ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, December 5, 2017
09:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. SCI III Math Library

Present: D. Boschini (Chair), B. Hartsell (Vice Chair), M. Slaughter, A. Hegde, J. Millar, J. Tarjan, J. Zorn

Absent: M. Rush, C. MacQuarrie

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   - M. Rush absent because she is interviewing candidates on behalf of department chair.
   - C. MacQuarrie absent because he’s picking up his daughter from school as part of precautionary evacuation call due to fires.
   - Someone self-nominated to Academic Administrator Review Committee and it presents a potential conflict of interest in elected reviewer.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   B. Hartsell moved to approve minutes from 11/30/17. M. Slaughter seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Addition topics under Discussion Items: Election update, and Tenure Track Counselor

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. Financial transparency and faculty participation in budgeting process- D. Boschini and A. Hegde attended the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (USP/BAC) meeting December 4, 2017. D. Boschini reported that the transparency portion has improved based on website posting. There are headings for future figures: Faculty head count, tenure-track density, and salary without benefits. A. Hegde reported that the purpose of the USP/BAC meeting was to register requests. Faculty Hiring Initiative using a $2 million ask was accepted as the top priority. The 2018 budget is based on the state’s target FTES of 7777. Yet, our projected enrollment is 7953, which is 2.2% over target. For that extra need, we only get tuition and fees and no other state support.

   Last year CSUB had $1.6 million carry-forward. $600K for tech refresh and the $1 million for faculty hiring. Academic Affairs asked for $4 million for starter funds, faculty recruitment, assigned-time, course sections, faculty travel, student travel, accreditation, professional development and IT roadmap. Sometime IT is in AA, sometimes in FTES.
The IT roadmap has specific things like mobile apps. The Provost’s office also provides funds for IT outside roadmap like computer refresh for faculty. The Deans are doing things in labs which are not in IT Roadmap. Maintenance of equipment requires funds we don’t have. Other initiatives include tax credit for low-income students, cultural events, and research, etc. Student Affairs $130K: some to Athletics to make their support staff permanent. Some allocated for Food Pantry. BAS had $600K ask for IT Roadmap. It came from 2017-2018 carry-over funds. In 2018-2019 it’s also $600K because it’s a 3-year plan. For 2019-2020 the fund provides $300K, totaling about $1.5M over three years which gets us to 1995 standards. BAS asked for $223K, mostly to convert Q-S personnel from temp to permanent.

J. Tarjan is on a mini Task Force to define student success. While more classes get them graduated, there are other factors like hunger, trouble with transportation, picking up another job, etc. affecting student success. Students on probation clearly identify time issues and personal problems; that’s some of why they drop out.

Last year University Advancement (UA) asked for $350K soft money from state-side for critical issues. This year they’re asking for $420K again defined as critical in areas of annual giving, stewardship, public affairs, and support on campus. They asked $280K for Sustainability Coordinator, student internship, and to renew contract with Alliance Against Family Violence. There is a lot of Title IX things and personal contracts. UA did not say anything about capital campaign in the USP/BAC meeting. A. Hegde heard that all our needs sum to $5 million. Thus, there is a gap of $3 million which should be closed as part of UA’s charge.

USP/BAS meeting take away:
Faculty initiative got top priority. The $2million ask is not enough but it is an attempt to close the gap. The SFR dropped because of the Q-S. One drop under the circumstances should not be seen as a trend. This is why we need multi-year data. D. Boschini will write an end-of-the-semester statement to faculty. We asked for comprehensive financial data, and still have a way to go.

b. Handbook Updates –Proposed changes to Handbook resulting from Senate approval of RES 171813 Faculty Participation in Budgetary Matters requires a vote and then the Constitution changes can take place. (Estimated completion in February)

c. Advising Concerns – D. Boschini reported that the list of questions developed by FAC & AS&SS was sent to Provost. There will be different surveys, including one for students. The Provost is bringing in a consulting firm to help implement best practices.

d. Graduation Check and Enrollment Management – The most recent Grad check Report was distributed via Outlook Executive Committee Group. EC to revisit numbers, comparing December plan and January results.
e. ROTC at CSUB – B. Hartsell moved to dispense of topic. New programs need to be faculty-driven and go through established process to then get on Academic Master Plan. There is insufficient support from faculty at this time. J. Tarjan seconded. Approved.

6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. EO 1110 implementation process - D. Boschini introduced discussion. CSUB Academic Senate Bylaws (hand-out) are governing documents and not in Handbook. If the faculty is going to have input into EO 1110 there is a place for that discussion to happen to get feedback to small group that’s working on developing pre-baccalaureate Quantitative Reasoning and English. The Academic Senate Bylaws are useful. Refer to Standing Committees, Section 4, page 5 Academic Affairs Committee (AAC). GECCo is the specialist that deals with GE and makes the curricular decisions. AA is the curriculum committee for university programs, among other things. For any inter-disciplinary program, AA is their curriculum committee (CC). D. Boschini formally referred issue to AAC to examine the all university impact. The charge is for AAC to assure that implementation of EO 1110 is appropriately coordinated throughout the university. It applies to both Math and English areas. Each academic program has to look at the course, see what the learning objectives are, and then see if it’s meeting requirement. AAC would ask that question of the people already in the implementation process. Further, what will happen to some students in remedial when they’ve been disqualified but they want be able to come back next year when there is no rule for remediation? New students have to be math prepared. The policy needs to be qualified. If a student applied for re-admission will they be treated the same? AA programs to clarify policy. It should be explained in all catalog formats.
   b. Concentration Proposal for Engineering and Energy (hand-out) – The new emphasis in Engineering Sciences referred to BPC and AAC for review before it comes to Senate for approval.
   c. Elections Update – There are vacancies for Academic Administrative Review Committee. The objective is to have a fair process with a breadth of representation which includes faculty representative from each school. Members are to sign a confidentially agreement because it’s a personnel matter and cannot be divulged outside of committee. A referral sent to FAC that any administrator has a right to veto a person for bias to avoid conflict of interest. Right of refusal has to be in policy.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING** (Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)
   - **Announcements**
     - F. Gorham - Classroom Task Force report.
     - New protocol set whereby speaker’s time limit is 8-10 minutes for presentation and 5-7 minutes for Q&A.
   - **Consent Agenda**
   - **Old Business**
     a. RES 171807 Amendment to Classroom Observation Policy *
New Business

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

* Changes to the University Handbook