ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, September 18, 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.)

Visitor: V. Harper, D. Schecter

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order. D. Boschini finished Jury Duty and will return to campus tomorrow.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   WCSUC Campus Update – V. Harper (handout) Time Certain 10:05 - A. Hegde introduced V. Harper, Associate VP of Academic Programs (AP), as one with considerable experience in accreditation at previous institutions and has done a good job marshalling activities at CSUB for the last year and a half. V. Harper reported that the Draft #2 Institutional Report (handout) is one of four versions expected. It’s the work of the steering committee comprised of faculty, staff, student representative, and administrators. The AS Chair on the committee. The draft was sent to editor, M. MacArthur, who did an outstanding job working on all the essays through the summer. V. Harper worked on the draft, too. V. Kohli played a substantial role in Draft #2. D. Jackson replace V. Kohli on Draft #2. The link WSCUCIRFeedback@csub.edu for feedback was distributed September 17 along with a link to the Draft #2 Institutional Report. V. Harper expects the Senate to weigh-in with comments. Draft #3 will be given to the Cabinet. The Draft will be sent to the Commission by Feb 12, 2019. An off-site review will occur, approximately ten weeks later. CFO, President and Provost will teleconference where Academic Programs (AP) will hear the Commission’s lines of inquiry. That’s where there is a request for additional information which can be provided throughout the summer. The Visiting Commission, the President and Chair of the Commission and her team, arrive Oct 19. There will be two open forums in November to hear comments.
   A. Hegde opened the floor for questions. E. Correa asked about appendixes. V. Harper responded that the online version contains hyperlinks to the source material. For example, page 10, the first paragraph refers to lines of inquiry citation 1.8 refers to the CFR. “05” means there are five documents supporting this document. In the final draft, the citations will be hyperlinked; no need for appendixes.
   Recommendations were communicated to V. Harper that were editorial except for one: J. Tarjan – Essay #7, write a summary that states that not only are the revenue streams from the state uncertain, the budget is allocated to campuses after we’ve all made commitments for the coming year. Here’s what CSUB tried to do in the planning in response to that.
This is V. Harper’s third time going through the Institutional Review, yet first time here. TheWSCUC changed how the accreditation is done to be consistent with other regional creditors. In the past, the process was several smaller documents over ten years. Now it’s one document. M. Rush suggested that every committee chair make an announcement at their committee meeting. M. Danforth suggested make an announcement item at Senate – get your feedback to committees by Nov 15. The email WSCUCIRFeedback@csub.edu enables direct feedback. The feedback is part of the proper process.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   M. Rush moved to approve September 4, 2018 minutes. E. Correa seconded. Approved

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   J. Tarjan suggested adding Faculty Awards for future Discussion item. There are issue with emeritus and the validity of the content put forward and whether changes were made. A. Hegde moved to add BPC membership/staff as a Discussion topic. E. Correa moved to approve. M. Danforth seconded. The Agenda approved as amended.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. **AS Log**
      AAC is checking one final thing before the resolution draft goes to Senate. The committee invited J. Paschal/Advising for clarification on GI Hold Proposal. AAC meeting location changed to SCI III 328.
      AS&SS hasn’t had any business yet to report.
      BPC Street confirmed Questica training for BPC. They will see if it’s useful. IRPA will present trend data September 20. In October T. Davis will present his data to this point in cycle.
      FAC meeting location changed to Science III 235
   b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – B. Street reported that October is the time for number crunching and verifying accuracy. The Budget Forum, open to General Faculty, is scheduled for the spring. There is a University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Council (USP/BAC) meeting in December 18. What is expectation of Budget Forum? There is a $1M and the pushback that there are hires and that the money is already gone for items that are not visible. A. Hegde said there is $8M of funding. Of that, $5M gone to faculty increase, staff, tech. Of that $5M, there is a $1M one-time increase. In one sense it hasn’t been spent. If one moves the numbers around, it has been spent. In response to the President request to state priorities, the Senate has already spoken; it approved RES 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring. The resolution specified $2M to support what studies show that tenure-track faculty and SFR contribute to student success. There has to be some kind of recognition that we are in this position because of past practices that were not helpful.
The campus may need education on the distinction between an expansion hire from a replacement hire to keep that commitment alive. A. Hegde – it depends how far the replacement hire analysis goes back. BPA used to have 35 faculty members. If we have that conversation, we need to go back further. E. Correa we need exact categories of how money is spent. B. Street met with T. Davis requesting that he provide line items of how the money is spent. M. Danforth - All faculty and all staff has to have access to Questica.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. BPC membership/staff representative replacement – The committee decided to bring to EC the question of how to fill the staff position that was vacated by a former member who was promoted to an MPP. The list of Staff responses to Call for Interest Staff to be emailed EC for them to reply with their preferences. The replacement to be for the academic year. The EC’s recommendation will go before the full Senate for approval.
   b. Results of Faculty Survey (see previous handout) M. Danforth assumes that the EC knows that the pay for adjuncts and Lecturers are not par with Bakersfield College. The topic of intimidation and bullying is of concern since it affects campus culture that thwarts academic freedom, and civility as a whole. If a person wants to be politically active, it may affect them professionally in a negative way. The Campus Creed is not as visible as before. There are cases of students that are unhappy with their grade filing a grievance through the President’s Office instead of going through the proper channels. The President’s Office notifies the Dean to take care of the problem. Then, there is pressure to do something that is more favorable to the student. Faculty members are not comfortable with the visibility of their ID number being available to students on SOCs. There is a concern about faculty input on Administrative Reviews and how it’s being received. Not every administrator got excellent reviews but President Mitchell said everybody did. It’s not the Senate’s job to figure out what’s wrong with Administrator Review process. Instead it’s about the feedback that the campus community receives on Administrator Review and how accurately it reflects on the evaluation. It would probably be referred to FAC. Faculty Survey Results deferred for next meeting for members to have another opportunity to review with the intention of parsing what warrants referral to specific committee(s) or not. Some issues may be combined into a single referral.
   c. Ombudsman (handout) J. Millar will speak with R. Alvarez, Director of Students Rights and Responsibilities, will have a better report on what is the intent on bringing the Student Handbook Article III Complaint Procedures to the EC. FAC Chair asked for new referral on Student Misconduct, but these handouts do not address it. In BPA there is a form to fill out a form. Why is a complaint under the Student Rights and Responsibilities office instead of Academic Affairs? There are students that are repeat offenders and other faculty don’t know it. What is the role of Ombudsman (M. Palaiologou)? They may advocate for students – so there could be multiple conflicts. Should someone in Student Affairs be making the decisions about academic roles and
responsibilities? No, but that’s how it is now and what can we do to make it better. M. Rush said the Student Misconduct Task Force met to clarify the process. There is a flow chart and a form. Some schools fill out the form, others don’t. Faculty wants to handle on the spot but there is a greater good that we have to address, and we have to deal with repeat offenders; they could be misbehaving university wide with more stringent consequence. J. Millar said there is an academic violation and a Student Conduct violation. The OSSR picks up that end of it and it doesn’t get communicated back well. When the Senate developed the flow-chart there were competing “good” on how to correct student’s behavior and student’s academic behavior and where they intersect. The handout is on different things. E. Correa had problem with plagiarism and why she didn’t hear anything about it. Part of the problem is the Right of Students and Privacy. J. Millar supposed that the violation of Student Code of Conduct is a personnel issue and the faculty is not privy (or has the right to know) to the outcome. J. Miller said the faculty has the right to fail the student. M. Rush asked to table Ombudsman – Student Handbook Article III Procedures.

d. RES 181901 University Handbook Renumbering – A. Hegde reminded the group that the Senate returned the item back to EC after the First Reading to change the last line to “reorganization in strikethroughs” and insert “approved” to the Rationale. After discussion the EC sent the Handbook back to B. Hartsell of the Handbook Task Force to make more clear the items that were moved, remove repetition, and where moving a section to where the wording doesn’t make sense. It’s OK to make editorial changes to make the document internally consistent without making any substantial changes. There won’t be a second reading until those changes have been made.

e. Appointments – (see previous handouts) - The EC agreed that a Call for Interest to be Appointed to Various Universitywide Appointments, and Call for Nominations for Elected positions be sent. The interested party to indicate why the committee is of interest, such as they have expertise in that area. There are fourteen committees that need to fill faculty vacancies.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING SEPTEMBER 27, 2018** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - WASCUC – V. Harper (Time Certain 10:05)
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
   - Old Business

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook