ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, October 16, 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 (Alt.)

Absent: M. Rush, E. Correa
Visitor: D. Schecter

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Timed Agenda Items

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   B. Street moved to approve the Minutes, October 2, 2018. J. Tarjan seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   A. Hegde requested adding grad check to the agenda. D. Boschini requested adding Catalog Change Approval Processes. J. Miller requested adding Search Updates to outstanding positions. J. Millar moved to approve agenda as amended. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC M. Danforth - 2018-2019 Referral 03 GITF Hold Proposal Memo (handout) The Task Force took feedback and then updated the table with new column to specify when the holds are in place. It will be placed on AP website. It doesn’t rise to the level of a resolution. EC accepted the completion of the referral. Instructor Initiated Drop Policy will be reworked based comments made during last year’s Senate discussions.
      ii. AS&SS – No updates.
      iii. BPC - B. Street reported that the committee spent time on the $1M priority list. The main focus are the referrals from last year: 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative, and RES 171827 Office Space Allocation. BPC will be meeting with AAC on the Interdisciplinary Program referral. The referral on the University Hour is open –A. Schmidt to provide specifically what is expected. It was suggested that utilization of classrooms will help the students see what’s available. There is support for University Hour and it’s up to other bodies to
come up with plans and implement them. The Classroom Task Force looked at fall 2017 – the lowest utilized time block was MWF during lunch time but there was still 50% use of classrooms during that time; 50 classes scheduled for 100 classrooms. It’s hard to imagine how that many classes could be shifted to other time blocks, especially when so many time blocks are 100% utilized. Consider the trade-off for graduate students who are here after work and it pushes them out until 10pm. Biology and Chemistry for the lab components – they would have to take classes on Saturdays.

The 2013-2014 time block resolution isn’t a document/plan tool. The schedule builder is good, but access is needed earlier to make it meaningful. Advisors should have access. D. Schecter will ask that the Provost to suggest that the Academic Affairs Council relook at the whole thing. We can start talking about it at that level and then bring in faculty input - D. Boschini will be in that meeting – to consider how to bring in the Senate or sub-committees on the subject. Now we have data on two years of the semester system, we can revise it by thinking through the process. J. Tarjan, M. Danforth and D. Schecter will share relevant documents. Currently, the time blocks can’t be found on the website. The conversation will be 1) where are the time blocks and 2) opening up the time blocks. There may be a referral to BPC. Inform A. Schmidt that University Hour is being looked at in a more global way. D. Boschini asked the EC to talk to their constituencies to learn if this is something we should take on, and include “Time Block Schedule” (possible referral) on Agenda October 30th.

iv. FAC – no report.

b. Search updates – Dean of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies, Director of Academic Operations, Interim AVP Enrollment Management, Associate Dean of BPA, GE Faculty Director. The AVP Enrollment Management is still in that position through November. There needs to be progress on the Evaluation Committee for the Provost. D. Schecter said the Associate Dean for BPA is underway and should be finished in November.

c. “Reviews” will be a Continued Business item for future EC meetings. Composition of review committees was a concern whereby staff reporting directly to the person being evaluated may be positioned where they are compelled to defend the Administrator. The EC will take up the discussion on whether the staff representative has to be from that Administrators’ unit, committee chair selection, procedures, and consistency.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – B. Street meeting with T. Davis to go through examples and stages to create a Budget Book and an update on Questica usability, and content for the spring Budget Forum. The Engineering tutoring center budget was cut 28%. Economics tutoring was cut from 10 hours because they supposedly were over budget. A. Hegde will set-up a meeting with R. Thompson and M. Danforth is invited to attend. Tableau is two years out of date. D. Boschini replied that the President knows that we cannot make recommendation for planning unless we have current data. Example: we don’t know if we’ve made progress
on tenure density this year. It was suggested that IRPA bring an intern from business or computer science to learn the system to support IRPA.

