ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, December 4, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), J. Millar, J. Tarjan, M. Rush, E. Correa, B. Street, M. Danforth, J. Zorn

Absent: M. Rush

1. CALL TO ORDER
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Budget Forum – December 5, 3:30-4:30, Student Union MPR Room, and live streamed.

   Trustees visit update – Lillian Kimbell, Silas Abrego, and Jack McGrory on December 12, 2018
   The President said earlier that one of the reasons that the Trustees are visiting is because of the Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   November 13, 2018 Minutes (approved electrically November 30, 2018)
   November 27, 2018 Minutes – E. Correa moved to approve the minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   M. Danforth requested an addition of Honorary Doctorate Degree Process. E. Correa moved to approve the modified agenda. B. Street seconded. The agenda approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
         Referral #14 Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder –Technologies and Process Integration- Preliminary discussion held. The Interim Director of Academic Operations is scheduled to attend the next meeting.
         Referral #7 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal – A joint committee meeting with BPC took place. The consensus is that there are holes in the proposal that need to be addressed.
         Referral # 8 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy- D. Boschini said if there are specific aspects of the resolution that one wants to change in the Second Reading, send
them electronically to B. Bywaters and bring them in writing to have them displayed at the Senate meeting.

ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
Referral #5 Canvas Pilot- C. Hu and F. Gorham attended the committee’s November 15 meeting. The committee presented their ideas and concerns. C. Hu and F. Gorham responded by emails. The dialog has concluded.
Referral #10 Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal Policy – C. Catota sent two revisions. The committee wasn’t satisfied with the changes. AS&SS returned the document containing recommendations to the proposal. The recommendations are the end point.
Referral #11 Textbook Ordering Process - D. Schecter and the Bookstore representative are scheduled to attend the next meeting, and potentially the IncluED program representative.

iii. BPC (B. Street)
Referral #7 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal – the BPC and AAC chairs gave feedback from their committees on the proposal changes to D. Knepp. He is working on it.
Referral #9 University Hour - A survey from ASI went out, but with errors. There was some miscommunication. A. Schmidt made some changes to the survey that the committee wanted, but the set-up changes weren’t made.
Referral #12 Academic Calendar – Provost Zorn was great in bringing individuals to the meeting who have impact on the calendar. The real issues are scheduling exam days and reading days into the calendar. BPC will write a resolution.

iv. FAC (M. Rush) Information reported via phone:
Referral #6 Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) - B. Carlisle, faculty leader of the DLC, to attend Thursday.

b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – D. Boschini brought handouts: A chart from the Chancellors Office (CO), and her most recent tenure density analysis.
Handout of document by Leo VanCleve, Assistant Vice Chancellor Internal & Off-Campus Programs shared with C. Nelson, CSU Academic Senate Chair – The document demonstrates why we are having the conversation about how much of the $1.52 million will be spent on faculty hiring. The funds are shown in the column called “Extra Support for TT Hiring”. Even though six positions have been approved, there is still a big question why is it only six at the cost of $829,000 when number in the column is $1.52 million. The majority of senate chairs from other campuses have interpreted the number in that column as what a campus will spend on tenure track (TT) contributions and the campus needs to be able to report that they did so, including names, producing a net gain, and it needs to happen in Fall 2019. The reason that the interpretation is different that it’s been evolving since the first conversation happened. They knew there is additional money to share with campuses. The reasons why the 3rd column (Extra
Support for Tenure Track Hiring) is different for different campuses is because those campuses with lower tenure density were allocated more money for them to directly address that particular problem. It’s understandable that there are a number of ways to help students. However, if our campus is given additional money to increase tenure density, why would it be spent on other things? This discussion is not about taking on the President. We need to be really clear why we are still talking about this and what the conversation has been on other campuses. The spending on those additional six new hires is concerning because our budget is still being corrected and it will take years to make right. Even if we took the $1.52 million and spent it on eleven positions it would buy, it would not change our TT. Those eleven positions in net gain, assuming continued enrollment increases, we’d still have to hire Lecturers. The $1.52 million set aside to improve TT is not enough. A. Hegde thanked D. Boschini for creating the report and analysis. Looking at $1.52 million, we’re getting maximum allocation for TT hiring. There are larger campuses getting same or less. It makes sense when one looks at the campus ranking of tenure density. CSUB is 18/23. He is concerned about the President’s language whereby the funds are to be used for extra-support for TT and high-impact practices. The column clearly says Extra Support for TT Hiring. This is an important juncture. D. Boschini referred to the chart. Adding six positions results in falling to 19th of 23 campuses. If we added 11 positions, it keeps us at 18th assuming the other campuses stay in the same place. She’s aware that there are other ways to change tenure density other than hiring tenure track people. The campus could not hire lecturers. The campus could lay some off. The President was really vocal at the Cabinet meeting about other campuses that are doing things to manipulate the tenure density data that are unacceptable and we’re not going to do it. Looking at all the different levers that could be pulled to improve tenure density, it all comes back to the hiring. Referring to the Tenure Density Analysis table (prepared by D. Boschini). Up until 2018-2019, the hiring has increased but the tenure density trended downward. By adding those six positions for 2019-2020, then beyond, this is the proposed plan to get CSUB back to 56% tenure density. That’s the system-wide average and where CSUB was in the 2014-2015 school year. We dropped precipitously, in the past three years. To get back to 56%, we would have to spend the amounts shown in the last row of the table. The crushing blow of the data is if we want to hire the projected number of people year to year to move the needle, (assuming everything else stays on track with enrollment, class size, etc.) that’s an extra $2 million we’d have to spend each year. That’s $10 million of additional funds needed in the next five years. Unless we do something dramatically different, this is the level of investment to get back up to 56% tenure density average. If one looks back to the document from the CO, the Pell eligibility % ranks CSUB #2. Even with the additional six new hires, it puts us further down the downward trend. Looking at the graph of Tenure Density Analysis (prepared by D. Boschini) one draws a vertical line between 2018-2019, we assume enrollment growth continues, push out in the future, and if we needed to hire the same number of faculty, class size and assignments. The growth of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) and growth in Full
Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF), in order to hire enough TT to move our tenure density back up to 56%, this is what we have to work for, even if we work harder to hire faculty than is possible. Our whole campus budget is $100M. If we add $10 million to $100 million, that $110 million is not coming. We are not going to get $110 million base budget unless the governor makes a big shift. We need to fight as hard as we can if we don’t want to lose any more ground. We could slip down into the 40%’s so easy, and our students can’t afford that. The lack of progress in our Graduation Initiative (particularly in the equity-gap) is troubling. Even though D. Boschini is telling people in every meeting, more conversation is needed toward a long-term strategy. Other campuses have figured this out. We need to talk about campus-wide spending prioritization; there is a reason why we are 18th and still sliding. We’ve been sliding for years. We need to completely rethink it. D. Boschini acknowledged that J. Zorn was present and a good resource for this conversation. D. Boschini, as Academic Senate Chair, is doing what she should be doing: the person who is vocal, putting it on the table, forcing the conversation albeit uncomfortable. E. Correa asked of the other campuses that have the same $1.52 allocation, how many hires are they adding? D. Boschini replied that the $1.52 M achieves 11 hires. She knows from two other campuses that they have hired all 11 TT as planned. The numbers in her analysis came from the CO and from K. Krishnan. If the CO has different data, that would be important to know whether it skews the conversation one way or another. If we are doing it wrong there, we also need to bring that to the administration’s attention. She will follow-up on that. There was a question whether the 2018-2019 column in the Tenure Density Analysis table (prepared by D. Boschini) included the TT expansion lines that failed. For example, in NSME there were at least two expansion hires last year that backed out. D. Boschini said that they are not reflected in the data. M. Danforth said the 2019-2020 column searches seemed maybe greater than six. If they didn’t show up in the 2018 column and they show up in the 2019, it may be a skewed number when the number of failed positions are added. D. Boschini said that she made a good point; hearing the discussion of the six expansion hires it has been stated that it is six new positions that had not been previously approved. The searches that failed for one reason or another last year and had permission to continue this year are not part of that number. J. Zorn asked about the data from the Vice-Chancellor’s office. What were the assumptions of FTES - would they stay at 8512 across the six years? Did you make any assumptions about FTE growth? D. Boschini replied, yes. She based it on whatever enrollment growth we’ve had, that created whatever faculty hiring needed, and if that hiring pattern continues; she looked at the FTEF. She is interested in looking at factors such as assigned time, attrition, and working the projection (especially the 20 people that came on this year and have 2 years additional assigned time). Based on this large number hired this year, that’s going to potentially improve tenure density down the line. She would like someone who can look at all those factors. J. Zorn – basically the FTES was not calculated to get the FTEF. D. Boschini said the student population was not included in the analysis. She doesn’t
know what the student projection or plan for student growth is. J. Zorn said there is a Projection Task Force. D. Boschini said that would be helpful to know the student growth with more certainty. J. Zorn asked about Lecturer row in the Tenure Density Analysis table (prepared by D. Boschini). What was the assumption there? In 2019-2020 we grow by 14.4. D. Boschini said that everything in the projected columns are based upon if we continue with same trajectory. She referred to the notes on averages, located below the table. It’s problematic when one looks at averages and at actual. Lecturers range from -3.4% growth in hires to +20.5% growth in hires. The average number of TT being 6.8% hiring growth and average number of Lecturers being 13.6% hiring growth.

