ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, January 22, 2019  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, V. Harper

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   D. Boschini welcomed the new Interim Provost and VP AA, V. Harper, to the Executive Committee. V. Harper addressed the group about the transition: Former Provost Zorn has been helpful and supportive toward maintaining continuity. She wishes the campus her very best. The EC, in discussion with the President, stated that they would support whatever candidate she selected. V. Harper will be addressing faculty at the Spring Faculty Meeting February 11, 2019.

   J. Tarjan reported 1) In response to the controversy surrounding EO 1110 and EO 1100(rev), the ASCSU charged the Executive Committee to meet with system administrators to work on a path forward for shared governance. The process was suboptimal but eventually resulted in the adoption of a “Tenets of Shared Governance” document that outlines some principles for shared governance going forward. 2) Two names from CSUB went forward for Faculty Trustee position. Three names will be considered by ASCSU in March for recommendation to Governor Newsom. The Governor makes the appointment after receiving at least two nominees from ASCSU. 3) There is a difference between the tenure density information J. Tarjan submitted in his Campus Report last semester and the updated tenure density information. The site link directing to the information http://www.calstate.edu/hr/facultyresources/research-analysis/documents/Tenure_Density_and_SFR_Trends_2009-18.pdf 4) The State of CSU address and the message from the CO was optimistic in the way that the institution makes a difference in society and the new Governor has approved additional funding.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Rush moved to conduct approval of December 4, 2018 Minutes by email. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   A. Hegde moved to add Blackboard issues. M. Danforth moved to add SOCI issues. The modified agenda was approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) The first meeting of the semester is January 31, 2019.
ii. AS&SS (E. Correa) The first meeting of the semester is January 31, 2019.

iii. BPC (B. Street) The first meeting of the semester is January 31, 2019.

iv. FAC (M. Rush) A proposed revision of RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy to be presented at the Senate meeting, January 24, 2019.

b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – the USPBAC meeting was cancelled just before its scheduled time of December 18. The President said that she wants to get further into the conversation before setting 2019-2020 budget priorities. The committee had been divided into two: a budget sub-group headed T. Davis, and a strategy sub-group headed by former Provost Zorn. V. Harper said that the President and Cabinet are still working on the final structure of the USPBAC. D. Boschini summarized discussion by saying that last year faculty was at the table. This year, the opportunity was cancelled. It appears that President Zelezny is sticking with her original interpretation of the memo that the $1.52 spend was discretionary whereby she could decide the number of faculty hires and make high impact practices an item. What is the balance of those resources to be used for? The $1.52 million earmarked by the CO for eleven TT hires, ended up being only six. CSUB received $1.52 million because we are so far below the rest of the campuses on tenure-density and it needs improvement. We’re still trying to have that conversation because the President didn’t agree that it was for eleven new TT hires. What is the criteria for the assigned positions? It’s needed in order to plan and develop new programs, and to go forward on commitments, etc. V. Harper will address the need for transparency on how lines are allocated, to make sure that we use the Program Review process as much it’s practical in order to provide evidence for positions to be allocated to places in need, and to make sure departments have done what they need to do to open new lines, and to open dialogue with Dr. Schecter about looking at that process. A. Hegde stated that we had the same issue with the Budget Forum. The same language is used; We don’t know what the strategic plan is, and until we have a strategic plan, we’re not going to be doing anything. We keep pushing to have something concrete to present to campus. Every meeting with President Mitchell, he said the feasibility study would occur over fall and spring 2018. Every meeting the EC had with President Mitchell, including the one in March 2018, he was asked if the feasibility study was really something that he was going to do. His respond was, we’re going to do it over the fall. The feasibility study is like a can that keeps getting pushed down the road and we can’t do a strategic plan until the is feasibility study is done. When the USPBAC meeting gets cancelled, it’s not a good sign. As faculty, we could say we’ll give you the benefit of the doubt. But there is a limit as to how many times the faculty can be put off. Twice we’ve reiterated why we need $2M. When we get $1.52 million and the Senate asked President Zelezny why only six TT hires, the answer was that some of the fund was for high impact practices. That’s not what the fund stated its use for, nor was it agreed upon. If the priority has changed, we need to know. If we’re going to have strategic plan, we need to meet. The funds from the CO states clearly that $1.52 is for eleven TT faculty hires. V. Harper agreed that we need to meet quickly to establish priorities for FY 2019-2020. D. Boschini met with the
President whereby she shared recent data from CO based on info we sent to CO. K. Krishnan’s tenure density number from October is 51.9%. The January tenure-density number from the CO is 53.5%. The number for tenure-density has increased substantially for the same amount of time. D. Boschini asked the President how that number changed from November to January when there weren’t any new hires. How can we have the conversation on tenure-density when the numbers from IRPA are different from the CO? V. Harper reviewed the number of graduates with K. Krishnan. Subsequent to the actual graduation dates, students may get a substitution, student may change their graduation date, etc. D. Boschini said its problematic that the tenure-density number increased, the timing whereby only six new hires, and the meeting to discuss the differences was cancelled. We can’t have a conversation when the information keeps shifting and the decisions are being made to make it more favorable for the administration. J. Millar reiterated that the Counselors are faculty and the BOT Chair supports mental health issues and the more TT counselors we have the more consistent the responses are for students.

c. Searches- V Harper updated the EC:

i. AVP Enrollment Management (EM) – The search will launch this semester. He has been working with K. Knudsen. She has performed a forensic analysis of this institution’s enrollment management in terms of student services and fiscal structure. Under her leadership, K. Knudsen has provided a great measure of service to this institution and has instilled a level of trust in EM. The Cabinet is looking at consultants for Academic Affairs. V. Harper commented that the people in EM work exceeding hard and he agrees that EM needs to be more student centered. D. Boschini was pleased to hear K. Knudsen say that one can be hard-working and still have a need to improve dramatically. The student point of view would be addressed, and faculty input will be considered. A. Hegde noted an improvement in EM’s website toward directing students to information on graduation on the academic calendar. V. Harper wants to reduce the cycle time between graduation evaluation and get their grad checks before registration of the student’s final semester. M. Danforth shared that from the intake side, there’s been slow processing of transfer credit reports. She ran a pre-requisite enforcement report and found an RD grade from Spring 2018. The transcript scan had been sitting there for months. It’s the final grade but it’s still not in myCSUB. D. Boschini and K. Knudsen agreed that when there is a situation, get student name, ID number, and bring it to K. Knudsen because she wants to see the pattern. M. Danforth suggested inviting K. Knudsen to the DCLC so she gets the information from the chairs. D. Boschini said if she wants to know how grad check is going, ask the right people; ask the chairs and faculty.

ii. GE Faculty Director – L. Paris is on a one-year interim position. It’s a full-time assignment. If there is reassigned time, department chairs need to be told ASAP. The call went out this morning. The announcement should include that
it’s also a Grant Director. It’s not clear whether it’s always going to be full time. GECCo makes a recommendation. The Interim Provost makes the appointment. The EC is not involved in the interviews.

iii. Director of Academic Operations – to be to be posted in 10 days.

iv. Interim Associate VP for Academic Programs – V. Harper is doing both jobs. He intends to place an interim (internal only search) and expects that person to have significant time in that position. D. Boschini and V. Harper have talked about having a Leadership Academy for campus individuals to build skill sets for future opportunities. Place “Leadership Academy” on next EC Agenda.

v. Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies – search committee meets today to come up with job description. The job will be posted in February. By the end of March, the position is expected to be filled.

vi. Provost and VP Academic Affairs – Interim, V. Harper, has the appointment until June, 2020. The search committee needs to be created in the spring.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Spring 2019 General Faculty Meeting - Feb 11, Stockdale 11:30-1pm. Topics:
   i. Interim Provost to address Faculty and Q&A
      1. Faculty and Administration Search and Hiring update. No MPP positions to be created.
      2. GI 2025 Preliminary Progress Update data. Report followed by Q&A
b. Newsletter – the chairs were asked to submit content. Statewide Senators corner.
c. GE Faculty Director Appointment Process has been turned over to GECCo.
d. Faculty Trustee Nomination Process: Campus Procedures
e. President Zelezny will meet with
   i. Executive Committee - January 29 10:30-10:50; April 30 11:30 – 12:30
   ii. Academic Senate- February 21 and April 4. (Time certain 10:05 – 10:30 a.m.)
f. Financial Aid moved to BAS
g. Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (handout)
h. Article 20.37: the call for applications should go out ASAP because of the need to have subsequent reassigned time decisions made earlier in the semester. Last year, the review committee included B. Hartsell, M. Rush, and J. Millar. A. Hegde will replace B. Hartsell, and M. Rush and J. Millar agreed to serve again. M. Rush will be the contact person and in charge of the process. The amount of the award was 14 and a fraction of WTUs. It makes a lot of sense to round up to 15 WTUs so five awards of 3 WTUs can be made. V. Harper will talk to D. Schecter about how many WTUs are available. A. Hegde said it’s not up to the committee to say when the award applies.

