ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, November 27, 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

Visitors: C. Catota, R. Alvarez

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Dream Resource Center – C. Catota (Time Certain 10:05) C. Catota was tasked by the President to explore ways to serve students who are undocumented, AB 540, and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). There is a model on other campuses. It was presented by the students to the President during her Walk & Talk event and at a Strategic Planning Forum. C. Catota met with Undocumented Student Equity Task Force, United Now for Immigrant Rights, and other groups. R. Alvarez is part of the Task Force. Students don’t want to call it Dream Center. Not all qualify for DACA. The more inclusive name, “Scholars without Borders” is preferred. The goal is to offer legal clinics, legal assistance and support of DACA students and counseling, training for faculty staff to better understand AB 540 and normalize AB 540, and to have a place where students can tell their stories. Resources For Undocumented Students (handout) was created by the Task Force. The EC reviewed the brochure. Suggestions were to include faculty mentors, create Safe Zone similar as those for LGBT and post stickers to show students especially for those who work and not available during office hours, faculty who are mentors indicate such on syllabi. Further, there were suggestions on education: the difference between affidavit and a fake one; authorization for search; know how to respond, etc. The Counseling Center has two bilingual counselors. R. Alvarez shared that the idea from the Task Force is to have a designated coordinator at the Scholars without Borders. D. Boschini suggested that C. Catota could receive high quality feedback in DCLC. A. Hegde will inform the Senate as part of his EC report. The next DCLC meeting is in January where C. Catota may share more information. The online version of the brochure
   https://www.csub.edu/compliance/_files/UndocumentedStudentResources_Booklet.pdf

Budget Forum – December 5, 3:30-4:30. There has been a room change to the Student Union MPR Room. B. Street will make introductions and outline the accomplishments to this point. F.
Gorham will be there to discuss Questica. Questica availability moved out to summer. D. Boschini is part of WASC. They were assigned to read essays. Essay 7 discusses the finances of the university. She requested significant rewrites because the way the information was presented. The problem of lack of transparency was reported as tension between the faculty and administration. She informed the steering committee that the problem wasn’t tension, it was the lack of information. Putting faculty in front of the Budget Forum misses the greater point: It’s the university’s responsibility (BAS) to generate data and to make it available to the rest of the campus. The Steering Committee was very receptive to her input. T. Davis will present until 3:55 and then answer questions.

Trustees visit update – D. Boschini said that depending on the timing of the session, not all of the EC may be able to attend. Department chairs may be invited. If so, perhaps there will be a prep meeting for chairs to share Trustee meeting protocol and assign topics. The meeting date, December 12, is the first day of finals.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   October 30, 2018 Minutes (approved electrically November 14, 2018)
   November 13, 2018 Minutes deferred for electronic approval.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Add Honorary Doctorate Degree process   E. Correa moved to approve the amended agenda. A. Hegde seconded. Approved as amended

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. Administrator Reviews (deferred)
      i. Committee composition
      ii. Conflict of interest - prevention
      iii. Procedures: chair, process, consistency
   d. Searches (deferred)
      i. Associate Dean of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies – results of call for committee
      ii. Director of Academic Operations - results of call for committee
      iii. Interim AVP Enrollment Management
      iv. GE Faculty Director
   e. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC (deferred)
   f. 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
g. Election to fill recent vacancy (deferred)
i. Academic Senate A & H
h. Committee Structure – 40 committees - (committee proliferation) (deferred)
i. Staff member selection process to various service opportunities (deferred)
j. Hiring Procedures (deferred)
k. Time Block Schedule update V. Harper wrote in email for EC distribution: “The Block Scheduling pilot is currently in Year 2 of a planned 3 year assessment. In Year 1 of the pilot, 240 students were enrolled in Block Scheduling. Those students showed an increase in their respective GPAs and Earned Units. We believe that the “effect” seen in Block Scheduling is due to learning community nature of pilot (students took the same courses with other students in the same major). In Year 2 of the pilot, 638 students were enrolled in the Block. We are looking forward to evaluating the performance of the Year 2 students. At the most recent DCLC meeting, the Provost led a discussion regarding Block Scheduling. My opinion is that there was openness to expansion of the pilot.” He is going to talk to the GI Task Force. Discussion ensued. If we put all in block schedule, then it becomes CSUB problem and not student’s ability and responsibility. There is concern about whether the administrative process is capable to have all put on block-schedule. Advisors have said that it was a lot of work to handle those in the block schedule. The advising resources are already so stressed, and if we put more stress on the block schedule system they won’t be able to keep up with the demand. From a faculty perspective, given the resources, any students who don’t want to be in the block are disadvantaged. One suggestion was to do a lottery system for the block, and therefore go with a smaller percentage to see how the resources play out. There could be a dramatic increase as more departments and more students are added. There will be a point where the system has reached capacity. There would be a proportion of disadvantaged students. Part of the problem of excluding some students is that it throws the planning of course majors off. There was a suggestion to include the entire major or not. From a faculty-advisor point-of-view, the problem is in between semesters when we admit students. Perhaps stop admitting students at a certain point. When orientation occurs when they come in July, every class is either blocked or not available. At some point, we’re going to be doing this 100% anyway. Why not include all students now as part of the pilot, so we know what the resource costs are. It should be part of the feasibility study: The cost/benefits analysis. From a tech POV, examine how much of the workload is being done by hand. Part of the feasibility is looking at the tools that can automate the block scheduling process. What does PeopleSoft do and what can be done manually and what can be scripted. How much can be automated
into PeopleSoft is part of the problem. We need to use tech for analysis. J. Zorn responded that to the degree to which technology can be used to make it more systemic and looking at orientation and knowing who the students are sooner—those are the administrative pieces—to make it easier to include all students. Block-scheduling for all freshmen is not ready for fall 2019.

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. University Council – New committee position Library Representative requested by the President. (see previous hand out) (deferred)
   b. Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation – Referral Review (see previous handout) (deferred)
   c. Honorary Doctorate recommendation from the Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee
      i. Review of the candidate – The EC is in support of the work of the committee. The EC endorsed the recommendation and informed the President’s office.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 29, 2018** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   **Announcements**
   President Zelezny presents a brief report. **(Time Certain: 10:05-10:20)**
   **Consent Agenda**
   **New Business**
   RES 181906 Academic Master Plan 2019-2020 through 2029-2030
   **Old Business**
   RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy **Second Reading** It was suggested that instead of using an academic process to drop, the less controversial way to address it is non-attendance the first day. If on wait list, attendance every day of class. A friendly amendment may go to the floor.
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* **Second Reading** Discussion: The President approved RES 181904 with the provision that selection of the Ombudsperson would be in consultation with the Academic Senate, the appointment ….made by the Provost. J. Millar said one of the reasons she had a good run as the Ombudsperson was because she was unattached. She reported to the President. The position should be autonomous and confidential.

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   D. Boschini closed the meeting, saying we are excited about the six new faculty hires.

* Changes to the University Handbook