J. Zorn – so +4.6 plus 15.3 plus +10.6, average that, to get an average of 13.6 per year? D. Boschini – Starting from 2019 and beyond, 13.6 was used as the number expected to be hired. The projection is how many TT we’d have to hire if we go with the proposal to increase tenure track density to 56%. J. Zorn said we’d have to cut back the growth of Lecturers from 13.6% growth to 5.4% growth in 2020-2021.

D. Boschini can see the patterns developed under the conditions that existed. We are in a set of conditions that has caused us to lose tenure density during a time of under-hiring TT professors in a time of rapid enrollment. During rapid expansion, brand-new students were admitted all the way into the school year. One does not hire a TT economics professor in August, so the school grabbed lecturers at the last minute. There’s been a pattern of doing that every year to the point that it’s created this scenario. Other factors contributed, too. We’ve been trying to hire TT every year, but we haven’t had a plan that is nearly aggressive enough.

J. Millar shared that at the BOT meeting and at the Mental Health Services Advisory Committee, D. Brevly, Director of Student Wellness and Basic Needs Initiative from the CO announced a 28% increase in counselor faculty. It’s an increase from 177 to 220 counselor. It sounds great until one sees that mental health services for students is 1 counselor per 2727 students. She asked for consideration of an additional tenure-track faculty member in Counseling. Given association standards, there is a need for 400 CSU counselor/faculty to serve 600,000 campus members.

A. Hegde – The President mentioned re-assigned time. Yesterday he spoke with K. Krishnan. 1) Re-assigned time. The way IRPA calculates SFR is full time equivalent (FTE) faculty in the department. If someone gets release time, the presumption is that that release is replaced by hiring someone else. Then you add up all those. But that’s not always the case, especially in the business school. Last year, to make sure we have the faculty qualifications to meet the standards of the percentages, (at least in the Economics Department) adjuncts were not hired. When one uses the SFR, if one did hire adjuncts, then SFR looks pretty good. Looking at the Department of Management, where they had to hire a lot of adjuncts, the argument can’t be made that time-equivalent faculty are the same as hiring the TT. Even in the SFR calculation there are ways it could look OK. The reality is that not all faculty release is filled with an equal
rank. 2) When one gets re-assigned time, presumably one is getting it to do something else. If all the reassigned time were cancelled, those things wouldn’t get done, and committees wouldn’t be filled because people need to get credit for it. It’s a little dangerous to say, there are other things we can do. He suggested that, using the new software that CSUB might get, to see how many extra sections are needed and how many faculty is needed to teach those sections. In that case, student growth makes a big difference. Has the analysis been done on enrollments, how many extra sections will we need, and how many faculty does that translate to? It’s more complicated than to say, we just need more sections. When certain course sections are added, it’s not difficult to find faculty. However, when Econ or certain sciences need to be added, one can’t find a PT lecturer alleviate those bottlenecks. Take a comprehensive look. While the numbers may look fine, part of this large issue is where do we get the qualified people to teach the subjects in the bottleneck? Every campus gets money, but it’s not in the best interest for the students that each school gets an equal amount, because the money may not be addressing the bottlenecks.

E. Correa thanked D. Boschini for bringing this data and the discussion out for the purpose of transparency on financial matters. She observed that the table from the CO shows that Channel Islands, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Dominguez Hills, and San Marcos are getting $1.52 million. According to the Graduation Initiative 2025 Preliminary Progress Update dashboards, those same campuses have at least one column where they’ve been successful at full “green”. For example, Los Angeles has full green for the Pell Equity Gap, Monterey Bay campus is successful at the Transfer Graduation Rate, Dominguez Hills, Channel Islands, and San Marcos scored well for filling the Pell Equity Gap were CSUB does not. We hear a lot on this campus about “best practices”. Let’s look at those campus receiving the same amount of money to how they are being successful in two or all three categories. While we look at the whole issue, we could be looking at the number of folks who are leaving CSUB compared with the rate at other campuses. What happens to those positions when they leave? D. Boschini acknowledged that the discussion could fill an entire day given all the factors affecting tenure density. For example, the lowest tenure density is 43. CSU LA has 46% and CSUB is at 52%, yet LA has a different set of circumstances when hiring Lecturers and very different pool to draw from. There are differences in every row that could get us mired in analysis. Let’s look at the actual numbers and what we’ve already done to ourselves. Instead of worrying about the projection, identify the habits and patterns and begin solving the problem.

B. Street expressed his appreciation of the work behind having the numbers available to study. The next step isn’t something for the Academic Senate Chair to do. There are people on campus that can refine the data that is their specialty. The downward trend is clear. The drop indicates a loss of effort in certain areas. It has to be compensated; we have to make up for it. One cannot be absent in these efforts and coast along and expect it to improve. It must be addressed. Unfortunately, there are issues beyond our
control. Thus, we have to make decisions on priorities. The expectation is that the university will make tenure-density a priority.

A. Hegde volunteered the Economics department to look at graduation issues over the break. V. Harper sent data to him. The department will produce a comprehensive white paper focusing on the graduation issue and the tenure density will be a part of that.

M. Danforth said in relation to the Graduation Initiative 2025 Preliminary Progress Update, goals and tenure track density, student retention needs to be investigated. We have a very leaky freshman pipe. She sees a loss of 50%. The vast majority who haven’t registered for Spring 2019 are on financial holds. There is obviously a bigger issue with our local students. If we keep them, we need the faculty to teach them. The ones we’re not keeping, that leaky pipe needs to be addressed.

