

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 57th SENATE
[Faculty Senate Remote/Zoom Meeting Practices](#)
<https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87179814033>

M I N U T E S

SESSION 6 - April 11, 2023 – 2-4 PM

Members Present: Ece Algan, Cary Barber, Haakon Brown, Rong Chen, Claudia Davis, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Jordan Fullam, Donna Garcia, Janelle Gilbert, Tom Girshin, Mark Groen, Angela Horner, Ann Johnson, Tiffany Jones, Jason Jung, Karen Kolehmainen, Janet Kottke, Angela Louque, Rafik Mohamed, Tomás Morales, Fadi Muheidat, Kathie Pelletier, Haiyan Qiao, John Reitzel, Brent Singleton, Chad (John) Sweeney, Monty Van Wart

Members Not Present: Helena Addae, Melissa Bakeman, Nicole Dabbs, Stacey Fraser, Paola Galvez, Alain Guevara, Gina Hanson, Young Suk Hwang, Ryan Keating, Sailesh Maharjan, John Mumma, Ho Sung So, Beth Steffel

Alternate Members Present: NA

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

Guests Present: Gerard Au, Sandy Bennett, Gwendolyn Brower-Romero, Lori Caruthers Collins, Rueyling Chuang, Melissa Evans, Twillea Evans-Carthen, George Georgiou, Tomás Gomez-Arias, Karla Gonzalez, Kevin Grisham, Bryan Haddock, Melika Kordrostami, Sally McGill, Robert Nava, HK Oh, Paz Olivérez, Brad Owen, Sastry Pantula, M. Jean Peacock, Robin Phillips, Andrea Schoepfer, Sam Sudhakar, Jill Vassilakos-Long, Clare Weber, Marisa Yeager, Jie Yu, Jake Zhu

1. CALL TO ORDER (2:00 PM)
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
 - 2.1. The Faculty Senate Agenda for April 11, 2023 was approved unanimously as presented.
3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3.1. [Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes March 7, 2023](#)

- 3.1.1. The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes for March 7, 2023 were 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 February 28, 2023](#)

4.2. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes March 14, 2023](#)

4.3. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes March 21, 2023](#)

4.4. Curriculum

4.4.1. [Course Changes 3/17/23](#)

4.4.2. [Program Changes 3/17/23](#)

4.4.3. [Course Changes 3/28/23](#)

4.4.4. [Program Changes 3/28/23](#)

5. OLD BUSINESS

5.1. FAM 640.5 “Recruitment and Appointment of Academic Affairs Central Administrators” [FAC] (Second Reading)

5.1.1. [With Markup](#)

5.1.2. [Without Markup](#)

5.1.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned there was a minor change in terminology from “college” to “constituent unit”. This allows librarians and counselors to serve on these recruitment committees.

5.1.2.2. Chair Davis yielded her time to allow Provost Mohamed to speak.

5.1.2.3. Provost Mohamed suggested an editorial change to update the title of PDC Dean to PDC AVP. Provost Mohamed discussed the recruitment committees for the PDC AVP and CECE Dean. The FAM states there have to be representation from each college and faculty have to be the majority. However, in the case of PDC, the AVP works mostly with staff as faculty report back to administrators on the San Bernardino campus. Provost Mohamed mentioned he would like to ensure staff have a significant voice in that recruitment process. For the CECE

- recruitment, not every college has programs through CEGE, so each college might not need representation.
- 5.1.2.4. Senator Kolehmainen stated this is the first time this has been brought to her attention. One possibility is to remove the PDC AVP from this policy and make a separate policy.
 - 5.1.2.5. Senator Kolehmainen motioned to approve the policy. Senator Pelletier seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The results were 21 Ayes, 1 Nay, 0 Abstentions. The policy passed.
- 5.2. FAM 652.1 “Evaluation of Tenure-Line Faculty” [FAC] (Second Reading)
- 5.2.1. [With Markup](#)
 - 5.2.2. [Without Markup](#)
 - 5.2.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned some of the changes were previously approved by the senate. One change is committee members are now recommended to attend training provided by FAD before reviewing files. Also, FERPers can now serve on college and university evaluation committees, however the committees cannot consist of only FERPers. The SOTE name was changed in case the instrument changes in the future.
 - 5.2.2.2. Senator Kolehmainen motioned to approve the policy. Senator Chen seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The results were 21 Ayes, 0 Nays, 2 Abstentions. The policy was approved.
- 5.3. FAM XXX.X “Credit for Prior Learning Acquired Through Experience” [EPRC] (Second Reading)
- 5.3.1. [With Markup](#)
 - 5.3.2. [Without Markup](#)
 - 5.3.2.1. Senator Fullam motioned to present the policy as a second reading. Senator Franklin-Guy seconded the motion.
 - 5.3.2.2. Senator Fullam mentioned this new policy was developed in response to the Chancellor’s Office Executive Order. Apprenticeships and internships were previously excluded. However, in the absence of universal standards for internships and apprentices, departments may want to use this policy to award credit for apprenticeships and internships. Examples were added to strengthen the

