

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

CLA Building, 98, P2-8

Zoom Login: <https://cpp.zoom.us/j/89567890075>

Meeting ID: 895 6789 0075

Password: executive

Attendees: Laura Chase, Saeideh Fallah Fini, Mario Guerrero, Rita Kumar, Kevin Moore, Jocelyn Pacleb, Gabriel Davidov Pardo, Dennis Quinn, Julie Shen, Gwen Urey, Nicholas Von Glahn, and Michelle Yoo.

Guest: Seema Shah-Fairbank

1) Minutes



Final_Executive_Co
mmittee_Meeting_M

Senator Quinn motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Senator Pacleb second. There was no discussion.

M/s/p to approve the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from January 25, 2023.

Zoom Poll Results: Yes – 9 (100%), No – 0 (0%), Abstentions 0 (0%)

2) Chair's Report

Senator Seats

Chair Von Glahn mentioned the upcoming senate elections and the two at-large seats in the Academic Senate. The two at-large seats are within the College of Environmental Design. Nominations will begin on February 13, 2023. The due date for nominations is March 3, 2023. The voting windows are between March 6, through 12, 2023.

Nominations for the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate will start on March 2, 2023. The elections will be held on April 5, 2023. Chair Von Glahn mentioned that he plans to serve as the Department Chair for Psychology next year, so he will not run for a second term in AY2023-2024. Chair Von Glahn plans to nominate Vice Chair Kumar as the next Academic Senate Chair for AY2023-2024. He reminded the Executive Committee that the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate will be vacant and to think about

who to nominate for AY2023-2024. There was a discussion on the resignation process for senators that go on sabbatical leave.

3) Vice Chair's Report

FA-005-223 Request to Update the Academic Senate Policies for a Vote of Confidence in a Department Chair and a College Dean – **REFERRAL**

Vice Chair Kumar mentioned the two separate resolutions and the formation of the resolutions into policies. The Academic Senate adopted a resolution that faculty may request a vote of confidence in the performance and leadership of a Dean on May 20, 2009. This was followed by a resolution that faculty may request a vote of confidence in the performance and leadership of a Department Chair on October 2, 2013. Both resolutions include policies detailing how to request a vote of confidence. One of the notable differences between vote of confidence resolutions for Dean and Department Chair is that the Department Chair has 14 calendar days to respond, and College Dean has 30 days and there is a statement that the Dean should only address the complaints in the petition. There was no discussion.

Senator Urey motion to send the referral to committee. Senator Chase second.

Zoom Poll Results: Yes – 10(100%), No - 0 (0%), Abstentions – 0 (0%)

M/s/p to send FA-005-223 to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

FA-006-223 Revision on Policy 1328 Regarding Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) and Department RTP Committee. – **REFERRAL**

Vice Chair Kumar mentioned the following three considerations to modify Policy 1328:

(a) General Principles (1.0): Suggestion to add language that reflects CPP's commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion across the University community, e.g.: Cal Poly Pomona is committed to fostering a vibrant community of diverse students, faculty, staff, and administrators. As part of this commitment, the University seeks to recruit, retain, tenure, and promote a highly talented and diverse faculty who will advance the CSU mission. Embodying Cal Poly Pomona's core institutional values of diversity and inclusivity is the responsibility of every member of our community. Therefore, individual faculty, administrators, and committees engaged in the RTP evaluation process are expected to practice equal employment and mitigation of bias in faculty evaluation process.

(b) Department RTP Committee (3.0): Suggestion to add language that supports implementation of DEI best practices at the DRTPC level to support a more equitable review process, e.g.: Department RTP Committees shall be diverse with representation from academic ranks, subdisciplines or specialties, and historically under-represented groups. To ensure diverse DRTPC committees, the department may elect members from related disciplines/departments upon the request of the RTP candidate. Other best practices may be suggested, such as training of evaluators.

(c) Department RTP Committee (3.0): Suggestion to add language that supports DEI by incorporating an Equity Advisor role into the DRTPC, e.g.: The DRTPC shall include a committee member (not the chair) who serves as Equity Advisor. The Equity Advisor is elected by majority vote of the DRTP committee. The Equity Advisor works with the DRTPC chair to ensure all policies and laws are being followed and support the fair and equitable evaluation of RTP candidates.