D. Boschini stated that it is a complicated issue. If we talk about TT in a vacuum, we could miss some really important discussions. We could build a silos that makes things worse in facultyland. There are a lot of divisions who are struggling with the resources they have. When we are on the TT train all the time, we are saying we need more resources here and it impacts others over there. For example, if the students in the dorms felt unsafe, she would be open to hear about and discuss resources to fix that problem. She does not want to be a one-issue person and miss what needs to be done to help students. As a faculty group, it’s important to know whether improving things in the classroom dramatically improves student retention. If our CSUB students leave because other divisions are doing a worse job, we need to know the difference. As much time as we may spend fixing this problem, it may not move the needle as much as we may like to think it would. From what she hears, there is room for improvement in other divisions. D. Boschini then addressed the Provost. It may be discouraging on some level since it’s what the Provost spends her life on. It’s hard to get the resources needed for faculty and then to hear that we’re not moving enough. D. Boschini acknowledged how much the Provost works to help. It’s a long-standing pattern of resource allocation and the Provost has been trying to steer in a new direction.

c. Administrator Reviews - D. Boschini said that the Provost Review Committee is moving forward. Replacements have been made.
   i. Committee composition - See next item.
   ii. Conflict of interest – prevention. There was a question whether it was person specific or Handbook specific, and the hot time has passed. There isn’t a need for a referral at this time. All agreed.
   iii. Procedures: Committee Review chair, process, and consistency – There were concerns about how the communication goes out to the campus at the conclusion of the review. The President has been given a lot of input on that. Ultimately, what the President shares is up to her. The review committees for Dr. Harper, and Dean Asher have concluded and the Provost will work with the President on notification to the campus community.
d. Searches
i. Interim AVP Enrollment Management (EM) – J. Zorn reported that J. Mimms has separated. V. Lakhani is working as signature authority for December. The Provost is working on the appointment of an interim who will be in place just for the spring term. Then, there will be a national search for a permanent replacement. A call for a faculty member to the Search Committee will be made in January.

ii. GE Faculty Director - Lori Paris was appointed as interim for one year. J. Tarjan said the committee approved a revised job description. The GE Faculty Director Appointment Process to be on the January 22, 2019 agenda. A call for tenured faculty applications will be made in January.

e. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC – It’s recognized that there are various ways of program development. For example, the Interdisciplinary Studies Program. Background: The Academic Master Plan (AMP) process is dictated by the CO and the fact that programs get put on the AMP before full approval by the Senate – it’s just how the system is set-up. We know that faculty is hired with different talents, and sometimes a critical mass of faculty gets hired and then a program becomes possible. The Senate’s intervention will probably not create a policy that will fix all the messy paths. E. Correa replied that we wouldn’t want to give more structure to the point of curtailing creativity. J. Tarjan said that the issue is that some people attribute the AMP as a wish list. There are others who see courses reaching a threshold or preliminary analysis of demand. People understand it differently. Complicating that is that there were a number of programs put on last year without faculty being consulted. It was awkward. The process was updated to require that department chairs sign-off on programs to be added to the AMP. Faculty communicated that it is a faculty lead-process to bring the curriculum development forward. D. Boschini suggested, as a resolution to this question whether it’s in the Handbook on the advancement of new programs – there is a process from the CO, Page 13 in Handbook, and there are documents on Academic Programs (AP) webpage. If it’s a problem that there is a chain of people who don’t follow the existing communication expectation and policies that exist, you can’t solve that by more policies. It was suggested that a Task Force of AAC and BPC to look at it if it were to come forward. It refers to Academic Planning Manual, but it doesn’t have an area for department endorsement and no feasibility. J. Zorn responded that it’s not required for the initial proposal to get on the Master Plan, and doesn’t need feasibility plan. The Trustees only give OK for the campus to explore the idea within five years. There may be issues why it couldn’t go on there, perhaps because of sister campuses that may compete. Feasibility doesn’t come until afterwards. D. Boschini asked J. Tarjan to look at whether there are gaps, and which part of the process needs to be improved. If there are compelling reasons to make a referral we can put it on the agenda in January.


i. Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.

