ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, November 13, 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

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Catalog Copy Process – V. Harper (handout) (Time Certain 10:05)
   V. Harper has gained understanding of the goal of students graduating by overseeing Academic Operations. There is a significant process for students getting to Grad Check and the process is not yielding as many as expected. Refer to the handout (Office of Academic Operations & Support: Request for Senate Inquiry Regarding the Regularly Updated Catalog) on how things evolved. His aim is to dialogue and get action by the EC to bring the faculty into process of solving the problem. One of the things that contributed to the problem was the conversion in 2009 of paper to pdf catalog. There are two processes closely linked to the catalog: Degree audit is used by students and then it’s used by evaluators in Enrollment Management (EM) to determine whether a student has completed the requirements. When it was a paper catalog, it was very difficult to change which created stability. People could change the catalog and could change the curriculum in a very fluid and quick sense in pdf form. Then, in 2011 the first iteration of the updated catalog appeared. Changes are logged on the website in terms of what changes to the curriculum have been made to the regularly updated catalog and close the changes that are different than what he would categorize as the static catalog. Importantly, the regularly updated catalog is a pointer for the degree audit which points to the updated catalog. V. Harper speculates that once CSUB went to the regularly updated catalog, and the regularly updated catalog points to the degree audit, the issue with that particular change would not show up for multiple years because prior students acted upon the stable catalog. It’s an example of organizations whereby there is a lag between a decision and implementation. Most times people don’t connect the problem to the decision because it’s about four years. For the students who came in on the regularly updated catalog in 2014 one can see the problems in degree audit and grad checks. Perhaps the faculty could consider an annual catalog, as well as having the faculty set a time line for curricular changes through their school curriculum committee. In concert, those two things would bring stability to the catalog. We’d still need to go back and fix problems, but overtime one could see the Degree Audit and Grad Check problems disappear with a static catalog. V. Harper and M. Danforth discussed the issues. There needs to be some exceptions to the annual catalog where there are programs that have a
grant and the grant requires a change to catalog on a more expeditious timeline. M. Danforth identified that another change that happened after CSUB went to the regularly updated catalog was getting rid of the process whereby departments submitted concentration outlines for their majors. There is a need to be flexible in some cases where the curriculum cannot be reflected in the degree audit. For example, in the Computer Science and Electrical Engineering (CS&EE) Department she lets them use the new electives on older catalogs. That’s not something that can easily reflected in the degree audit. Having that signed outline making it though with the application to the desk of the evaluator is important. It lets them know that the student came to the department and they got the department approval and isn’t just making up an application. That communication between the department and the evaluators, involving the department chairs, is a better pathway. Maybe there is a way on base that can be done to throw it up there for them. It would help a lot. It would allow us to bypass issues in the degree audit when we know there are several programmatic issues in the degree audit, especially when then system indicates that the categories are completed when they’ve completed five courses even if they are missing the ones on the checklist. That has happened not only to Quarter to Semester students but for transfer students where they had transfer credit and also when students took the course here and showed up on the audit twice and students were told they were done with the category even though they were missing a course on the checklist. D. Boschini thanked M. Danforth for her feedback. When V. Harper brought the issue forward and sees that there were issues, she provided in-depth feedback. He received good faculty insight into the recommendation that might help with where he might hit some resistance. V. Harper agreed that it’s a good idea if the faculty were to choose to go to an annual catalog. He expects it would be multiple cycles before the problems to go away. As an interim step, use the outlines in those several years while we are trying to push the instability out. Once the catalog is stabilized, then continue to build. D. Boschini said there is a need for flexibility for Grants and accredited programs – and if our accreditation expectations change we need to pivot. A. Hegde – First of all, if there are going to be any changes to the catalog, check with the students. The faculty circumvent that by advising and having an outline and such. Still, electronically, their first reaction is to go there. That ties in with their schedule. Schedule Builder allows them to plan their schedule. It is very important that the degree audit is accurate. Part of the problem is when we have a lot of transfer students and many different courses that fit a category, it doesn’t show up even if you’ve made the changes in PeopleSoft – the change doesn’t show for the students that they’ve met that category. For A. Hegde, the catalog is less of a concern as the degree audit. M. Danforth stated that until the programmatic errors in the degree audit are fixed, we’re telling the student that we are done with the category when they are still missing a course, and we’re telling the student that they are not done with the category when they are done with the category. Until those issues are fixed, we can’t rely exclusively on the degree audit. Students who do rely exclusively on the degree audit have been denied graduation because it tells them their done when they aren’t done. That’s a fundamental problem that has to be addressed. D. Boschini reinforced that the student doesn’t look at the catalog. The problem isn’t just what we do with the catalog, we need to get them to use it. Also, if we’re going to change any processes, we need to re-educate department chairs and faculty that do
advising, of the changes. If it’s going to committee resulting in a resolution, it needs to include the implementation of student and faculty. E. Correa suggested looking at it in steps. First refer to AAC to get faculty on board with the changes, and then AS&SS for the student component. D. Boschini said the catalog is purview of faculty to make sure the curricula and the process is tight. It has components of FAC and AS&SS. Yet for the issues that V. Harper and M. Danforth have identified, AAC is a place to start. E. Correa moved to send to AAC. A. Hegde seconded. All in favor of making the referral to AAC.

Academic Master Plan (AMP) – V. Harper (handout)
The AMP is a document which casts future academic programs that will potentially be launched by a campus in the next ten years. The AMP is unchanged from last year. The only changes are in the program review. This [fall semester] is the only window we have to put programs on the AMP. At this point, this needs to be approved by the Senate. It must be approved by the President. The Trustees meet in the spring. They approve the AMP. After the AMP is approved, each department that has a full-degree program approved then develops a full proposal that makes it all the way through the curricular process of the university. J. Tarjan thinks the dates of the programs are ambitious and to check with BPA to see if the masters programs can happen in two years. D. Boschini suggested that in the future, if we want programs to be faculty developed, the faculty would have needed to know at the beginning of the year that there is a deadline. It would be a better process if the faculty knew it was occurring before it is brought to the Senate. J. Zorn will inform the department chairs so they know for next year. A. Hegde requested that the Provost and Academic Programs educate the Deans of the process; how programs become official. Pilots usually proceed program adoption. Just because their programs are on the AMP with an expected date, the process needs to be reinforced. D. Boschini will draft a resolution that the EC recommends approval of AMP. All of EC was in favor of moving forward. No opposition.

Block Schedule – V. Harper (handout)
Block-scheduling is the assignment of the students’ full year schedule by their academic department instead of their self-selection. We are in year two of the two-year pilot. All A&H, Bachelor of Business Administration in BPA, and a variety of programs in SS&E are participating. It requires coordination across multiple units. There were 224 students in first year, and 630 in the second year of block-scheduling. He brings this to Senate Executive Committee in light of good governance and their approval to expand it. He has received inquiries from programs that want to use block scheduling. The flow chart simplifies how it works (handout). #1: Fall term enrollment forecast by each department and by course level. If Kinesiology has 130 students coming into the GE program, we need to know which of those students are going to be in which particular course. The major advantage is that it provides the department and the university what the block schedule is for the entire year. What occurs is (1A; the purple arrow) it allows a department to select to move students in the fall and the spring. The department chooses where the student goes over the course of the year. It’s load-balancing over the entire year to give predictability to the individual departments. #2: Seat reservation forecast in pink. The 61 students (refer to chart) in red come over- and because they aren’t yet enrolled—we need to hold their seats in PeopleSoft based on block schedule forecast. If there are a certain number of
students coming into a program into the fall and spring term, the classes are reserved by manipulating the cap. #3: The advisors work with the chairs who have agreed to use block scheduling. Iterations of the block schedule are created for the students. As they are enrolled by the advisors, (their applications go through the summer), the advisors put the students into the seats that were reserved. They have a full schedule built. The goal is to increase the number of units that students actually come to sweep in the first year and for those units to be on track based on the roadmaps that were created by the academic departments, giving the incoming students the best start possible in their first year. There are at least three issues: 1) The reserve for the incoming students reduces capacity for those who failed the class. 2) The block schedule creates a cohort in GE classes. For example, an entire class of accounting students in Theater classes which reduces diversity in the classroom. 3) It reduces students’ choice. Data shows that when students choose classes, they do not select in ways that ensure they graduate in four years. Looking at other handout Block scheduling Evaluation Summary, if one looks at the IRPA data comparing sophomores, students in block schedule enrolled in more units; 14.15 blocked, compared to 13.4 all sophomores. Of those students enrolled in 15 units or above 57% blocked vs 45% all sophomores. The retention rate was raised for the entire 600 students in the block. Those students who started year one in the block, 81% returned for the second year versus our historical 73% retention. D. Boschini said a referral is a natural result of V. Harper’s request to have the AS review Block Scheduling. J. Tarjan is a fan of block schedule and appreciates the data especially the comparison of GPAs. He suggests the data include the number of courses dropped, thus the number of units dropped. For the students in the block, how many units were dropped. The block students are taking up more spaces than they are dropping. A. Hegde is not a fan because the bigger problem is those students that can’t get their class (Communication 1008 for example) because they are blocked before registration even starts. Although he appreciates that at least some of the graduation issue is getting fixed by the students getting into their block earlier. D. Boschini acknowledged that it’s difficult when enrollment is so late coming and when it comes in waves especially over the summer. Even when schedules were ready, they weren’t adequately blocked. For example, two weeks into registration and into the summer scheduling was blocked. D. Boschini can see it’s difficult for people who are enrolling late into the summer and fall. She mentioned to the President that one of faculty’s concerns is enrollment; how can one project when there are still people coming in waves throughout the summer. We don’t want to say block scheduling is a problem when we have many other concerns going. The President is looking at a deadline for new freshman. A. Hegde suggested it go to AAC because it’s a scheduling issue, and it is part of the curriculum. The pilot has already been expanded. Thus, the decision is whether we want to do block scheduling permanently, or not. After it’s already been expanded, send a note to the Senate that the pilot has been expanded. Do we want to extend it so there is more information to decide to do this as a policy? AAC should look at it as policy. Presumably, once AAC looks at its effectiveness, it will be expanded to all incoming freshmen. D. Boschini is concerned that block scheduling expands to the point where the disadvantaged students gets condensed and get blocked out. It has to be everybody or else the people who don’t have block scheduling can’t
get what they need. J. Tarjan doesn’t think Senate needs to be involved because it’s a pilot. The apt analogy isn’t academic programs it’s the status of academic jeopardy. Maybe AS&SS can start now thinking about assessing whether to make it a permanent policy. D. Boschini heard a lot about block scheduling through the Grad Initiative committee. The Senate will be hearing about it for the first time. There’s going to be an expansion point where it’s going to be an across-the-board permanent structure. B. Street asked if there is sufficient data to be put in that position. V. Harper replied that IRPA is still in collection of data. The hope is that of the 1492 entering students, that the 630 students in block scheduling come back in the fall 2019 in greater numbers such that CSUB would show we have the ability and capacity to improve the retention between their first and second years. That’s institutional altering. It changes peoples’ lives. If expanded, that would take approximately 2/3 of the new students into the block. If they have a GPA increase and improved retention, fewer will be on probation than their comparative cohort. If we can parlay those benefits to all of the incoming class, it makes a big structural change. M. Danforth – how many students not in the block? How many of them were negatively affected by the block? Is there a way to determine if they were on the waitlist due to a saved seat? D. Boschini – If we’re at about 40% [now] we’re going to potentially see 75% of the remaining [incoming] 30% are probably pre-nursing students. There could be a huge chunk of people who already have a long time to graduation and they get lost [in the system]. She sees the nursing students are competing like crazy to get into their prerequisite courses. The Kinesiology students could be the ones taking all the blocks. If the program expands, things could get disadvantaged for groups of students not included. V. Harper does not want to disenfranchise those. AP could still schedule for those students. J. Zorn sees a strong argument to have everyone in block scheduling. If those who weren’t in the block have lower GPAs, get the students in the blocks-get the courses that they need-and then see if it makes a difference for all students. With some in and some not, there would be different success rates. V. Harper the level of disenfranchisement would scale up as the number of students not in block-scheduling would get smaller. A. Hegde proposes all or none. The problems we’re seeing is also with upper level requirements when there is only one section offered. He is in favor of doing the pilot for all incoming freshman, so we can see the magnitude of the problem. Scalability makes a big difference. M. Rush said that this way it’s not just certain majors that are disenfranchised. If there is a lottery, students who didn’t get in the block will trickle out. M. Danforth said the university probably doesn’t have the resources to put all freshman in block-scheduling. M. Rush – if it’s not programmed, identify everyone who is in block-scheduling, and then run a lottery so it won’t disproportionally affect one discipline. D. Boschini doesn’t feel it’s ripe for referral. The DCLC meets tomorrow and there is an opportunity to talk to all the chairs. A. Hegde recommended that based on the Senate Bylaws, (the Charge for AAC includes academic policy and procedures, programs, and curricula having interschool or all-university impact) and since there are multiple people from the Senate are on AAC, it makes it easier when it comes to the Senate. M. Danforth suggested getting feedback from DLDC to see how many want to join the pilot. D. Boschini wants to expand the block scheduling pilot to include the nursing students. It’s not mutually exclusive. We don’t decide whether to go all in at this meeting, we could send to our subcommittee(s), and talk to other places. M. Rush asked of the
case studies from other campus, what were the impediments? E. Correa recommends the DCLC is a good place to get support. D. Boschini asked if the group wants to refer to sub-committee or hold off. E. Correa wants to hold off. She agrees with Aaron’s position to expand, and DCLC should help. D. Boschini – the committees that would be involved are AAC and AS&SS. Both chairs want to hold off. The feedback to V. Harper is to take expansion of block-scheduling pilot to the Grad Initiative Task Force and DCLC. V. Harper will brief the DCLC and inform them that there would be 1000 students in block scheduling. He’ll get feedback from DCLC and there will be follow-up on next EC meeting agenda. 

Trustee Lillian Kimble expected to visit on December 12. 
It is occurring in the context of the GI 2025 Task Force. No word from the President’s office yet on inviting Senate (faculty) representation. There will be two more visits through the academic year. It may be possible for trustee(s) to attend an Executive Committee meeting.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Deferred for an electronic vote to approve the Minutes, October 30, 2018. Seconded. Approved.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
Medical Withdrawal removed from the agenda. E. Correa moved to approve the modified Agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. AS Log (handout) (deferred)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
      iii. BPC (B. Street)
      iv. FAC (M. Rush)
   b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation (deferred)
   c. Results of Faculty Survey (see previous handout) Action Items (deferred)
   d. Administrator Reviews (deferred)
      i. Committee composition
      ii. Conflict of interest - prevention
      iii. Procedures: chair, process, consistency
   e. Searches
      i. Associate Dean of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies – call ends November 16, 2018
      ii. Director of Academic Operations- – call ends November 16, 2018
      iii. Interim AVP Enrollment Management -
      iv. GE Faculty Director – Pending job description
   f. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC
   g. Workload - What constitutes workload? (deferred)
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 a one WTU release?
v. Is release time consistent?
vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval
h. Types of concerns that should be directed to the Academic Senate (deferred)
i. Election to fill recent vacancy
   i. Academic Senate A & H – Results of Second Call, Amy Ressler. She had to withdraw due to class conflict this and next semester. New call is needed to replace Amy Ressler.
j. Appointments made
   i. Academic Petitions Committee
      A&H member, Steve Campagna-Pinto - appointed
   ii. Canvas Pilot Planning Committee
       BPA member, Mansik Hur - appointed
   iii. IACUC and HSIRB recommendations for appointments (see previous handout)
       IACUC Chair, Matt Leon recommended by EC to Provost
       HSIRB Chair, Chandra Commuri recommended by EC to Provost
k. Request for 2019-2021 Faculty Trustee nominations (see previous handout) (deferred)
l. Committee Structure – 40 committees - (committee proliferation)
m. Staff member selection process to various service opportunities (deferred)
n. Hiring Procedures (deferred)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. University Council – New committee position Library Representative requested by the President. (previous hand out) (deferred)
   b. Faculty Awards – Emeritus and other faculty awards - the validity of the content put forward and were changes made. There have been assertions that emeritus professor information is not reliable and that may be true with some of the faculty awards. It was referred to FAC.
   c. Time Block Schedule – See discussion with V. Harper under Announcements
   d. Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation – Referral Review (handout)(deferred)
   e. Service Animal Emotional Support Animal Policy – C. Catota came back with two revisions. It pertains to housing, not the classrooms. The original request was for faculty feedback and the EC is the faculty body who can provide feedback. C. Catota made amendments and wants to know the next step. D. Boschini said that AS&SS can give feedback to C. Catota, and then it’s complete. It does not involve faculty Handbook policy. It’s a university policy and doesn’t go through the Senate.
   f. Graduate Commencement – Students want it in the evening. If in the Icardo, tickets will be issued. The students don’t want ticketing. D. Boschini signed a joint letter with the President about the changes to commencement. It was moved to soccer stadium
without tickets with Icardo available for people who can’t take the heat. The EC endorses D. Boschini’s signature to represent the faculty on the decision about Graduate Commencement.

g. Wang Award nomination process debriefing – The EC recommended the nominees go forward to the President’s Office: Anne Duran Outstanding Teaching, Brandon Pratt for Outstanding Scholarship, and John Tarjan for Outstanding Service. D. Boschini suggested to schedule October meetings for the FHAC upon their spring election.

h. Grad Check Process discussed in Announcements. Referred to AAC.

i. Academic Calendar – Too many MW teaching and lab days were lost. Referred to BPC.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 29, 2018 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   Announcements
   President Zelezny present a brief report. (Time Certain: 10:05-10:20)
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   Old Business
   RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson’s Role in Dispute Resolution Second Reading

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

   V. Martin is not returning to Senate. He will answer the questions posed at Senate off line. The President has been asking for feedback the last couple months from the different divisions on campus on how to spend $1M if we had it. There have been a series of conversations recently. At the same time, the Statewide Senate Chairs and CFA have been discussing how their campus is spending the GI 2025 Allocation that has been assigned for tenure density. CSUB’s allocation is $1.52 M. There is the $1M conversation, and there is the $1.52M conversation. Depending on who one asks, those are the same pots of money or completely different. Depending on who you talk to, the $1.52M is entirely for new faculty members to increase tenure density, or it’s new hires for 2018-2019, or 2019-2020 new hires of which we are planning “zero” at this point. According to the Statewide Senate Chairs and CFA, the concern is that the $1.52M is earmarked specifically for new tenure-track faculty hires in the 2019-2020 academic year, and our campus announced at the beginning of the year that we were planning “zero” of those. D. Boschini spoke with the President last week about the GI 2025 memo with the $1.52 allocation – it didn’t specify that the money had to be spent on tenure-track hires. Others have not read the memo that way. She asked the President if what we’re arriving at now is the realization that that memo was misinterpreted, or somehow the legislative intent didn’t translate in the memo,...at what point did the communication fail? If this is faculty leaders being off-track, if it’s Presidents’ not getting information that will lead them to the right decision, or if it’s we just see it differently, ...it’s evolving. The $1.52M would be predicted to create approximately eleven tenure-track spots. If $1.52M creates eleven, over 30 years we hire an average of 20 FTEF, in order to not have our tenure density decrease, we would have to throw all our eggs in the tenure-track basket and try to hire no lecturers. If we
tried to hire 20-22 tenure-track people, now we’re up to $3M to move CSUB tenure density in the right direction, assuming no one retires, quits or dies. The data is highly alarming. CSUB is ranked 18th of 23 campuses on tenure-density. If we don’t do any hires, it will change to 20th. D. Boschini shared that with the President. The President is open to considering tenure-track hires for next year but said it’s too late for searches. D. Boschini’s response was that the searches that should be on-going are not on-going. We need to be willing to not have that as barrier. D. Boschini’s response was, show her the data that shows we have an assigned time problem. The conclusion of the conversation was that the President needs to see a proposal from D. Boschini on behalf of the Senate that says we’re requesting. Last year we recommended $2M. This year, if we don’t recommend $3M and we don’t spend $3M, our tenure density is going to be on the slide. Yes, we need to hire new tenure track hires for fall 2019. The $1.52M is the absolute basement that we can’t go below. D. Boschini would like to recommend large amount of money and get chairs to recommend as many tenure track hires as we can manage, even if it means sharing an office with a tenure-track new hire. B. Street recommended to further the previous request for $2M stated in last year’s resolution and to affirm our interpretation of the $1M. M. Danforth referred to a meeting last week whereby the external analyst for scheduling software keyed in on the many students’ demands that can’t be met due to lack of faculty resources. That should be part of our narrative, particularly since the ASI/students have already been thinking of how to spend the money. There are going to be some optic issues there where they think their voices they are being cut out. We have to very clearly say we’re doing this for the students; addressing their unmet demand. The student trend is up. The faculty tenure track trend is down. Tenure track faculty is highly associated with student success. For a campus that has one of the lowest numbers of overall outcomes for student success, we should be able to make a strong argument to hiring more faculty. If allocation for tenure track is too late, lets carry it over. If we fail to hire tenure-track, we shouldn’t lose the position. E. Correa asked if there is anything in the strategic plan and the CSUB mission that points to future and faculty needs because that could support new tenure-track hires. D. Boschini replied yes, “excellent faculty”. D. Boschini will draft letter with B. Street. We have new data that is compelling for an addendum to RES 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55.

* Changes to the University Handbook