i. Faculty Awards: The Call for nominations is scheduled to go out the third week in semester. The language of the call is a combination of the Handbook and the best efforts to make clear in advance. There were concerns about the decision. Assignment for EC is to look at the Handbook and how we can make things more clear, such as no self-nominations and departmental review of awards for next meeting.
j. IRB and IACUC appointment recommendations agreed unanimously by the EC.
   i. Dr. John Stark appointed to the IRB for Non-scientific Concerns member Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2020
   ii. Mr. Grant Herndon reappointed to the IRB for Community Member from December 31, 2018 – December 30, 2021
   iii. Mr. Larry Saslaw reappointed to the IACUC for Community Member from Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2021
   iv. Dr. Andy Troup reappointed to the IACUC for Non-scientific Concerns member from Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2021
k. Onboarding process for new faculty: there is a need for improvement in the contract signing, background check, HR processing, Peoplesoft registration, campus ID and getting new faculty into Blackboard. D. Boschini is working with D. Schecter on improving the on-boarding communication and process involving HR, faculty chairs, and Faculty Affairs.
l. Blackboard (BB) issues - In the Fall 2018, IT sent a message that in Spring 2019 they would create a shell for each course in Blackboard and bring rosters over from PeopleSoft. The Chemistry department identified issues. F. Gorham agreed to wait until Fall 2019. However, it was rolled-out December 19, 2018. There were two course shells for every section. Lab sections got duplicate shells for every section in PeopleSoft. Most faculty add content to their course shells and make only certain content available to students at a certain time. However, content was made available to students during winter break. F. Gorham’s solution was for faculty to bring over content. From the subsequent communication between faculty and IT, F. Gorham said that still allow faculty to make new courses unavailable for students, and whatever old shell faculty is working with, they could populate themselves. There is a tool kit to populate that, but that had to be fixed. F. Gorham stated the benefits of what was created: 1) student success - It allows students to look two years after their course to look at their course, 2) students’ access to BB brings their awareness to whether they are in or out of the system due to financial aid, etc. 3) If there is any grievance, faculty can check on when the student logged in, etc. No one asked IT to do that. What problem are they trying to solve? Now there is a problem that has shifted to faculty to solve. The TLC in conjunction with IT implemented idea that all courses get a shell and it’s the faculty member’s responsibility to migrate their course material into the new shell. E. Correa had teacher who taught during Winter Session. They followed the set of migration and instructions and found that the process didn’t work. Subsequently, each of them has to go to TLC to get it fixed to be course-ready to teach. Further, when one teaches an online course using BB, if they have a number of sections the program has identified those as separate classes. It would be better if it was identified as one. There will be problems as faculty discovers that they have new shells but not the content. A. Hegde raised the issue of storage space - every course, every semester, every section has been duplicated. To solve for that, F. Gorham said that faculty could create a master course. Again, faculty did not ask for this. V. Harper will talk to F. Gorham. If there was no
consultation with faculty as described, that will be addressed. D. Boschini said there were conversations in pockets, and committees that don’t meet as they should. Then there are conversations with selected people over the phone, ‘Hey what do you think about this?’ when it’s just a portion and then when things roll out there are key differences in what was rolled out and consequences that weren’t taken into account. Faculty didn’t know that shells would be created with students in shells that faculty don’t want to use. We want to have a course to use semester to semester and the students can be deleted after certain time. IT has created an additional process that is not helpful nor necessary. M. Danforth said that the TLC staffing issue will make the problem worse. Impress that ITC is not the same as talking to faculty. D. Boschini said that the DCLC is a good place for F. Gorman to roll-out ideas. In contrast, to meet with a committee with only four faculty reps and then they don’t get looped into the implementation reality – it’s not working. V. Harper sees that the issue could have been avoided with good instruction, enough lead time, and communication [and skilled support staff]. His line of communication with F. Gorham will be 1) how do we make sure that students are in the correct classes and that content has been migrated this semester, if needed, 2) going forward, to make sure that such a significant change would be vetted with DCLC and not just the ITAC. J. Tarjan suggested if IT wants to consult faculty, that they sketch out all their reports up to the appropriate channel. In this case it’s the DCLC. Just like Block Scheduling, people generally knew what was to occur. Block Scheduling is a good model. A. Hegde added that when consulting the chairs, give them enough time to assess change because they didn’t meet with faculty every week. There may be one or two individuals who have a specific case where the feedback doesn’t apply to other things. D. Boschini spoke with a faculty member who was able to successfully migrate all her content. She said she asked for and received individual instruction on how to do that. It wasn’t that hard, yet she didn’t know she had to do it. Furthermore, the time it took to get all her course materials uploaded and downloaded—it took hours and hours whereby she had to keep it running overnight. So, for whatever work she wanted to do in the moment, couldn’t be done until all this content could be brought over. This was a task that she, as a faculty member, never had to do before. It was always done by the TLC for her. E. Correa and M. Danforth had departments members who experienced the same. D. Boschini said that clearly, faculty was unaware of the magnitude of the task as they hadn’t done this before. The agreement was that this would not create additional work and then it did at the last minute before the semester ended. It still hasn’t been resolved in some cases. The work is not something faculty should be doing. Follow-up next EC meeting.

m. SOCIs - Not all have been returned and the RTP files are due next week. D. Boschini said that the dates have been set by D. Schecter in consultation with the Handbook and the contract. The way he sets the dates has been described as the contract has a certain number of days. For example, one gets a ten day rebuttal period after receiving a unit committee letter. The time one uses all those waiting periods, it backs one up to certain range dates that are actually the required range of dates. It has this other contract
language pushing those dates. Currently, she has SOCs for three in her department. That’s a fraction of the people whose files are due six days from now. Classes are now starting so people are serving students. They’re going to be getting SOC’s at the last minute. There are going to be problems with the SOCs because there always are (some missing or run inaccurately). People need to submit those files, we’ve created a work crunch, and it’s been poorly timed. The date could be moved. With the SOCI problem, we could perhaps move it back a week. It’s an urgent situation. If V. Harper could talk to D. Schecter and then let faculty know today. Then, for the future cycles, speed up the SOCI processing. Lecturers—even PT Lecturers that teach even one unit in the fall and one unit in the spring—some of them were hired on a year contract. Some of them were notified last fall that their file would be due next week. People who were added fairly recently, who were asked to teach in the spring and who originally had planned to, or they were issued one semester at a time contract, they didn’t receive notification as the others did in the fall. Thus, we are just now realizing there are people who need to submit files next week. And they’re getting told the last minute that they have to prepare these files. There has been advise at different times that, if you know you’re going to use a faculty member for both semesters, sometimes we’ve been told give them a year contract, and sometimes we’re told only give them a contract by semester. But, when we only do one semester and it’s fall, then that implies that they may or may not work in the spring. And we know they are going to, but we don’t issue them a contract, then that doesn’t trigger them being notified that they have to submit a file. They don’t know. In summary: The urgent issue is that faculty has asked that the RTP due date be changed to January 28th. All first year TT, and all FT and PT Lecturers teaching both semesters, turn in a file next week. That’s a huge group of people, and we’re just seeing the SOCs trickling in. Many will not get their SOCs in time, nor will they be able to make a reflection on the SOCI feedback. D. Boschini asked V. Harper to check with D. Schecter to see if there is any way the deadline could be Friday Feb 1, noon. Otherwise we will have first year faculty and lecturers that will have no SOCs in their file.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING JANUARY 24, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   RES 181907 Academic Calendars
   Old Business
   RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading
   That was held up by the President’s interest to read.

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
* Changes to the University Handbook

Meeting adjourned at 11:55