ii. Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)
iii. Schools have different workloads based on different criteria
iv. What constitutes one WTU release?
v. Is release time consistent?
vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval

g. Election to fill recent vacancy
i. Academic Senate A & H – newly elected member to begin in January.
h. Committee Structure – 40 committees - (committee proliferation) It has been described as a service burden. D. Boschini suggested that “Committee Load” will be under Workload on EC’s January 22nd agenda.
i. Staff member selection process to various service opportunities – It came from the need to put staff members on committees and a process that parallels the secure and private online voting that faculty uses. B. Bywaters to check with K. Garcia if she wants to work on the process. If K. Garcia doesn’t see it as a priority we’ll let it go.
j. Hiring Procedures – there are on-going concerns from faculty, particularly department chair and search and screening committee chairs on working with faculty affairs on what’s required to discuss searches, start searches, the paperwork, appointing or electing people to committees. There are on-going questions on whether they are being handled consistently. The best location for the Provost to talk about it is may be in the DCLC. Ask for feedback from the people who participated in the hiring process last year. Some of the frustration was the fact that form one and form two went into a black hole over the summer. Those who were pro-active to get things in early (Biology and Computer Science submitted in May or June and didn’t get processed until September.) D. Boschini suggested for the Provost look at that time at the DCLC where D. Anderson-Facile led faculty discussion without MPPs. Possibly the best way to get information from the chairs is to have the chair-of-chairs lead a discussion, take careful notes, and then give the feedback to the Provost in a way that she could move forward with it. The Provost was agreeable to the suggestion.
k. Time Block Schedule update – J. Zorn said there isn’t anything new from D. Schecter collecting information.
l. Honorary Doctorate Degree process - A. Hegde will ask the committee for their feedback. Defer discussion until next meeting in January.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. University Council – New committee position Library Representative requested by the President. (See previous hand out) Referral made to FAC with the suggestion to work with University Council for input. A new position would require a Handbook change.
b. Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation – (See previous handout) The necessity for FAC to be included in the process of approving a new department was reviewed. Procedures were revised to take the names of the committees off to clarify that there could be issues that did not need extensive review, included but not limited to issues that would go to other committees. Rather than say that these are the things that the committee should talk about, we said that these are the type of things that need to be
discussed and the EC could make a referral as appropriate. FAC was mentioned because there are faculty issues coming to the table that were not in the charge of AAC and BPC. The faculty concerns are somewhat person-dependent in a way that the Senate could not effectively address at the open discussion and policy level. B. Street’s concern is that EC is making a decision as a policy issues. Right now it’s something that can be managed without FAC. D. Boschini shared that the wisdom of the Senate a few years ago was that not all committees need to be put on every time. Putting the committees back on would be rescinding what the prior Senate had done. The EC agreed to hold off on referring to FAC.

c.  Spring 2019 General Faculty Meeting – Feb 11, Stockdale Room 11:30-1pm.  Live Steam. January agenda to include meeting content: GI 2025 Progress Update, etc.

d.  GI 2025 Preliminary Progress Update –D. Boschini tasked the EC with a reading the document over the break. Even places we did well, we’ve slid. She discussed the report with the President yesterday. The President has inquiries to division heads to gather data on what has changed that contributed to this. This is a big issue and be ready to talk about it in January. Go to Cal State dashboards and to the CSUB website https://www.csub.edu/success/. J. Tarjan said that there are so many factors and focus groups discussing this. J. Zorn responded that the GI Task Force minutes show what they see and where is the gap in retention. D. Boschini said she is not seeing enough of what students are experiencing.

e. President Zelezny at EC, January 29, 2109 10:30-11:30 – The main topic will be GI.

7.  **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING JANUARY 24, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   
   Announcements
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   RES 181907 Academic Calendars
   Old Business
   RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading  D. Boschini sent a copy of the most recent version to the President and the Provost. The President had questions about where the nominations would be submitted, who sees them, how much material is required of the candidate to submit, are there interviews, are they names and just feedback on names, and how the Provost is going to handle the input process and appointment. We want to consider what may happen on the floor.

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook