

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 57th SENATE

[Faculty Senate Remote/Zoom Meeting Practices](#)

<https://csusb.zoom.us/j/87179814033>

MINUTES

SESSION 4 - February 07, 2023 - 2-4 PM

Members Present: Ece Algan, Cary Barber, Haakon Brown, Rong Chen, Nicole Dabbs, Claudia Davis, Sherri Franklin-Guy, Jordan Fullam, Donna Garcia, Thomas Girshin, Gina Hanson, Angela Horner, Ann Johnson, Tiffany Jones, Jason Jung, Ryan Keating, Karen Kolehmainen, Janet Kottke, Angela Louque, Rafik Mohamed, Tomás Morales, Fadi Muheidat, John Mumma, Kathie Pelletier, Haiyan Qiao, John Reitzel, Brent Singleton, Beth Steffel, Chad (John) Sweeney, Monty Van Wart

Members Not Present: Helena Addae, Melissa Bakeman, Stacey Fraser, Paola Galvez, Janelle Gilbert, Mark Groen, Alain Guevara, Young Suk Hwang, Sailesh Maharjan, Ho Sung So

Alternate Members Present: Taline Georgiou

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

Guest Presenters: Kelly Campbell, Bradford Owen, Ashlie Singleton

Guests Present: Gerard Au, Sandy Bennett, Tiffany Bookman, Chris Bradney, Lori Caruthers Collins, Rueyling Chuang, Khalil Dajani, Kimberly Cousins, Lesly Davidson-Boyd, Chinaka DomNwachukwu, Melissa Evans, Twillea Evans-Carthen, George Georgiou, Karla Gonzalez, Bryan Haddock, Christina Hassija, Dorota Huizinga, Rebecca Lubas, Josephine Mendoza, John Mumma, Robert Nava, HK Oh, Sastry Pantula, Emily Porter, Robin Philips, Andrea Schoepfer, Samuel Sudhakar, Mandy Taylor, Jie Yu

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1.1. [Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes November 22, 2022.](#)

1.1.1. The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes for November 22, 2022 were approved unanimously as presented.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

- 1.1.2. Vice Chair Jones made a motion to approve the Faculty Senate Agenda for February 7, 2023. Senator Chen seconded the motion. The agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

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

2. COMMUNICATIONS/INFORMATION ITEMS
 - 2.1. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes November 15, 2022.](#)
 - 2.2. [FS Executive Committee Meeting Minutes November 29, 2002.](#)
 - 2.3. [CSU Memo Executive Vice Chancellor](#) & [Suggested Template](#)
3. OLD BUSINESS
 - 3.1. Proposed Center: [Center for Advanced Functional Materials \(CAFM\)](#) [EPRC] (Second Reading)
 - 3.1.1. [CAFM Recommendations](#)
 - 3.1.1.1. Senator Fullam motioned for a second reading of the EPRC's recommendations on this proposal. Senator Chen seconded the motion.
 - 3.1.1.2. Senator Fullam explained a new center called the Center for Advanced Functional Materials has been proposed and recommended taking action on this proposal.
 - 3.1.1.3. A vote was taken for approval of the proposed Center for Advanced Functional Materials. The results were 21 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 1 Abstention. The motion passed.
 - 3.2. FAM 105.4 "Policy Guidelines for the Formation and Review of Centers and Institutions" [EPRC] (Second Reading)
 - 3.2.1. [With Markup](#)
 - 3.2.2. [Without Markup](#)
 - 3.2.3. [Proposed Committee for Centers and Institutes](#) [EPRC] (Second Reading)
 - 3.2.3.1. Senator Fullam motioned for a second reading of the revisions to FAM 105.4 on Centers and Institutes. Senator Kolehmainen seconded the motion.
 - 3.2.3.2. Senator Fullam informed the revisions to FAM 105.4 on Centers and Institutes began because an audit from the Chancellor's Office found that in many cases, policies and procedures were not being followed. The Chancellor's

Office recommended updating FAM 105.4 on Centers and Institutes.

3.2.3.3. Senator Fullam presented the revisions that had been previously presented at the last Faculty Senate meeting. As a result of that feedback, the EPRC Committee made three small revisions. The first was that the proposed committee, which is being called the Committee for Centers and Institutes, was changed from a standing committee to a special committee. Second, the description of duties now contains the following statement “provide the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate a report at the end of each semester that includes the status of all CI annual reports and a summary of other committee activities related to the duties described above”. The last change was to the description of the committee. It will now be composed of one tenure-track faculty member from each college, one student representative and two directors of centers or institutes.

3.2.3.4. Senator Fullam made a motion for approval of the revisions. Senator Chen seconded the motion.

3.2.3.5. A vote was taken. The results were 21 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 2 Abstentions. The motion passed.

3.2.4. Committee Book 2022-2023 [EPRC] (Second Reading)

3.2.5. [With Markup](#)

3.2.5.1. Senator Fullam explained that they removed the responsibility for oversight for centers and institutes from the description of the duties of the EPRC Committee in the Committee Book. It was removed because it will be turned over to the Committee for Centers and Institutes if the FAM is approved.

3.2.5.2. Senator Fullam made a motion to approve the removal of the responsibility from EPRC. Senator Louque seconded the motion.

3.2.5.3. A vote was taken. The results were 24 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 1 Abstention. The motion passed.

3.2.6. FAM 035.4 “Guideline for Distribution of Assigned Time for an Exceptional Level of Service to Students Awards” [FAC] (Second Reading)

3.2.7. [With Markup](#)

3.2.8. [Without Markup](#)

- 3.2.8.1. Senator Kolehmainen moved to accept this policy revision for a second reading. Senator Pelletier seconded the motion.
- 3.2.8.2. Senator Kolehmainen explained that these are the awards that were formerly known as the CEAT awards. The awards have been renamed to Exceptional Service to Students Awards (ESSA). Besides the name change, there were a few substantive changes. The first major change is the timing of the awards. In the past, there were issues with the awards because they were not typically awarded until the end of fall semester. The assigned time people received was to be used in the spring. Now the awards will be awarded the previous spring to be used the next academic year. This will give more time to rearrange teaching schedules for those individuals who get the awards. The second major change is regarding the membership of the committee that hands out these awards. Previously, appointments were one-year terms. Now they will be two-year staggered terms.
- 3.2.8.3. Senator Kolehmainen discussed the new timeline. Early in the fall semester there would be a call for applications for the awards and a call for committee members to serve on the committee that determines the awards. The applications would be due by the last week of January. The committee would evaluate the applications in early February and make their decisions by the end of February. The awardees would be notified in early March.
- 3.2.8.4. Senator Kolehmainen explained that the final change is regarding eligibility. Lectures are eligible for these awards.
- 3.2.8.5. Senator Pelletier recommended updating the Committee Book to reflect the new name change.
- 3.2.8.6. Chair Davis made a motion to update the Committee Book to the correct name.
- 3.2.8.7. A vote was taken to approve FAM 035.4. The results were 22 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1. FAM XXX.X “Interruptive Circumstances” [FAC] (First Reading)

4.1.1. [Without Markup](#)

- 4.1.1.1. Senator Kolehmainen explained that this FAM proposal was prompted by the appendices that the English Department and Kinesiology Department have in their department RPT guidelines. The proposed FAM explains that if an interruptive circumstance happens in the future, RPT should take that into consideration when reviewing files. While faculty may be allowed to delay their tenure clock when something of this nature happens, there may still be negative consequences in doing this. It can affect salary, lifetime earnings, etc. Not everybody may choose to exercise the stopping of the tenure clock. Therefore, RPT evaluators should be a bit lenient in taking these considerations into account when evaluating faculty who have been affected by something like a pandemic. This would be a new FAM policy, which is why it does not have a FAM number or marked up version.
- 4.1.1.2. Senator Kottke expressed support behind the idea but did have a question. There is a statement mentioning how “mobility of faculty” “destabilizes the department”. Senator Kottke did not understand what it is doing in the proposed FAM since the primary purpose of this policy is to support faculty.
- 4.1.1.3. Senator Dabbs explained that the intent was to show that if multiple faculty members were affected by an interruptive circumstance, it could have a ripple effect on the entire department.
- 4.1.1.4. Senator Kottke suggested using different verbiage such as " the collective consequences of an interruptive circumstance need to be taken into consideration". The goal is to provide more justification for why RPT committees need to be cognizant of how interruptive circumstances can create a cascading effect.
- 4.1.1.5. Senator Sweeney expressed support for the change. Senator Sweeney mentioned how the junior faculty in the English Department are very concerned since English