policy. Credit for prior learning through this and/or other policies is limited to a maximum of 25% of the units for the degree.

- 5.3.2.3. Senator Chen asked if the 25% came from CSU.
- 5.3.2.4. Senator Fullam mentioned it came from the CO's EO.
- 5.3.2.5. Senator Fullam motioned to approve the policy. Senator Louque seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The results were 20 Ayes, 0 Nays, 2 Abstentions. The policy was approved.

5.4. FAM 105.4 "Guidelines for the Formation and Review of Institutes and Centers" [EPRC] (Second Reading)

5.4.1. [With Markup](#)

5.4.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 5.4.2.1. Senator Fullam motioned to present the policy as a second reading. Senator Chen seconded the motion.
- 5.4.2.2. Senator Fullam mentioned the policy was previously approved, however there were a few minor typos.
- 5.4.2.3. Senator Fullam motioned to approve the policy. Senator Chen seconded the motion. A vote was taken. The results were 23 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. The policy was approved.

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.1. FAM 035.3 "University-Level Awards" [FAC] (First Reading)

6.1.1. [With Markup](#)

6.1.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 6.1.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned language was added to allow librarians, coaches, and counselors to be eligible for the Outstanding Service and Outstanding Scholarship, Research, Creative Activities Awards. They were not made eligible for the other awards because those place an emphasis on teaching. Librarians, coaches, and counselors are encouraged to establish their own awards.

6.2. FAM 652.2 "Evaluation of Lecturers" [FAC] (First Reading)

6.2.1. [With Markup](#)

6.2.2. [Without Markup](#)

- 6.2.2.1. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned language was added to allow the Honors Program to evaluate their own lecturers.

If a lecturer has a joint appointment, they will be evaluated separately. The policy specifies how an evaluation committee would be chosen. Some of the timelines were changed as well.

6.2.2.2. Senator Chen expressed appreciation for the FAC as these revisions fill gaps in old policies. Senator Chen kindly encouraged lecturer senators to review the policy and discuss it with their colleagues.

6.3. FAM 827.3 “Distributed Learning Policy” [EPRC] (First Reading)

6.3.1. [Current Policy](#)

6.3.2. [With Markup](#)

6.3.3. [With Sources](#)

6.3.4. [Without Markup](#)

6.3.4.1. Senator Fullam motioned to present the policy as a first reading. Senator Reitzel seconded the motion.

6.3.4.2. Senator Fullam explained the process used to put the policy together and explained several of the revisions. The language of expectations is used throughout the policy since it is appropriate when discussing high expectations. Decisions about instructional modality will be data-driven, transparent, and centered on student needs and success. These decisions are pedagogical decisions and therefore within the purview of faculty.

6.3.4.3. Senator Fullam mentioned there was significant debate on whether to require or strongly encourage faculty training. In some instances, “strongly encouraged” was used and in others “expected”.

6.3.4.4. Senator Fullam mentioned any new DE course or programs and changes to existing courses must go through the curriculum process. Any disputes about modality will be resolved through a vote.

6.3.4.5. Senator Chen mentioned this policy was debated on the senate floor a few times last year. Senator Chen asked what is defined as co-synchronous. Is it the use of next generation smart classes (NGSC)? How will co-synchronous classes be coded in the curriculum?

- 6.3.4.6. Senator Fullam mentioned co-synchronous was defined in the policy. Co-synchronous classes will be coded as hybrid.
- 6.3.4.7. Senator Chen mentioned hybrid and co-synchronous classes are both labeled under hybrid. Students might need more direction since the two modalities are different. Senator Chen also mentioned there seems to be motivation for the campus to promote co-synchronous classes. If we eventually push to have everyone teaching every class in that dual modality, we are going to see no face-to-face classes on our schedule. Senator Chen mentioned he is unsure how that will make the campus look to the public and WASC.
- 6.3.4.8. Senator Fullam mentioned he will discuss clearer distinctions between co-synchronous and hybrid with EPRC. Senator Fullam also mentioned he has been told by campus administrators that several programs will need substantive change approval through WASC. If that is the case, there will be less restrictions for programs in adopting DE courses. Additionally, faculty cannot be compelled to teach via DE which would not align with that policy if it were taking place.
- 6.3.4.9. Senator Chen mentioned if the University is prepared to file substantive changes, that is fine. However, he believes it is not a good idea because we would be turning into the University of Phoenix.
- 6.3.4.10. Senator Kottke mentioned faculty are expected to provide proof students are learning and this places a higher threshold for faculty teaching in this format since faculty are not required to provide this proof when teaching face-to-face.
- 6.3.4.11. Senator Fullam mentioned students are requesting flexible learning options, however they are not performing as well online. There is an impetus on campus to improve teaching in distance education. The language of expectations was considered appropriate. EPRC discussed how faculty will be held accountable for these expectations. The appropriate venue for holding

individuals accountable is the established evaluation procedures on campus. Faculty are recommended to submit evidence of student success in DE courses, any professional development activities, etc. in their FAR. Additionally, evaluation of faculty teaching DE courses will follow the same procedures as face-to-face courses.

- 6.3.4.12. Senator Kottke asked for clarity on section 5f. What constitutes the event that an instructor of record is not available to provide permission? Can an example be provided? Senator Kottke mentioned she could foresee mischief coming from this statement.
- 6.3.4.13. Senator Fullam mentioned the examples would be extraordinary extenuating circumstances. The language is not clear and could create some confusion so EPRC will re-evaluate it.
- 6.3.4.14. Vice Chair Jones yielded her time to allow Guest Brad Owen to speak.
- 6.3.4.15. Guest Brad Owen mentioned the spirit of NGSC, was to allow students who might be ill with Covid or have other credible reasons for not attending class to participate synchronously. Guest Brad Owen respectfully requested considering excluding NGSC and co-synchronous classes as hybrid.
- 6.3.4.16. Senator Kolehmainen yielded her time to allow Provost Mohamed to speak.
- 6.3.4.17. Provost Mohamed asked what is meant by “equitably” in section 4e. Does every faculty member have an equal opportunity to teach DE courses? Does it consider student needs? Additionally, Provost Mohamed suggested the language “expected to complete” instead of “strongly encouraged” in section 5b to be more consistent. Section 5e states faculty are expected to have demonstrated efficacy. What qualifies as “demonstrated efficacy”?
- 6.3.4.18. Senator Pelletier asked what EPRC did with all the information that was brought up last year. Some of those amendments address several of the discussions today. What of those previous amendments was included?

- 6.3.4.19. Senator Fullam mentioned the meeting minutes and different policy versions were reviewed to get a sense of what folks cared about. The policy was presented four times, but only received substantive discussion on May 10th, 2022. The amendment about excluding SOTEs that was voted on at the May 10th meeting can be put back in.
- 6.3.4.20. Senator Pelletier mentioned every co-synchronous class would be considered hybrid but not vice versa. Students and faculty need to know what they are signing up for. Senator Pelletier asked if EPRC can provide clarity in how courses are designated for students and ensure that once a faculty member selects a modality, it does not get switched on them based on a technicality or definition.
- 6.3.4.21. Senator Fullam mentioned based on this discussion, the policy can be improved by differentiating between co-synchronous and hybrid. EPRC will work on it.
- 6.3.4.22. Senator Louque referred to section 5f on intellectual property. Who is the "appropriate administrator"? Is it someone in the college or outside the college?
- 6.3.4.23. Senator Fullam mentioned based on the feedback provided, this is problematic. EPRC will discuss it and either just strike out the sentence or add clarity.
- 6.3.4.24. Senator Chen mentioned there are only two senate meetings left this year. Senator Fullam will be presenting the policy back to the senate for a second reading. Senator Chen suggested bringing the policy back in May to allow senators and faculty more time to think about the policy.
- 6.3.4.25. Senator Fullam mentioned he is open to that, if that is what the majority of senators decide. The policy was brought up four times on the senate floor last year and was never voted on. If the policy is brought up in April, it allows the May meeting as backup in case it is needed.
- 6.3.4.26. Senator Pelletier concurred with Senator Chen. The policy has far reaching implications for faculty. Senator Pelletier asked if the policy can be postponed until fall.
- 6.3.4.27. Chair Davis mentioned it is important to have feedback from our constituents.

- 6.3.4.28. Senator Fullam stated he does not think it is a good idea to postpone the policy until fall as there could be a different EPRC chair and members. Senator Fullam would like the current EPRC committee to finish the policy this year.
- 6.3.4.29. Senator Pelletier mentioned it is important that any amendments passed are included in the policy, even if there is a new EPRC chair. Senator Pelletier agreed with Senator Chen that having more time would be appreciated.
- 6.3.4.30. Senator Chen made a motion to bring the policy back on May 9th. Senator Qiao seconded the motion.
- 6.3.4.31. A vote was taken. The results were 23 Ayes, 3 Nays, 2 Abstentions. The policy was postponed until May 9, 2023.

7. [CHAIR'S REPORT](#)

8. [PRESIDENT'S REPORT](#)

- 8.1. Senator Kottke mentioned she watched the Board of Trustee meeting online and a staff member asked if CSU is developing an anti-bullying policy. Senator Kottke asked if the CSU system or CSUSB has started working on an anti-bullying policy.
- 8.2. President Morales answered that he is not currently working on one and does not know if CSU is.
- 8.3. Senator Kottke mentioned it is something to be considered since there are issues across our campus.

9. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#)

- 9.1. Senator Chen asked how many faculty are being hired for next year.
- 9.2. Provost Mohamed mentioned there are currently thirty authorized, but hopefully that number can be extended. Thirty-nine tenure-line faculty will be starting in Fall 2023.

10. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 10.1. [FAC Report](#)
- 10.2. [EPRC Report](#)

11. [STATEWIDE/ASCSU \(ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU\) SENATORS' REPORT](#)

12. SENATORS' REPORTS (INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT'S REPORT)

13. DIVISION REPORTS

13.1. [Vice President for Information Technology Services](#)

13.1.1. [ITS Tech Talks](#)

- 13.1.1.1. VP Sudhakar highlighted three upcoming events which he encouraged faculty to attend.
- 13.1.1.2. Senator Pelletier asked if it is possible to notify of programs being considered before they are purchased in case they have any implications on faculty.
- 13.1.1.3. VP Sudhakar answered absolutely.
- 13.1.1.4. Chair Davis asked for confirmation that ConexEd is a student-facing system.
- 13.1.1.5. VP Sudhakar answered yes.
- 13.1.1.6. Chair Davis asked VP Sudhakar to expand a bit since faculty have the choice to decide whether to use ConexEd yet they are being used as volunteers to test the system.
- 13.1.1.7. VP Sudhakar mentioned several faculty members were involved in the evaluation process and have volunteered to pilot the system by using it to schedule office hours.
- 13.1.1.8. Chair Davis asked if it consisted of faculty and/or chairs department?
- 13.1.1.9. VP Sudhakar mentioned he can provide the names. He did not remember at this time.
- 13.1.1.10. Chair Davis reiterated that VP Sudhakar during an EC meeting stated that faculty have the choice to use it or not.
- 13.1.1.11. VP Sudhakar answered yes, faculty do have the choice and that it is primarily a student-facing system.

13.2. [Vice President for University Advancement](#)

- 13.2.1. Marisa Yeager presented on behalf of VP Nava. University Advancement and the Philanthropic Foundation have been very active. Alumni Relations has also been very busy and has multiple activities for all to join in. The federal and state priorities that were approved by the CSU Trustees were included in the report.

13.3. [Vice President for Student Affairs](#)

13.3.1. VP Olivérez encouraged folks to participate in the Desi Month activities taking place and to encourage students to vote in the ASI elections taking place this week.

13.4. [Vice President for Administration and Finance](#)

13.5. [Vice President for Human Resources](#)

13.5.1. VP Phillips mentioned there is an event recognizing the members of our campus who are retiring and encouraged individuals to attend if they can.

14. DISCUSSION ITEMS-None

15. OTHER BUSINESS-None

16. ADJOURNMENT

16.1. Senator Chen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.