

**ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 19, 2026**

Approved 3-5-26

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-130

Present: Ahmad, Badal, Barber, Barros, Blandon-Gitlin, Becerra, Bono, Bonuso, Brusckke, Carlin, Ceisel, Chen, Chik, Childers, Dabirian, Fontaine, Ghosh, Gradilla, Graewingholt, Jarvis, Kalczynski, Kanel, Kleinjans, Mallicoat, Martin, Plouffe, Robinson, Rutkowski, Salguero, Salim, Setten, Shahrestani, Struckhoff, Swarat, Thomas, Tobias, Wilson, Wood, Wynants

Absent: Kuffner, Landeros, Larios, LeeKeenan, Luker, Miller, Milligan, Rochon, Tsong, Valdez, Valencia

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jarvis called the meeting to order at 11:30 am.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

- No urgent business.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

➤	TitanWell presents Sweet Talks	flyer in Dropbox folder
➤	TitanHEALTH Mobile Health Clinic	flyer in Dropbox folder
➤	TitanHEALTH Naloxonel Training	flyer in Dropbox folder
➤	TitanWell presents Pillow Sesh	flyer in Dropbox folder
➤	Cook and Connect with ASI Pantry & TitanWell Chomp	flyer in Dropbox folder
➤	TitanTHRIVE Empowerment Healing Program	flyer in Dropbox folder

- (Graewingholt) I just want to make a little public service announcement since I have a lot of faculty in the room on behalf of the library.

The procurement changes that we've seen on campus with CSU BUY have really changed things for how quickly the library can process materials. So, now is the most important time for you to stay in communication with your library liaisons or with the library in general so that we can order books for you in a timely manner.

For example, in the past, if you forgot to let us know you were assigning a streaming film or an e-book that you needed, we were able to activate it usually within 72 hours. That is no longer the case. We are looking potentially at several weeks, if not months, to make purchases that were very quick in the past. So, I encourage all of you to think like a semester ahead, especially for things that are out of print, potentially, if we go to buy them on Amazon, we're not getting approval in time and that item is gone. So, it may take us multiple attempts to buy the book that you need.

So please stay in communication with the library so that we can have all the resources that you need available.

- (Chik) Two things, number one, Happy Lunar New Year to everyone. The other one is Ramadan Mubarak of those who celebrate and honor that observance, and it's also the season of Lent. So, I just casually want to remind folks of religious accommodations on our campus. If you have any questions about those, feel free to reach out, we're happy to provide that support.
- (Chik) After a lot of advocacy around our Women's Resource Center, I want to share with the body that we'll be relocating the Women's Resource Center to PLN 140, which is that fishbowl space that currently is occupied by Project Rebound as a satellite space. They'll be moving in there as a new Women's Resource Center to ensure that we can accommodate more folks in the space and be able to provide resources and programming.

I want to thank Provost Dabirian for his advocacy and his work in ensuring that we can meet that need for our students.

- (Kanel) I would like to yield the microphone to Alex Rosales, Director of Contracts and Procurement.
 - (Alex Rosales) CSUBUYP2P is a system-wide rollout sponsored by the Chancellor's Office; therefore, all procurement is happening in this system.
 - The Admin and Finance team (CSUBUYP2P) is working with all suppliers to ensure they are correctly set up to mitigate order delays.
 - We will work with the Amazon account rep to ensure that all CSUBUYP2P orders are processed in a timely manner.
 - The team will also work with Amazon to provide desktop delivery vs shipping to our central receiving dock.
 - Please let the CSUBUYP2P team know of any vendor associated with Library resources to ensure prompt onboarding.
 - If you experience any delays with your orders, please get in touch with DL-CSUBUYP2P@fullerton.edu so we can triage and expedite the request

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- M/S/P (Salim/Kanel) Motion to approve the January 22nd minutes. Motion passed unanimously.
- 5.1 ASD 26-07 Academic Senate Minutes 1-22-26 (Draft)
- 5.2 ASD 26-14 Academic Senate Minutes 2-5-26 (Draft - *forthcoming*)

V. REPORTS

1. [Chair's Report](#)
2. President Report
 - No report.
3. [Provost Report](#)
4. Statewide Academic Senate Report
 - No report.
5. ASI Report
 - No report.
6. CFA Report
 - (Ceisel) I'd like to thank everyone who came out to help support the Teamsters in their picket and strike this week. They will be out, of course, today and tomorrow as well.

We rely on them, obviously, for the maintenance and service that keeps the university running. Their fight is very important, it's also important to our fight as Unit 3 faculty, because we will need them. And when we all do well, we all do well.

I also encourage everyone to continue to respect students who feel strongly that they do not want to cross a picket line and be accommodating whenever possible.

I encourage everyone to attend bargaining sessions. While our team meets in bargaining with management, we will caucus together in between breaks to discuss what is happening.

Bargaining happens Thursday and Friday, the Monday after that, we host town halls for all members. If you have an opinion or anything at stake in this contract round, do come to the meetings and share your thoughts. We can't do this without you.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.1 ASD 25-115 Revisions to 411.104 - Policy on Online Instruction

- M/S/ (Childers/Kanel) Motion to approve ASD 25-115 Revisions to 411.104 - Policy on Online Instruction.

From AS meeting 1-22-26

M/S (Childers/Kanel) Motion to approve ASD 25-115 Revisions to 411.104 - Policy on Online Instruction.

[MAIN MOTION]

Chair Jarvis reminded the body where they left off on this document.

[MOTION ON THE FLOOR]

- M/S/ (Dabirian/Kleinjans) Lines 78: motion to add the wording "Instructors are required to obtain the department chair's approval to change modality to online for the first and last week of the current term."
 - (Childers) Motion to convene to the Committee of the Whole. Motion passed.
 - Senate continued discussion of the document while in Committee of the Whole.
- Suggestions/comments:
- (Blandon-Gitlin) Line 44: reword to read "In Hybrid Courses, the selection of the modality of exams is at the instructor's discretion, unless determined otherwise by the department".
 - (Jarvis) We had a series of other amendments that we were possibly going to look at. In my chair's report, I noted that if we are to go through all of these things, it will take significant time. What I'd like to do is, in a sense, quickly look at some of the proposed amendments and maybe just do some straw votes to see if we're all in agreement on them nor not. So, I'll just sort of go through a series of these things.

- There were a few amendments that Senator Brusckke was going to offer, largely around the idea of student work authentication, cheating, plagiarism being communicated to students. I think those are actually two separate issues

So, the first one is basically that IT has to help faculty in student work authentication. This is basically catching people who are using illicit support for their papers somehow.

 - (Wynants) If the intent is to encourage good assessment practices that support academic integrity, I would support language that focuses on guidance and resources and that avoids implying surveillance-oriented solutions or centralized mandates.
 - (Dabirian) The question is, what is a policy? We can't require tools in a policy. I think this could be a practice. We can put something out there, but I don't think having it in the policy makes sense at this point. I think the policy needs to be general. We can talk about generalization of those things; I don't think this belonged to a policy. I think it's more of a practice and how we're going to use IT in a practice.
 - (VP Manriquez) I'm going to agree with what Provost Dabirian has said that at this point in this present time, there is no tool that exist to address that specific issue that's being called out. And technology tools should be in support of the general statements in policy, not specifically called out this way.

We're happy in IT to be able to support and continue to provide tool sets, but at this point in time, there isn't the capability in technology, the system or otherwise, to be able to do this.

- Q: (Jarvis) How many are in general in favor of the idea of putting some language to this effect in the document? Would you want to put in IT has to help us authenticate student work in there or not?

A: The sense of the Senate, they would not support adding this language into the document. So, I would suggest that we probably don't want to waste more time discussing it. It would seem to me prudent not to instruct a committee to do this if the will of the body is not to add the language in the first place.

- (Robinson) The problem is we're trying to create a policy at a point in time where we don't know what things are going to look like in a year or two years, because AI is not what it was two years ago and it will be different two years from now.

I don't think we have tools that can help faculty the way that Senator Brusckke is asking, but we might in a year. So why not just have some pretty milquetoast language that says help them to the extent that it's available?

I think the principle that Senator Brusckke has laid out is pretty good and could be useful in the future. Just have some boilerplate language, faculty should be helped. If the tools develop, the campus should work to secure those.

- A number of Senators, Salim, Brusckke, Ceisel, had proposed language in various parts, basically dealing with the concept of who's doing the teaching here. We're still on the AI concept, largely, but it wasn't entirely just AI because it was also outside contractors.

I guess the first thing as sort of a straw poll is, do we want to see some kind of language in this policy policing that?

I've had discussions with Senators, Salim, Brusckke, Ceisel on this, and coming up with that language has been tricky. Because when we ban it outside contractors, does that mean I can't use Pearson's provided slides, even if I'm doing all the lecturing on top of it? Or does it mean I can't use their online quiz software? Is this something that folks are thinking we do want to have in the policy?

So, is the body generally in support of the notion of putting something here, even if we're cognizant of the actual language on this. We may want to suggest that the UCC bring in HR to try to figure out what the language would be so we're not engaging in bargaining, but we are still sort of coming up with a policy that's basically saying, we still want a faculty member teaching students.

- (Salim) Just as a point of clarification, the most updated language that I've submitted to the Senate includes dealing with the publisher, the ability to use publisher-provided resources.
- (Bono) To me, this issue of who's doing the teaching and the creating and the grading and all of that should be dealt with in personnel standards because it's going to differ from department to department in terms of what's acceptable, in terms of shared material, using technology for these various teaching things. It doesn't belong in this policy; it belongs in each department's personnel standards.
- (Thomas) I just want to add, as a faculty member that runs a very complicated co-curricular that requires us hiring some contractors, I am surprised by some of the language in line 134, because my own experience with this process has been to go to great lengths with HR, explaining that they are not teaching our course, that the co-directors of this program are running the show, are leading the charge, but the folks that we have to bring on serve as judges because of an insane ratio of the number of competitors we have to judges we have to bring in to attend a tournament with us, things like that.

I would really encourage, if this is going back to the committee, to check this language against HR because I am not under the impression in the process I've run by my chair and college dean that it's as easy as them changing language and approving it.

I am sympathetic to unique programs or departments, but something just fills off with the use of contractors here. I understand that's not in context to online courses, but it seems like we need to do some digging.

- (Ceisel) I think we're kind of dealing with two separate issues that are getting conflated. One being what an individual faculty member decides to do as far as their course material. How a department wants to handle a faculty member who has an online async class and loads up the material from the publisher and just kind of pieces out and checks the multiple choice questions, that's a faculty issue, that's for their review process.

What I'm really concerned about in thinking about this is we are watching faculty jobs get slashed. San Francisco State is a bloodbath, they laid off so many lecturers, they're now laying off tenure line faculty. We are really facing a crisis as AI comes in, that leads me to want to be sure we can keep the education that comes with an educated, trained faculty member leading the class. And that is about not outsourcing our instruction to another company completely.

I'm not as concerned about the slides we might use or the multiple choice questions we might grab, but rather that we make sure faculty are in charge of pedagogy and we're not outsourcing it. So as far as our AI policy, we are in bargaining and that is something that CFA has proposed. We have created an article on it, so if you're interested in helping shape that or seeing what's going on, the proposal is up on our website.

(Mallicoat) Since the point was raised about RTP standards and things like that, I think it's important to remember that there is a point in time where faculty aren't doing regular reviews under those standards.

I would argue that at line 133 we add language that says "departments are encouraged to develop department level policies on online teaching pedagogy and course requirements".

That gets around the fact that you could be 23 years in and a full professor and never go through an RTP, or you could be a 30-year lecturer who now doesn't have to put together a comprehensive file. I think that that's where we can empower departments to say, this is what we feel is appropriate for our discipline, for our department, and it doesn't, and it becomes more of a curriculum and pedagogy conversation within a department and class assignments via a chair rather than an HR process.

- (Jarvis) What is the sentiment? It's sounding like there's some folks who definitely want the committee to look at including some of this stuff. And there's other voices who seem to be wary of including this stuff in the document.

Q: So how many folks would like the committee to take a run at including some language along these lines in the document? Do you want this policy to have something along the lines of AI can't teach your class?

A: The Senate is relatively tied on this question, my count was 14 to 17, this is relatively split.

This is probably something the committee should engage on and bring in some people to talk to them, because it has led to some disagreement here.

- (Wood) I think that the policy should include a statement about ownership and control of pedagogy, and also a statement about department's responsibility and how a should around departmental standards.
- (Wynants) I just wanted to clarify that when you do send this material back, you will include the document that you asked us to write revisions on because I put a lot there and none of that's been brought forward.

- (Childers) Motion to dissolve the Committee of the Whole. Motion passed.
- M/S/P (Kanel/Mallicoat) Motion to send this document back to the Curriculum Committee and have the Academic Standards Committee look at the document as well for rigor, in terms of policy on online instruction. Also include the Google document which has been circulated, which has other comments on it.
- (Dabirian) I want a note to the committee to bring the document back before the marathon meeting because there are certain things in this policy that's important for next semester to be approved.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 ASD 26-03 Revisions to UPS 260.102 - Sabbatical Leaves

- M/S/ (Graewingholt/Jarvis) Motion to approve ASD 26-03 Revisions to UPS 260.102 - Sabbatical Leaves.

Q: (Robinson) I have two questions for the committee or whoever can answer them. Can I get feedback on the difference between the significance of the project and the impact of the project?

My second question is about process. I wanted to ask if the impact statement that is going to be developed, that's not something that's going to be considered by the reviewers in terms of what sabbaticals are granted, because I think what we don't want is a situation where someone says, oh, so-and-so is too important to the department to get a sabbatical, which would seem to have the wrong sort of incentives.

A: (Jarvis) I yield the microphone to Mark Carrier.

- (Mark Carrier) On the first question of the difference between the significance and the impact, I believe that's defined somewhere in the policy, they are distinct. Those words in that section may not sound too different from each other, but there is some further definition of that.

On the second question, the impact statements. Those are not going to be reviewed by the PLC members or the faculty reviewers. Those impact statements are coming from the department and sometimes from the deans. And those are going to go on to the provost when the provost makes their decision about the awards.

And I would just say in some very small number of cases, if a dean or a chair objects strongly to one of the semesters that a faculty member is proposing to take a sabbatical, then I will work with the department, the dean, and the provost to see if we can rearrange that award to be for a different semester that works for everyone. We do that sometimes, but the faculty member is aware of that.

- (Dabirian) I think that with the reduction of the number of reviewers, the percentage is so tight that if you reduce it to three, that can really be more subjective in the evaluation.

If you have got one third of the committee looking in one direction, that will skew the votes of the members. So, I worry about whether this is going to have an impact on people coming up because it's so tight. And if they haven't read it all the way, they would not be able to do the vote justice moving forward. So, I think these are very, very critical and the 10 vote matters. I don't want to have any method of reducing that to three.

- (Carrier) Faculty Affairs and Records (FAR) reviewed this section of the proposal, and we have the same concerns as the Provost. Reducing the number of reviewers from 10 all the way down to three for the detailed reviews is concerning to us for two reasons. One is the one the Provost mentioned, if there's three people giving detailed reviews and one of them is a particularly harsh reviewer, then that may have an outsize effect on how the rest of the committee reviews, interprets and votes on that.

The other issue is the people who are denied awards. In Faculty Affairs and Records, we see those concerns from the people who are denied. And we're concerned that this will introduce another reason for people not to be happy with the review process if they get denied, if they were only given a detailed review by three people. And it introduces another complication, which is who the three people will be? Will it be someone from their home college and two other people?

One of the things that Chair Jarvis mentioned was that the goal is to reduce workload in order to give the members more time to give detailed feedback in their comments, we definitely support that. But we have some ideas that we could increase comments without increasing workload too much. So for one, for comments, we don't really need the strengths. Most people who get denied just want to know what they need to do to improve. Two, for the reviewers, if they provide a comment, they could be asked to write a comment only when they're giving a rating that's below a certain threshold, which would be like below a satisfactory, then we could require them to put a comment. It doesn't have to be long because there would be potentially 10 reviewers giving a comment.

We could also, in Faculty Affairs and Records, when we handle all the sabbatical data, provide feedback to people that includes not only their overall rating when they get denied, but their component ratings. We could provide their score on their average score on the three different dimensions so they could see in more detail where they need improvement for the next time. We could also provide the mean of the awardees, the people who earned their sabbaticals on all three of those

dimensions so they can compare to the people who got awards. That would be something we would do, the reviewers wouldn't need to do that.

One other thing that FAR thought of that we could do to improve the workload situation is we could give reviewers an extra week to do their evaluations. Right now, we have the internal timing set up where we ask for evaluations to be done the week before finals week, and sometimes that puts a high pressure deadline on the reviewers. We could at least move that to the end of finals week, and that would be up to the body and to the members if they felt okay with that. That's an internal deadline that we set. So, we found some wiggle room there to give the reviewers an extra week and spread out that workload.

Two things I want to add to all that is that if you do decide not to use all 10 committee members as detailed reviewers, can it be more than three? Right now, if it goes down to three detailed reviewers, that's reducing the workload from 100% to 30%, that's a significant decrease in workload. Consider something like 60% of their current workload, that would provide significant relief as well. So, that would be a minimum of six reviewers. And the other thing is, if we're not going to use all 10 reviewers to give detailed evaluations, please provide FAR with some guidance on how we're going to assign which reviewers get which cases, because that's going to represent another challenge for us. And we want to do that in a fair way that also doesn't raise more concerns by people denied sabbaticals

Q: (Wood) I'm curious if there is any data that exists on inter-rater reliability? One way to approach this, no matter how many raters we decide to have, is to decide on a threshold, and if there is past that threshold of disagreement to trigger the full committee or some larger group to review. And that might be a balance that would be efficient but also protect faculty from a harsh reviewer or whatever else there might be.

A: (Bonuso) Yes, we did discuss that, what we talked about was that normally three is a standard number of reviewers for the National Science Foundation. We look at the standard deviation of the three different reviews, and if one reviewer is way off from the other two, they get an extra review.

So, whether we decide it's three and then an additional four, I still think 10 is a lot of reviews for one sabbatical, but that's where we were talking about the standard deviation stuff and the actual review never got into the text, but we did discuss that.

- M/S/P (Kleinjans/Bonuso) Motion to send this back to committee with the concerns about the three reviewers and how the reduced number of reviewers would be chosen, and the extent of comments the applicants will be given.
 - (Shahrestani) Amendment to this motion to include clarifying instructions on the impact form.

7.2 ASD 26-09 Revisions to UPS 300.016 – Withdrawal Policy

7.3 ASD 26-15 Revisions to UPS 100.015 - Review and Revision of University Policy Statements

7.4 ASD 26-16 Revisions to UPS 411.400 - Educator Preparation

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

- M/S/P (Wood/Badal) Meeting adjourned at 12:52 pm.