research is typically conducted by attending conferences, publishing papers, meeting people at conferences, publishing more papers, etc. Networking around the country leads to opportunities and success in publications and research. Therefore, two years of canceled travel to conferences can make a huge difference. Senator Sweeney reflected on what Senator Kottke mentioned about destabilization. If a number of faculty are not tenured on time, they cannot serve on certain committees. This would lead to too few people to serve on important committees that are necessary for the maintenance of the department. If there is not enough tenured faculty or FERPs to serve on the committees, it can have a cascading effect on the business of the departments.

4.1.1.6. Senator Chen asked if it is possible to have this policy be embedded in the Evaluation of Tenure Line Faculty policy.

4.1.1.7. Senator Kolehmainen stated that the FAC did think about embedding this policy into the RPT policy. The FAC opted for not putting it in the RPT policy. The reason being that a revision of the RPT policy was previously passed. However, it was not signed by the President. The FAC is now working on a revision to that revision that was never signed. Thus, they did not want to put this policy in the RPT policy in case the revision did not get signed again. In terms of the wording Senator Kottke suggested, the short paragraph can be reworded.

4.1.1.8. Chair Davis stated that this will continue to be a first read.

4.1.1.9. Senator Algan referred to the last sentence of the first paragraph. It mentions faculty of diverse backgrounds. Senator Algan wanted confirmation as to whether the policy is only for people of diverse backgrounds.

4.1.1.10. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that the policy is for all faculty. Senator Kolehmainen's takeaway is that diverse faculty may be more affected by some of these restrictions, just as they are by many other things in life. Also, from the point of DEI issues, it is an important policy to have in place.

- 4.1.1.11. Senator Algan asked if there are HR practices, forms, etc. in place that can help with this. Has there been a situation where a tenured track faculty member suffered through these interruptive circumstances and did not find the support or extension they needed? Is there really a need for this policy?
- 4.1.1.12. Senator Kolehmainen stated that some faculty members who were affected by the Covid pandemic have not been up for tenure so she is not sure if there will be people affected by it. HR does not have anything to do with RPT. Senator Kolehmainen explained that they have specified in this policy that if faculty members were affected by interruptive circumstances, they should mention any circumstances in their FAR and submit supporting documentation, when available. Senator Kolehmainen did not see the need to include a specific form, but if the Senate wants it, it can be added.
- 4.1.1.13. Senator Algan expressed that she is afraid faculty may want to take advantage of this and fill out these forms stating interruptive circumstances affected their performance. Senator Algan believes this should be more between Faculty Affairs and HR. Senator Algan mentioned that when creating a policy like this, it must be specific so it does not allow everyone to decide what an interruptive circumstance is.
- 4.1.1.14. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that documenting the issue would discourage frivolous attempts to apply this policy. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned it would be up to RPT review committees to decide whether it really is an interruptive circumstance under the guidelines of this policy and whether to do their evaluation accordingly.
- 4.1.1.15. Senator Dabbs provided the recent example of the floods on campus. If a flood occurred in a lab where a faculty member does their research, they will not be able to do their research. The flood did not affect the whole campus, but it could have significant effects on particular departments. If the policy goes through, faculty need to be

mindful of documentation and how it negatively affected their productivity.

