ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, January 29, 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

Visitor: L. Zelezny

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • President Zelezny attending today from 10:30 – 11:25, and the April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30.
   • President Zelezny Senate attending February 21 and April 4th 10:05 – 10:30 where she has been invited to provide her report.
   • Andrew Maiorano, General Counsel, will be attending the Senate meeting on February 21.
   • Trustee visits: Larry Norton visits on February 27 and Trustee Romey Sabalias visits on April 23, 2019

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   December 4, 2018 minutes unanimously approved by email.
   January 22, 2019 Minutes B. Street moved to approve the minutes via email.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   E. Correa motioned to approve. Br. Street seconded. Agenda approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) no news
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa) no news
      iii. BPC (B. Street) The committee will look at Academic Calendar distribution.
      iv. FAC (M. Rush) The committee will address membership addition to the University Council. The Call for Faculty Awards scheduled for next week.
   b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation. - B. Street spoke with T. Davis who said he’d work with the President to schedule a February Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) meeting and then a University Strategic Plan (USP) meeting shortly thereafter. This next BPC meeting will cover staying on track with the Budget
and Strategy calendar for faculty participation and to give campus a status update. Questica is scheduled to roll-out in summer. D. Boschini suggested a table that lists budget activities, dates due, and a column indicating by check or not checked on whether the approved calendar activity has been met. If there’s good excuse, list the reason(s). A. Hegde directed his comments to the Interim Provost. We’re not unreasonable people. Faculty has taken pay cuts, and an increased workload. So, this is why we need an explanation on why only six new faculty hires. We cannot have a meaningful dialogue unless we get the data. For example, the data from the CO on the tenure-density and other data is interpreted differently by faculty leaders and the President. B. Street saw that the Chancellor’s Office (CO) data shows less MPPs than what CSUB shows as the number of MPPs. J. Tarjan said that this campus perceives that we didn’t get our share and there is a lack of shared governance in the way the President announced six new faculty hires instead of eleven new faculty hires.

c. Spring 2019 General Faculty Meeting - Feb 11, Stockdale 11:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Topics:
   i. Interim Provost to address Faculty and Q&A
      1. Faculty and Administration Hiring update
      2. GI 2025 Preliminary Progress Update data

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a. Provost J. Zorn Review – When she left, her review was underway. The question was posed to the EC whether it wanted to complete or discontinue a process that was halfway. A. Hegde said there’s precedence whereby reviews were not completed when people left. The EC reached consensus to discontinue the review.

   b. Sustainability position – D. Boschini had talked to V. Harper and President Zelezny and there are many questions. For example, D. Boschini cannot locate a contingent calling for this position other than a small group. Given only six new positions, how does this fit within our priorities? At the Chairs meeting, we heard that there are programs that have grown dramatically and we’re still trying to get the classes covered. There are many programs that can’t be staffed to meet GE needs of students trying to get to graduation. What department will host the sustainability position? Is this the right position at the right time? A. Hegde provided some background. We do have a Sustainability Officer. The position used to be in former President Mitchell’s office, then it was moved to Facilities and the VP of Facilities was let go after just a few months. The Director of Sustainability is temporarily reporting to the campus Chief of Police. E. Correa said that some people in the school of Social Studies and Education (SS&E) think that they must vie for the position. D. Boschini can see a potential problem where there are different departments vying for it and what if A. Hegde applied for that the sustainability position? Could he have two assignments – the sustainability position and his current position? How would an existing faculty member taking the job affect the new hire position? A. Hegde provided more of the back story. He attended a recent “coffee with the President” meeting. When asked, what are you most proud of, he responded that as an educational institutional-what we did for sustainability – to
develop programs and awareness. Then, the President suggested a tenure track (TT) hire. A. Hegde said rather we need staff to collaborate with others and not TT because it’s an inter-disciplinary issue. Note: At this point, the President joined this EC meeting. D. Boschini shared that the EC had been discussing the rapid growth in certain departments that are struggling, and given our strategic plan, how did the new TT for sustainability become a priority and how would it come forward? Is it still on the table for discussion? The President attributed the idea to A. Hegde, J. Zorn and others. The President said she is listening and interested in A. Hegde’s position. He said the university can teach the community about sustainability, especially since we are educating those who go into the oil and agriculture industries. CSUB is leading by example with projects. The Sustainability Officer, J. Sanchez, has done good work applying for grants and other things. The President said that J. Sanchez needs a faculty champion. A. Hegde shared EC’s concern with the President about where the position would sit, since it is interdisciplinary. The President gave it to EC to discuss and decide. She has heard from others that sustainability needs to be a priority, including a resolution passed by ASI. J. Tarjan said the campus believe it’s important. What is the best way to get there? Maybe if we had a group of folks designated to suggest the path. Is someone with a PhD in sustainability the best person or perhaps someone on campus could be reassigned. V. Harper is willing to serve on that group. A. Hegde suggested having the conversation with V. Harper and get faculty from different schools to create a job description. The President prefers it to be a faculty line because of the stated priorities. J. Tarjan suggested a call to the chairs to get a person from each school, the ASI President, J. Sanchez. D. Boschini perceives, based on interest throughout the campus, that there isn’t that much interest in getting people together to talk about what a faculty line would look like. Rather, she’s hearing that it could be assigned time to a faculty member who has time set aside instead a new line. They like the work to be assigned to a faculty member in a department. V. Harper will meet the group and have a couple weeks of conversation and come back with a recommendation. It’s the Provost’s decision.

