - Motion to amend the agenda to add Item **5j** – organization of other activities, to discuss how to move forward

Second (Francois)

(Perchuk) – Motion to amend agenda to add, under new business (**6c**), a Resolution making the federal election day an optional instruction day and encourage faculty to give that day off to students

(Grzegorzczuk) – suggest it also should recognize 100 years of women being able to vote

No objections

Second (Pereira)

Agenda approved as amended

Approval of the **Minutes** from August 4* and August 11* and August 18 2020*

(Wood) Motion to approve

Second (Francois) – comment added to get on record: commended for great notes

Minutes Approved

Update from the Provost

(Say) – Provost search update:

Announcement went out informing that candidates will start coming Sept 21 / Still in process of finalizing – you will get CVs 48 hrs prior to their arrival, will be posted 24 hrs after they are here, then materials taken down – Not more information at this time/ acknowledged that the search committee discovered that one of the candidate was scheduled on the Yom Kippur holiday, so are moving things around and will get it out to you asap – shouldn't have happened but changing – 5 good candidates – Exec will have a meeting with each candidate – scheduling that so that Exec meets with each. Discussion continued with requests for live questions and calendar invites for the forums. The Search Committee will look into these requests seriously.

(Say)– sharing info: heard that half of CSU campuses are developing early exit plans for faculty and staff as part of overall strategy to work on budget issues that we will be facing and anticipated enrollment declines on some campuses – CI considering if we should move in that direction but before that decision is made there must be conversations with Unions - must meet and confer. For example, Humboldt already finished – certain Cal PERs Eligible with certain number of years with institution can resign or retire early – some buyout given, not a golden handshake, depending on campuses own revenues and what it can do – those who might decide to leave 5 years earlier – can replace with someone at a lower cost. OurHR is moving to meet and confer with all various entities / no plans, have to have conversation before develop any plans – want to make sure you are informed. Discussion continued stating this might be available to anyone who is CalPers eligible / not just tenure line

(Say) – additional update: Kirk was on vacation but will get started on the stipends for faculty summer work

Continuing Business

International Programs: Faculty Governance (Francois)

(Francois) –different decisions are being made about curriculum, that is international curriculum, which is in UNIV, where I chair and I find out. Issues are:

Lack of clarity; Email exchange with Center Director and roles of curriculum; Over the years the international pillar has shifted, because of size of International Programs at beginning with Antonio and then with Gary Berg things were shifted around – new Dean now, different understanding of roles – Need clarifying of who does what; UNIV392 courses, process goes CIA and IRA funded, delivered off semester delivered through EU and UNIV Experience schedules them – multi-prong process; Summer, call to cancel because not enough students enrolled- one year of planning goes into this – students gets visas, you have to buy insurance and many other things that must be considered with cost analysis of number students – and as Chair of UNIV, I was not consulted, Faculty Director was not consulted and Dean approaching faculty that course cancelled – in place of that; call for faculty to participate in – first demonstration for Deans on COIL – many UNIV teaching faculty received the information – except the Faculty Director of CIA did not get anything – seems to be willfully ignored by Dean – 392 is a travel course not a virtual course / no emails have been answered. Who is charge of International Curriculum – we have an elected board for the CIA that was not contacted or consulted; Need a clearer path of whose roles are what

(Say) – This has been going on, and have been meaning to call a meeting; waiting for faculty to return / would like Dean of EU, CIA board and get people together to work this out – some has to do with structural changes that happened within CSU that effect international. Dean of EU is Chief International Officer for the University – system wide decision. How does that effect the current structure and the CIA?I will own the whole issue of COIL – brought it up to Osman, used to have virtual study abroad course in English at CSUN – mentioned bringing to all Deans –



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

brought it to the Deans and asked, Would your faculty be interested? Tell them in your schools, ask if interested and then we could bring more information. I missed-step by not coming to Andrea first, I apologize and I would have to chalk this up to not knowing all the people (Francois) – Thank you for owning it, but there are multiple issues and needs to be conversation (Say) – yes