- 4.1.1.16. Chair Davis asked Senator Algan if she was making a motion and if so, what would that motion be.
- 4.1.1.17. Senator Algan stated that it would be a motion to not have this policy. Faculty were given an extra year for their tenure clock due to the pandemic. Those whose teaching were affected by the floods would typically fill out a form and RPT recognizes their SOTES could be affected. However, if they were to use this policy, another professor who was teaching elsewhere and was not affected by the floods could see it as unfair. It is important to be very specific about what an interruptive circumstance is or be careful about having this policy in the first place.
- 4.1.1.18. Senator Girshin expressed support for the policy going forward with the changes pointed out by Senator Kottke and others. Senator Girshin stated that the inadequacy of response from some junior faculty is what gave rise to this policy. While delaying a tenure clock by a year may allow faculty to regain some momentum, it still has ongoing negative effects on the individual. Based on his understanding, anybody who is going up for RPT with an interruptive circumstance is not going to automatically be granted tenure. Instead, the policy allows for committees to take interruptive circumstances into consideration as they make their ratings.
- 4.1.1.19. Senator Kottke mentioned that the reason the Senate makes policies is to demonstrate the values they have. A value that is inherent in this is an acknowledgement that sometimes things happen that are outside a faculty member's control. There are collective circumstances. Senator Kottke expressed that there is a need for this policy and is not particularly concerned with faculty abusing this policy. Essentially, this policy allows the Senate to demonstrate that they care and support faculty.
- 4.1.1.20. Provost Mohamed mentioned that probationary faculty were given an extra year for their RPT clock during the pandemic. They could still go up for tenure and promotion

as regularly scheduled. In terms of the language of the policy, the first sentence is nebulous and too broad. The first sentence does not suggest that it has to be something that extreme. If someone were inclined to try to find a loophole to abuse the policy, the vagueness of the first sentence would invite that. Provost Mohamed recommended tightening up the definition of interruptive circumstance, so it is clear that it is referring to extreme circumstances.

5. [CHAIR'S REPORT](#)

5.1. Chair Davis shared the Chair's Report. There were no questions.

6. [PRESIDENT'S REPORT](#)

6.1. President Morales deferred reading the report in an effort to be mindful of time. There were no questions.

7. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#)

7.1. Provost Mohamed shared his sympathies to those affected by the tragedy in Turkey. Provost Mohamed mentioned his report is posted and is happy to answer questions.

7.2. Senator Pelletier asked if it is possible to include a paragraph or two about topics discussed at the Board of Trustees (BoT) meetings that may have direct implications on the CSUSB campus, faculty and staff.

7.3. Provost Mohamed mentioned there were no BoT meetings, but there were Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA) meetings with the Chancellor's Office, which he mentioned. The priorities for now are the significant declines in enrollment and what needs to be done in response to that. Provost Mohamed also mentioned that the BoT meetings are public and recorded. Members of the university can go back and watch the meetings.

7.4. Senator Kottke mentioned there has been a lot of chatter about Chat GPT. Senator Kottke asked if the administration has given any thoughts about how the campus will manage this or what support will be provided to faculty to ensure the integrity and honesty of the people who are being educated at this institution. This will add a tremendous amount of extra care on any written assignment for faculty members.

- 7.5. Provost Mohamed stated that he does not see the University coming in and imposing any restrictions. Provost Mohamed did not disagree with Senator Kottke about the additional burden Chat GPT will impose on faculty, particularly to those teaching writing intensive courses.
- 7.6. Guest Brad Owen mentioned that Chat GPT is a very complex issue. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is having a speaker on this via webinar, which is open to all faculty. The Library and Faculty Development are also working together on a panel in March. A webpage is in progress that will provide resources. They will not be recommending a policy. Instead, they will try to provide resources for faculty.
- 7.7. Chair Davis mentioned that topic will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting.
- 7.8. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned there is a diagnostic tool that can be used to determine the probability that an essay was written by Chat GPT. It is not perfect, but it might be useful. It might alert to possible cheating which would result in keeping a closer eye on the students involved. Senator Kolehmainen asked if there is any plan to get that tool.
- 7.9. Guest Brad Owen stated yes, that is one of the resources.

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

8.1. [FAC Report](#)

- 8.1.1. Senator Kolehmainen informed that the FAC is working on the RPT policy. It is getting tougher to find faculty members to serve on the College Evaluation Committees. A suggestion was made in the EC by Vice Chair Jones to allow FERPers to serve on those committees. Current policy allows FERPers to serve on the Department Evaluation Committee, but it is silent on the College and University Evaluation Committees. There was some funny language in the CBA relative to this. The FAC will check that their interpretation is correct. If so, there is some language already in place that would allow FERPers to serve on the CEC's and UEC's.
- 8.1.2. Senator Kolehmainen mentioned that the FAC did a previous revision of the RPT policy that was passed by the Senate, but not signed by the President due to lacking a comprehensive review of the entire policy. This additional revision about allowing FERPers to serve may not be signed for the same reason. Therefore, before bringing it to the Senate, the FAC will check on the CBA issues.

The FAC also want to consult with Bryan Haddock to identify any possible issues with this policy before moving forward.

- 8.2. [EPRC Report](#)- Not covered due to time constraints.
9. STATEWIDE/ASCSU (ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU) SENATORS' REPORT- Not covered due to time constraints.
 - 9.1. [Statewide/ASCSU Chair's Report](#)
10. SENATORS' REPORTS (INCLUDING ASI PRESIDENT'S REPORT)- Not covered due to time constraints.
11. DIVISION REPORTS- Not covered due to time constraints.
 - 11.1. [Vice President for Information Technology Services](#)
 - 11.1.1. [ITS Strategic Plan 2022-2025](#)
 - 11.2. [Vice President for University Advancement](#)
 - 11.3. [Vice President for Student Affairs](#)
 - 11.4. [Vice President for Administration and Finance](#)
 - 11.5. [Vice President for Human Resources](#)
12. DISCUSSION ITEMS- None

3:15-3:25 PM Time Certain (If preceding items have not been completed)

13. PRESENTATION 1: [CSUSB Strategic Planning Process & Update](#)
Kelly Campbell, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Senator Nicole Dabbs
Co-Chairs of CSUSB Strategic Planning Committee
 - 13.1. Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Kelly Campbell went over the goals for the new strategic plan and how they came to be. Interim AVP Campbell explained that individuals either volunteered themselves or recommended others to serve on the work groups for the different themes. Once the list of names was received, the President's Cabinet established work groups that reflected the campus's diversity.
 - 13.2. Senator Dabbs informed that the objectives of the strategic planning work groups are to develop goal statements, objectives, strategies, measures and outcomes. Senator Dabbs explained the timeline for the strategic plan. Drafts from the work groups will be completed at the end of this month. There will then be an open campus feedback forum where

the drafts will be presented. The work groups will incorporate this feedback into their revised drafts. The final iteration of the strategic plan will be completed in May or early June 2023.

- 13.3. Senator Pelletier mentioned Jack H. Brown College has been engaged in sustainability efforts for the last decade. Senator Pelletier asked whether it would make sense to add another goal on sustainability. Senator Pelletier hopes it can be added to the strategic plan because there are measurable objectives that could easily be assessed. It would also put the University at a leading edge because this is a timely and global issue.
- 13.4. Senator Dabbs mentioned that she will take this back to the work groups and task force. Sustainability will be present in the revised core values.

3:30-3:40 PM Time Certain

PRESENTATION 2: [CSUSB Follett Access Program](#)

Ashlie Singleton Director, Follett ACCESS Solutions

Bradford Owen, Interim AVP Faculty Development Chief Academic Technologies Officer

- 13.5. Guest Ashlie Singleton informed that Follett Access is a way to keep costs as low as possible for students. Follett has two programs: Inclusive Access and Equitable Access. The Equitable Access model is for all undergrad students at a per term or credit hour rate. Students have the option to opt out at the program level each term. The course-by-course Inclusive Access is in place today. Faculty choose to participate in the program. Each course is priced based on individual materials that are adopted. Students have the option to opt out on a course-by-course level. The access to the material varies depending on what the publisher offers and what the faculty member is choosing to adopt. Faculty still retain their academic freedom to choose the content for their classes.
- 13.6. Provost Mohamed yielded his time to allow Guest Brad Owen to speak.
- 13.7. Guest Brad Owen informed that several of the groups who have been given this presentation reacted favorably. Guest Brad Owen reiterated that it is an opt out program. All students will be opted in and charged unless they opt out.
- 13.8. Senator Barber informed that this program has been supported at the state level. Senator Barber has been in full support for several years as it is a good bridge towards lowering cost.

- 13.9. Senator Chen asked for clarification regarding conflicting numbers of publishers. Senator Chen also asked what would happen if faculty members cannot find the right materials from the approved publishers.
- 13.10. Guest Ashlie Singleton clarified that Follett works with over 6,000 publishers. As long as publishers will sell the material to them, they will provide it. The twelve publishers noted on the slide are those who are currently delivering products on campus. The top ten publishers are the largest publishers in the industry that Follett negotiates lower prices with.
- 13.11. Senator Sweeney mentioned the idea sounds fantastic. However, if a professor chooses something that is outside of the 6,000 publishers what would happen? Would professors be prevented from using publishers outside the 6,000 or pressured to find something within those publishers?
- 13.12. Guest Ashlie Singleton informed that as long as a publisher will sell to Follet, they will get the material. If something cannot be delivered, that material would be purchased elsewhere for an additional cost.
- 13.13. Vice Chair Jones asked what the timeline for the program is if it is approved. Is it a year or multi-year program? Are there increasing costs predicted over a certain number of years? When would it be implemented?
- 13.14. Guest Ashlie Singleton informed that they price annually and do not require contracts for multiple years. Follet provides insight and info as to what has been adopted and how prices are trending. They are aiming for a Fall 2023 implementation, at the earliest.
- 13.15. Guest Brad Owen confirmed that pending approval by the ASI Executive Board, they are looking at Fall 2023.
- 13.16. Senator Girshin mentioned he liked the idea of increasing access and OER materials, however his concern is about costs for students. Students may see costs increase or decrease since materials in some disciplines are more expensive than others. Senator Girshin expressed concerns about the program disproportionately affecting certain students, particularly those in the humanities and arts.
- 13.17. Guest Ashlie Singleton explained that that is what the opt out option is for. Students have the opportunity to review and opt out.
- 13.18. Senator Brown asked if the program would cover things like a case pack from Harvard Business Publishing. Senator Brown also wanted clarification as to whether the opt out has to be for the full semester or if

one could opt out credit hours based on a course that does not have materials.

- 13.19. Guest Ashlie Singleton mentioned that the opt out is at the term level. In terms of the Harvard case pack, she would need more info. If they are currently sold at the bookstore, they are automatically part of the analysis to include in the program. If not, they would have to assess whether they could include them.
 - 13.20. Senator Algan mentioned that students may forget to opt out and be left with a large fee. Senator Algan asked if it would be possible to have the students automatically opt out and then have them decide whether to opt in.
 - 13.21. Guest Ashlie Singleton informed that at the current pricing being offered, it would not be possible. In order to provide the program at this price, it is an opt out program.
 - 13.22. Senator Algan asked how many weeks students have to opt out.
 - 13.23. Guest Ashlie Singleton informed it is at minimum two weeks, but usually three or four. The last day usually aligns with the census date, but it is determined in partnership with the University. The date is advertised in many ways.
 - 13.24. Chair Davis mentioned that Follett will return to the next meeting to answer additional questions. This will give faculty a chance to reach out to colleagues and do some research.
14. OTHER BUSINESS- Not covered due to time constraints.
15. ADJOURNMENT- Senator Chen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Senator Fullam seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:01 PM.