Vice Chair Kumar's comments on the referral include whether: "general principles, for example, equal employment in section (a) may also need to be included in the RTP criteria documents, the suggestions in section (b) could be challenging to meet for small departments and that it leaves room for different interpretations. Also, one needs to consider that it may be desirable to have DRTP members who have familiarity with the department." The referral states that an RTP candidate could request members from another department to serve on the committee.

Chair Von Glahn mentioned that the RTP voting for tenured and probationary faculty members, voting on the RTP Committee is stipulated in the collective bargaining agreement. There was a discussion on expanding RTP Committee members to be more diverse and recruitment of members outside the department due to lack of diversity on the committee and whether that part of FA-006-223 is a violation of Article 15.4(1) within the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Discussion ensued.

CBA Article 15.4(1)

The probationary and tenured faculty unit employees of the department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured faculty unit employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending faculty unit employees who are being considered for retention, award of tenure, and promotion. Probationary and tenured faculty unit employees shall elect tenured faculty unit employees to serve on higher level peer review committee(s). When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the peer

committee, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline(s). At the request of a department, the President may agree to permit faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program to run for election for membership on any level peer review committee.

Senator Urey mentioned in the chat that when there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the peer committee, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline(s).

Senator Urey motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Pacleb second.

Zoom Poll Results: Yes – 10 (100%), No – 0 (0%), Abstentions – 0 (0%)

M/s/p to send FA-006-223 to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

4) Reports

FA-002-223 Review of Policy 1212: Provost Award for Excellence – **FIRST READING (2ND Discussion)**

Dr. Seema Shah-Fairbank clarified the report for the Executive Committee. The items discussed and presented in the referral includes creating two awards (one for tenure track and one for lecturers, librarians, coaches, and counselors). The Faculty Affairs Committee recommended that the original referral be sunsetted and brought back to the author to deconsolidate the referral into multiple, smaller referrals.

During last week's Executive Committee meeting, Senator Barding mentioned that the Faculty Affairs Committee is not comfortable with separating policy from procedure. There were significant concerns about the policy revisions requested. A subset of faculty would be able to apply for both awards although the intention of the authors of the referral was to distinguish between instructional and non-instructional. And with the disparity between award amounts and the scope of the referral. The Faculty Affairs Committee recommended simplifying the referral and submitting several referrals instead of just one. The policy would not change, but the referral proposes changes with the procedure.

There was a discussion on the two awards, how to establish a new award, how to improve the radical method of nominee rotation, and whether a recipient could receive both teaching awards. Dr. Shah-Fairbanks inquired about how to add the new award and how the cycle for the new award should work. She mentioned fixing the rubric and the rotation of the colleges, so faculty could only apply on certain years. The Executive Committee suggested clarification on who should be included in each of the categories for the awards and the rotation of the awards. Dr. Shah-Fairbank mentioned that some faculty members have a difficult time qualifying for the teaching award under the traditional structure of the award. Nominees that are not selected are entered into the

nominations for the following year.

Dr. Shah-Fairbank mentioned that the former interim Provost Iris S. Levine stated that more funding could be provided for the awards. Currently, the Services and Scholarly Activities Award are \$3k each and Teaching Award is \$5k, but the new teaching award would be an additional award. Dr. Shah-Fairbank suggested that the award amounts could be divided equally among the categories for the awards.

Dr. Shah-Fairbank agreed to bring back a smaller referral and introduce the new rubric and recommendation documents. The Executive Committee recommended updating the rubric for equitable outcomes, that Provost Brown be included as a resource for the referral, and separating various items in the report into several reports. Chair Von Glahn and Vice Chair Kumar will write a memo to the Faculty Affairs Committee addressing the rubrics' criteria and which parts to deconsolidate from the referral. The Executive Committee agreed to reconvene with Dr. Shah-Fairbank later. Discussion ensued.

Senator Shen motioned to attaching the memo stating which parts of the referral to address and sending it back to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Senator Urey second.

Zoom Poll Results: Yes – 9 (90%), No – 0 (0%), Abstentions – 1(10%)

M/s/p to send FA-002-223 with memo to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

- 5) Old Business
- 6) New Business

The Executive Committee selected the following:

Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Advanced Computing and Chief Technology Officer (CTO)

Jorge Botana Alcade (SCI) and Mohammad Salehan (BUS)

- 7) Discussion

Adjourned @ 4:38 PM