Time Certain: 2:30pm President Beck, Shared Governance** (See attached SR 19-01, 19-06) (President Beck) – acknowledged that Resolution was passed last year – previous conversations via email with Greg, hoping to have conversation to describe what you are hoping to see change and see what a solution might be

(Wood) – All request for faculty service comes to Exec, we will create a functional budget committee with significant faculty voice. This is black and white and no hidden intent

(Beck) – not clearly defined for me, what are you all asking for? Multiple pieces of planning? Describe for me what the challenges are

(Pinkley) – broad way – faculty do not have meaningful role in budgeting process – identified the committees, they are disjointed, efforts some times in conflict with one another, no place for faculty to engage in meaningful conversation. For example: AA worked with Kirk with 6 yr budget process – urgent request for in between years, prioritized a rank list, then SRPC came out for SI funding and opened doors for others to “jump the list” – being funded through one-time funding through SI and now have to figure out how to institutionalize and those now become priority (Beck) – SRPC, has been established for a long time, pre-dates me – SI funding was something new that I introduced – was to come in line this year.

(Grier) – SRPC has not functioned, pre-dating you for what we see as a budget committee – we only hear reports, never solicited for ideas or feedback regarding changes happening – never visited that as a faculty to have any say that goes beyond that committee, beyond asking questions. That is how our participation varies and what we want that committee to be (Beck) – conversations happening at ground level and funnels up and down – have had budget forum but don’t think they have been attended well by faculty – having more than one mechanism at a time, that is unusual with SI but makes sense

(Francois) – second case in point – I sat on the committee – and fiscal policies – people who talk the most are faculty – appreciated to have opportunity to talk – but always after the fact; after the decision made and then we are told – The PPT is quarantined until after meeting and then released – we were able to talk more with other units on campus – not static – but committee in itself is not a co-deliberating body. New committee were formed in Academic Affairs – Fiscal had a seat, Advisory Committee, yet another body making different priority decision some faculty on but muddled the waters – numerous spots where competing or conflating decisions happening all at the same times all well-meaning that gets confusing- diffuses the faculty voice.

(Beck) – Who is on fiscal this year?

(Soenke) – I am new – our chair not able to attend because teaching

(Beck) – asked for the number of members

(Soenke) – 4 returning and 3 new



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

(Beck) – asked Greg to send composition please to be aware of who is on the committee
(Beck) - question about budget piece. Assumed it was just about budget, but it talks about planning more broadly – Jason can you talk about that? For me, it could be describing a structure we have not had before

(Miller) – conversation with budget committee reflecting broader conversation across campus of loss of deliberate goals and mission of campus – get back to having a way of collective goals in forms of planning, identify what is important for us, as a campus and community and within that framework would include budget. Have meaningful conversation about goals and budget can step in and have that happen – be more deliberate of what we are as a campus

(Pinkley) – campus sees planning and budget as one but really are separate. Prioritize SI funding because no waiting for those, hard to prioritize. Also, no long-term plan in place, just planning just past the end of our nose and that is it / feedback from SRPC was that decisions were already made and then heard of it. Meaningful conversations and decisions are wanted/regarding the pandemic: the committee making decisions that is effecting campus budgets, bring together faculty, administrators and staff to move us together

(Beck) – holes that are in planning for SI – some discussion about; short vs long – enrollment plan and academic plan – what are the degree programs that faculty vision coming online in the next 5 years, and how to allocate funds – am I hearing you right that this would be part of that

(Miller) – yes, they would be a part of the conversation

(Grier) – academic planning; haven't had for 7-8 years; not having a strong person, permanent person in that position – Request for faculty participation to come through Senate – this summer two faculty hired to work on curriculum and planning but were not people that had been elected to those committees – asking that if we can call committees to do the work at least give them first shot before those appointed, rest of faculty may not have confidence in product if handled that way

(Beck) – with respect to that particular situation – first, would a superseding structure, a structure led by Academic Enrollment Management, academic planning strategic planning – can SRPC be the ... in terms of composition – what is on paper – is it a superseding structure that holds all those levels?

(Miller) – I think it is a good question and I am not sure of the hierarchy – planning process, conversation about what institution wants and what our priorities are and the second part is the budget that the SRPC – I see it happening in parallel, budget a bit administrative

(Francois) – some institutional memory – we had a committee that was a University budget Committee co-chair by faculty and our BFA, What happened in that context – Steve Stratton good to speak to about – faculty wasn't always happy but most of the main cost needs, new building and other kind of needs were all in one place and able to see whole picture and co-chair was faculty – faculty felt better about – a lot more trust that there were channels to voice in a way – other CSUs faculty do chair or co-chair a campus level committee, have a more functional model in our own history,



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

(Beck) – SI is campus wide, but academic plan needs to be from that part of the house – have more dialogue and discussion and see if we can shake something and see what this may look like – more conversations in multiple places – structure, beyond division strategic academic piece (Wood) – SRPC – into an academic year, class sets already set and start budgeting everything else, if education is already set aside and you have a false choice about what to have – education needs to be put back in – instructed to bring to SRPC, but is already decided by fall

(Beck) – have increased TT faculty by 29% in the last 5 years

(Wood) – fewer faculty / more TT, but fewer faculty overall

(Beck) – was told when I stepped on campus to hire TT faculty / if that is not the goal, then ok – this gets back to academic planning – we had a huge push for TT hiring, we budget for the year before / not perfect, we have outgrown the mechanisms

(Beck) – back to faculty representation on University business / more clarity, some given in Jeanne response

(Grier) Senate Exec – have Exec provide faculty for all university business

(Beck) Where there are very clear of the faculty curriculum issues, and other things you identified / otherwise we will collapse under our own weight, if faculty wants to engage in university business through their chair or other, does not have to come through Exec – not same operational definition in own head – all working toward same goal, leads to communication breakdown

(Pereira) rationalize that for me – a guide book, otherwise too broad

(Griffin) – regarding TT hires, focus needs to be on ratio – in addition to hiring faculty – also had increase in number of students – it's the ratio not just the head count

(Beck) – acknowledged that the ratio is important – yes, we have not grown as much

(Francois) – operationalizing – we have faculty elected to work on curriculum and different things, hiring of [faculty on other work this summer] also an example of going around / if people have put themselves out there already then, we should use them. Perhaps a small bucket of funding for faculty – faculty are off and reluctance to reach out during summer – go through Exec, instead of hiring someone new to the topic, hire those elected to do the work, these others were paid, and no opportunity was given to those who were elected to do the work

(Beck) – can you operationalize that – put into clear – eliminate misunderstanding

(Adams) – clarity already there in inclusive and equity – fairness of opportunities – already operationalized

(Perchuk) – point – here as ConC chair – roster of committees, 95% accurate on the senate website – It is a place where anyone can go – not behind any wall – see who faculty has elected – if you want someone to represent the faculty – it should be someone who was elected to represent the faculty – people who have stood up and been elected through the election processes – point our resource

(Beck) – part is a diffused group of people across the institution – also in spirit operationalize this so each place that this is happening



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

(Perchuk) – operationalize what happens on the other side of those entities – if you need faculty representation – check with Senate, check with Secretary or ConC, much easier step – know that there is a resource in Senate, we can put them in touch

(Francois) – looking for a procedure? How to implement the policy

(Miller) – props to Alison, have everyone taking responsibility for their role in shared governance – working on this for a year, although best intentions, not happening –

(Beck) – absolutely fair / agree

(Beck) – have something else – good conversation with CFA, really good and productive – racial justice, social justice – know you have committee you are forming – not aware of what exactly but want to share about our new website: 7 point framework for realizing racial justice – will be linking to areas on University that are working on racial justice – stay in close contact and want to hear about that committee and what is happening and how to partner – appreciated the focus on social and racial justice – want to know what you are doing and how can help facilitate

(Wood) – still working on developing the committee. Other points on SR 19-01 included; structural changes that have occurred and faculty were not consulted – language in resolution indicates that we expect to be involved in structural changes – re: things that have moved around, advising, and various divisions that moved from AA to SA there was much frustration around that

(Francois) – part of it was timing – and no consultation and not even information sharing – faculty were confused about where to direct students and stuff

(Beck) – Financial Aid did not move, advising did not work out as well as we hoped – may have been two years ago

(Francois) – last summer when faculty realized things have been reorganized

(Wood) – also concern that A&S would be divided up and previous decisions happen and expected it be done without faculty knowledge until they return

(Beck) – no, I have no intention of dividing it

(Wood) – would need faculty involvement

(Francois) – series of things happened, IT moving, other things that happened – number of decisions, that were yours to make or the Provosts in the shared governance, would have conversation before decisions were made. Many changes and confusing – changes in [AVP]'s position – are we just told how things are now instead? These things on their own are not such a big deal, but all together became an issue and created a fear set of mind that you don't know what is going to happen

(Beck) – I hear you and this is why I am here; to have a conversation and have you to describe the challenges and to find the solutions together – I am definitely late for my meeting – circle back – have Genevieve here. I am interested in the work you are doing on social and racial justice. Also, implementing AB 1460 lots of work there – here to support and help

(Wood) – confirm your commitment to fix them

(Beck) – yes, absolutely – things that functioned well in the past – how to address mindset and structure that allows for representation – more support and structure, appreciated the example of SI and SRPC, very helpful.

President Beck left the meeting.

Continuing Business

Africana Studies Minor: Ready to go?

Questions/Discussion about the presence of a budget and support from Dean and institution to commit resources. Items were found on curriculog to be included in senate materials.

Tried to push forward before and told it was not ready.

Discussion about ensuring that planning connects to budgeting as necessary for new programs and the academic planning process.

Motion to put African American Studies on Senate agenda with attachments –

IN FAVOR 10

OPPOSED 0

Equity/Diversity/etc Definitions: Ready to go?

Discussions about process discussion of document vs a resolution vote during business.

Suggest having the co-chairs present to Senate to get a sense of what is needed to get approved.

Take questions and have resolution on next Senate agenda

Approval of Task Force for AB 1460 Implementation* (Grier, Pereira)

Discussion of Task Force Charge.

(Wood) – make a broad call for faculty for that taskforce

No objections – move forward

CoC Policy/Timeline: Ready to go?

(Wood) – SP 20-XX – invited Alison Perchuk to introduce policy

(Perchuk) – drafted last year – would like to see on agenda in a manner so that it can be approved before spring elections / we are fine continuing with fall elections / would like ideally no later than last meeting of the semester

Discussion on document elements such as procedural items included and some disagreement with suggested policy/procedures. Perchuk invited comments and edits about the issue.

Motion to put policy from Committee on Committees on Senate agenda

IN FAVOR 5

OPPOSED 4

moves to Senate agenda



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Approval of the Senate Agenda*

Discussion of agenda elements and role of exec in reporting/updating senate on umbrella anti-racist activities as a necessary part of each senate meeting. Distribution of liaison tasks occurred:

Hiring Handbook –Virgil / Faculty Affairs Committee

AB 1460 – Jeanne and Monica and a taskforce to be called

Anti-Racism Equity Committee – Marie and Greg – language

Draft Resolution on BLM – Marie

Cluster Hires – Adams

Chair Handbook – Dennis with Jeanne and Marie

Equity/Anti-Racism Committee Draft Language (draft available to edit via Google Docs link from Miller on 14 Aug email) * (Miller)

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1v23liGAbo18cAEO5ILWymio6lgo0UOVHxYyEYnSU0yw/edit?usp=sharing>

Africana Minor going on the agenda

Next Step in Cluster Hire –

(Say) We have 3 schools, the library and 23 different departments

Equity Anti-racism –

Will get back with feedback we have gotten already and will elicit more at Senate (Greg and Marie)

New Business

Honorary PhD (Evans-Taylor)

(Evans-Taylor) –This process will begin – started with committee on campus that includes Chair of Senate, Provost Say, and University Advancement and Celina Zacarias, Senior Director of Community & Government Relations and a student representative, ASI Chair - will come together with ideas for recommendations that are put to the President for viable candidates – bring names – highly confidential process – any guests will have to removed and put in waiting room while Exec members review materials and determine if candidates are viable – President decides which 2 candidates to put forth – but ultimately decision done by Board. Honorary Doctorate information is on website / see that there is some meaningful connection to the University Two is the maximum; exception is that Trustees that can give us additional one Trustee who helped us found our campus – and was given one. Also trying to balance local and non-local leaders – high moral character, -- cannot give to Chancellor or elected official or someone who has already been awarded – we want them to have a connection to us



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

(Wood) – we make recommendations but the Trustees pick them. Will be back in a few weeks with a list that Greg and Provost will be a part of

New Business

Extend SR 19-03 and 19-04 for the 2020-2021 academic year (Yudelson) *

(Griffin) – standing rules that were approved as we went into the pandemic and faculty are still trying to adapt to new; one these gives the option to remove a bad review or evaluation from file – and think we should extend – recommended that it be done for whole academic year

Other one – extending the year for tenure track – giving an extension

(Wood) – asked Faculty Affairs –reply; right now, all faculty that were brought on TT did have option to extend another year – any way we could ask for a second year; not sure I got through on that; to extend by one year Chancellor's Office said it was ok, asked Faculty Affairs if we can do another one – they don't want to do it unless we can do it.

(Griffin) – generally CBA sets minimal but can extend. Also, ability to pull out a peer review

(Wood) – need to let people know as soon as possible – source of a lot of concern

How do I do online peer evaluations - is there a policy

(Downey) – we should reach out to appropriate people on campus with how to do those evaluations

(Deans) have a concern – want to see policies extended – but another piece is new faculty that came in last year and faculty that come up this year that has startup money that were not allowed to use those – need to back up our faculty to make sure they have the funds to continue when able

(Wood) – where do I follow up?

(Deans) – CFA are meeting and doing labor management meetings but haven't gotten positive feedback. These are our colleagues that will not be successful even with additional year if their money goes away

(Wood) –have not heard about startup funds

(Grier) – are we being asked to extend these or putting forward new resolutions?

(Downey) – most of the things that have to do with evaluation of online teaching are really used for evaluating – we don't have specific forms. Be careful to not do more than we already have – checked with Jill at FIT to give feedback to faculty and there is no policy

(Adams) – first step to figure out what we can or cannot do – if not possible to extend, need information before we act

(Wood) –who – Faculty Affairs?

(Adams) – I would think Faculty Affairs – Sheila Grant's office – are there any system wide extensions?

(Grier) – a few other campuses have extended them through COVID

(Griffin) – and to Jeanne, intent of John's was to change the dates and alternate to come forth as new standing rules but essentially extending the dates



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

(Miller) – request a new resolution – because was written due to [rapid response to COVID social-distancing protocols and request to move to virtual instruction]– with new justification, reasonable request and need new justification

(Deans) – what happened in spring CFA and Senate worked in concert – may not have appeared, but CFA was working with Beth and Sheila at same time --Coming up with Memorandums of Understandings based on the Resolution from Senate – so necessary for those resolutions

(Downey) find a way to council junior faculty – anxiety of going through tenure – need to make aware of implications (monetary)

(Adams) – given that Jeanne has shared that this is possible – due date of Sept 10 for a bunch of stuff

(Grier) – email from John about extension of RTP clock – in same conversation or something different that has been negotiated

(Griffin) – first I have heard

(Grier) – seems like, why make a resolution

(Wood) – consequence of what happened last year – question proposed was are they able to take an additional year

(Griffin) – guidance from informal process – nothing to preclude anyone from doing that and would encourage faculty to take advantage

(Adams) – **motion to move forward** given timeline

(Wood) – add to agenda for Tuesday

(Adams) – in spring, didn't Exec make the decision

(Wood) –we got them through Senate

(Adams) – then write something – due date is coming Sept 10

(Griffin) – I will volunteer with Yudelson to make edits

(Wood) – materials go out Thursday

**Motion to add two resolutions as two new items to Senate Agenda for Tuesday,
September 8**

IN FAVOR 6

OPPOSED 0

Adjourn – 540pm