e. Results of Faculty Survey (see previous handout)
   i. Workload – The workload issue varies greatly across the system. The CFA does talk about a standard. We knew there would be workload issues with the Q-S conversion. Six years ago, the EC found it difficult to determine what other campuses do. Other campuses had many exceptions to 3-3 because of external funding, etc. Here, we don’t have the external funding so we can’t. We’re supposed to be 4-4, but when it comes to it, there are ways to get re-assigned time, ways to adjust workload and that puts it down to departments and chairs and individual faculty members to make it work. It’s complicated. We need to work on the timelines of awarding that assigned time. It’s difficult to observe all the time spent on EC and as a Standing Committee chair, for example. The conversation has happened enough places and enough times that people are aware that it’s a problem. If one gets a late RCU award through GRaSP during University Week, it’s too late to do fall adjustments because the department can’t bring in anyone new. D. Schecter will talk to GRaSP, review the process, and then ask Provost to report back to the group. What constitutes workload? One is administrative (when assigned time is awarded), one is that different schools have different workloads based on different criteria. What constitutes a one WTU release? Is release time consistent? When the key categories have been identified, EC can determine which committee gets the referral. D. Boschini – not having recent data makes EC’s analysis not relevant if we’re looking at three year old data. Three years ago, workload was not faculty’s #1 problem. So looking at that data isn’t meaningful. It’s a data issue and a growth issue. Our student population has grown and faculty is struggling to keep up with that. We don’t know what our current SFR is. By professional association standards (1500 to 1) we’re way out of compliance at 2200 students to 1 counselor. D. Boschini suggested wait for the fall data (Tenure density, etc.) from K. Krishnan to be available in the beginning of November.

d. Appointments (see previous handout)
   i. TEAC – Aubrey Kemp appointed
   ii. Academic Petitions Committee A&H – No one responded to second call. A. Hegde will reach out to the person who inquired about the committee.

e. Upcoming presentation to Senate by V. Martin, VP for University Advancement – The website needs to be updated. He wants to talk about the capital campaign and strategic planning. EC is interested in hearing about ROI on UA hires; people who have converted from soft-money to stateside; What is UA spending and how much are they bringing in; if the number of donors up, but the money is down; What is the revenue, excluding faculty donation, grants and contracts; Update on UA efforts to have faculty involved; Update on UA organizational chart with names; Whether it is the President’s or UA’s responsibility for fund raising opportunities for capital
campaign; What is the timeline for capital campaign and the result of the feasibility study? Five minutes for presentation and ten for Q&A. The recommendation is to present to Senate what the Senate/stakeholder group wants to hear.

f. Request for 2019-2021 Faculty Trustee nominations (previous handout) The seat went unfilled for a couple years. The Board usually has a recommendation of a Faculty Trustee to go for before the Governor to appoint. Usually, it’s an incumbent for another term. Currently Dr. Romey Sabalius of San Jose State is the Faculty Trustee. We already have J. Nilon to represent CSUB fairly well. The nominating committee looks at candidate interest and service at the system level. It will be a continued item for next meeting to provide an opportunity for the EC to bring a name forward.

g. Master of Science in Administration program – D. Boschini met with M. Novak EEGO and R. Dawson. They are not moving forward with any changes at this time. The curriculum should be faculty directed and it’s a Stateside purview. This program isn’t connected to any stateside faculty. EEGO wants to improve the situation. The recommendation is that they talk to the BPA Dean, Associate Dean, and Department Chairs of the departments where this program is a natural fit. Academic programs are housed within academic units. EEGO extends those opportunities in a variety of ways. We need to look at 1) the program has home in an academic department and 2) find out if we’re following policy. The Senate would expect that the program quality is assessed, and that hiring was being approved by a department. EEGO’s role should be to take applications and performing logistics of admissions criteria, and admissions. The academic department decides who delivers courses. It should be decided between BPA and EEGO. It should not be coming to the Senate. What may rise to Senate level is looking at oversight of EEGO where they offer programs. D. Boschini said that M. Novak reaching out was a positive move in itself. The situation is better in many areas than it was ten years ago. The option is to direct them to BPA to move the program forward.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Grad Check Deadline – For the longest time there wasn’t a deadline posted for grade check fall 2018. Then it appeared over the weekend as September 24, which is past the due date. As with students the week before, a certain faculty member told students to keep applying since the deadline will appear soon. A student prefaced her advising session with “I know I’m late already. Do I have to wait until spring to graduate?” No email notification sent to students. There is a lot about graduation on social media, but not about graduation check deadline. It’s a repeat of the issues in Enrollment Management issues that were discussed in Senate last year. The discussion to continue at next meeting.

b. Catalog copy approval – V. Harper plans to be in upcoming meeting.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 25, 2018 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   Announcements
   Consent Agenda
**New Business**
RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy - First Reading

**Old Business**

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
D. Boschini will be attending the Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium next week. There is a healthy discussion on how lottery funds and GI 2025 allocations to campuses have been spent. There was a portion of the money earmarked to support faculty hiring. There are posts to the campus list.serve identifying the number of new hires by campus; they knew exactly how many positions had been created with that money. There are some campuses that are spending the money allocation by campus size or by tenure-density need. There was the expectation that it was clear where that money was to the spent and transparency on where the money was actually spent. The awareness, knowledge, and transparency varied amongst campuses. D. Schecter will ask the Provost. There was a new hire in Student Affairs. It’s been said that the money came from funds for Student Success.