**c. Graduation Initiative 2025 and the Strategic Plan**—President Zelezny said that the GI 2025 frames the discussion about the strategic plan. She thanked the Interim Provost for jumping on board to address the topic, plus the time D. Boschini spent off-contract with her, and J. Tarjan for being a thought partner. There are glaring red spots. After reflection, she said it’s about students and their success. The President has been organizing the data received from community forums, walk-and-talk conversations, feedback page, etc. She is a member of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and reached out to member Sal Rinella to discuss the strategic plan process.

i. Show visually that the top issue is Student Readiness and Student Welcoming.

ii. The plan to address GI 2025 is on a rigorous timeline. The top issue will be addressed in our strategic plan.
iii. See Work Plan Draft January 26, 2019 timeline. (handout) The Cabinet looked back at the last strategic plan and the current Vision, Values, Mission. The Cabinet’s recommendation is to refresh the wording for the Vision.

iv. A sub-committee will be formed to take the foundational folks from USP, embed them into each of the work groups, and get other recommendations from faculty, staff and students. It’s still a draft plan.

v. The President will designate a logistics/coordinator for all the committees. The President shared her thinking, the candidates’ names, and asked for feedback. J. Tarjan suggested that the charge be to 1) organize and facilitate keeping the discussions on track, and 2) to help the campus feel that they are engaged, and everyone speaks.

vi. USP and BAC – President is open if there are other useful leaders to add to the committee. The members will be assigned to working groups. The committee aims for three to five goals. A. Hegde suggested that the sustainability person be on the USP sub-committee. A. Hegde said the Sustainability Director met frequently as it applied to grants, etc.

vii. President said it is vitally important to launch the feasibility study in May, and then have a soft period of a year before the 50-year Celebration.

d. Graduation Initiative 2025 – The President said to expect to see changes in student support services, advising, and other support services to get students to the finish line. Looking at the goals of the GI, the umbrella will be the Strategic Plan. She has been working with V. Harper on Advising and EM processes that need urgent attention. There needs to be a consultant to look at processes in Academic Affairs. The advising process related to the freshman 4-yr and 6-yr graduation rate (handout) will be looked at. We are looking at financial aid and the philosophy of financial aid to freshman so that they could be fully covered so we retain students. She’d like to have a year-long conversation about best practices for freshman. CSUB is a Regional Comprehensive that serves metro area. The Interim Provost is looking at best practices of Regional Comprehensive Universities for retention of freshmen. There is a conversation about a mandatory residential consideration for those students who come in from a certain distance (driving in fog, etc.) and whether it’s something we would consider. Transfer students are doing well, and it is where we need to double down and reduce barriers with Bakersfield College. We do need to be innovative. How do we jointly enroll students? It may not come forward due to politics. J. Tarjan informed the group that there used to be Senate money for departmental meetings. The President appreciates EC thinking about the GI. The concern is that CSUB has moved so far away from where they need to be. She gave V. Harper credit for working on figuring out how we can make immediate impact. She went to the Associate Deans and advisors meeting and had a conversation that we have to do better. (V. Harper’s handout) The President has a dream to have students assigned to an advisor, evaluator, and Associate Dean working together to get students to graduation. There is a block of students to get the dream
started. V. Harper referenced when he and D. Boschini met with Trustees about the work of the last two years and the progress we’ve made on the GI 2025. For example, Block scheduling, as interim activities. This effort is to shift to immediate activities to clear pathways for students who entered the university four years ago, to put them in a position to graduate this year. V. Harper found that “if I had this” I could graduate. For example, if I had an independent study, I could graduate this year. What the team did was pair students who entered in fall 2015 with an advisor from their school and with an evaluator from EM. It’s a pilot study with the intent to scale. Unlike previous efforts, this is to look at a very specific student and to call each and say ‘what do you need?’ A scorecard has been created to keep us accountable. The colored portion of the handout represent the four schools. Note “Expected” and “Potential”. “Potential” refers to students that we know that have the requisite number of units, they haven’t been disqualified, they are prepared to graduate, have a grad check, and received a response. The “Expected” is after the student has been contacted and had the discussion “you can grad if you’re ready”. This individual conversation is known as intrusive advising.

Looking at A&H, row 5, students in Group 1 have received their grad check and are ready to go. Overall, there are 30 students who entered in Fall 2015 “Expected” to graduate out of 45 “Potential”. The team is still working on the remaining 15. After two weeks, we’ll go back and talk to them, how did you do after that first test? How did you do on the mid-term? Do you still see yourself as graduating in May? Then, the scorecard gets updated on a bi-weekly basis. We have an “Expected” total of 375. If all the “Expected” students graduate, that would give CSUB a four-year graduation rate of 26%. To go from 14.6 to 26% would put us on the front page of the Chronicle! That’s our future goal. We need 450 students who are cohorts ready to graduate get to the 2025 goals. President said while 26% rate is an improvement, it is not acceptable. V. Harper gave President Mitchell 45% six-year rate as an achievable goal – which is 15% above GI 2025 goal. San Diego State is 46.6%, Cal Poly is 52%, and Chico State is 30%. B. Street says that 26% is a reasonable near-term goal, and in the meantime, there needs to be a culture-shift; the students are the priority and not just a liability on one’s day. The President and V. Harper thanked B. Street for his support. J. Tarjan requested a differentiation between capacity and emergency measures. He said he’s inundated with requests for independent studies in response to course caps and students who need a unit or two to graduate. These petitions are the acute solution. He believes that 1) one of the reasons CSUB’s numbers went down is because of the quarter to semester conversion. We did extraordinary things to make sure students who were in quarters graduated under quarters. Now, it looks bad because we are regressing into the mean. It was good before, when the capacity was greater. We need to look at increasing capacity. There have been many initiatives, such as increasing enrollment. However, this time we need a systemic change. Pairing students with advisors and evaluators is a good idea. The grad check has been a fiasco. 2) First Year Seminar (FYS) is an awkward two-semester program. There has been talk about combining the two semesters into one if we could figure out a way to give faculty 3 WTUs with the expectation that they
would do some extra mentoring. Consider identifying those students who would benefit from that. There could be sections of students where faculty would be expected to do things to make the freshman students who may be at risk feel more comfortable or directing them to the resources to help with other issues they’re having. V. Harper is supportive of the stretch format for FYS. What is being done now are intermediate activities and addressing capacity. J. Tarjan replied, give us enough faculty and we’ll graduate the students. V. Harper went back to the scorecard and the drive to get to 17% graduation rate. The focus is on the Spring 2020 graduation. Then, next year there will be a group of students with four semesters on the pathway to graduation that we expect to take us to 19%. M. Danforth stated that there is a need to capture students who are not freshmen. She discussed with Dr. Zorn and NSME Dean the need to address the gap when students are OK and when they have problems. Students come by who failed a term and since their GPA didn’t drop, it didn’t signal probation. They may have struggled due to a medical issue and didn’t know that they could take a medical withdrawal. If there could be some intrusive advising for those students whose GPAs are too low this may help. Perhaps allocating resources to contact students who do poorly for a term, (due to extenuating circumstances) would help with six-year graduation rates. V. Harper will look how advisors collaborate with each other and with faculty on how students are doing in the semester, such as how they did on that first test. We have to prevent students from getting on probation. M. Danforth said that there were no progress reports done in Fall ’18. She suggested the ability for faculty to input on the fly because it’s a workload issue. A. Hegde suggested to use software like Constant Contact and recruit faculty who would check on students and could work with advisors to put in a substitution request, for example. It’s difficult to get a one-on-one with faculty and students. He suggests faculty to volunteer. It doesn’t have to be a faculty member from that student’s department to say this is what we see, what is going on, what do you need? Further, there could be an email to faculty to say these are the students who need help. If people could talk to each other. V. Harper wants to scale what was done for the three students that A. Hegde helped. Case management is going to be fixed, and faculty will get more info on students and the graduation rate. The advisors appreciated this approach and look for leadership. J. Millar recalls that CSUB used to have a Mid-Quarter Intervention Program (MQIP) whereby counselors were notified of students struggling and then the counselors sent them a note to offer resources. The Counseling Department wants to be involved in the solution. V. Harper said that they pulled a list of Under-Represented Minorities (URM), specifically African American males in the interim class. T. Wallace has reached out to those students. His office is looking at how to scale to the entire organization. M. Danforth suggested to look at GE and the Junior University reflection and capstone class, and classes like that within majors and get faculty members willing to help to discuss how to graduate students. There are 10,000 students we need to get the word out to. Identify the touchpoints in GWAR and get GECCo faculty members to help with the long-term sustainable plan. For example, touchpoints the first year, touchpoints the second year,
and follow through to the capstone course. V. Harper emailed an invitation to faculty. He will be visiting each school to work with faculty and with each Dean so faculty can develop school-based solutions. There will be stipends so that faculty can develop their own school-based plan to be successful. The President said she will continue holding coffee & conversations with faculty members. D. Boschini thanked the President and V. Harper. Last week the DCLC discussed what measures would help keep students on track:

i. Adding more sections is obvious – The creative work-arounds can get in the way of having more classes for students to take when they need them.

ii. Engaging faculty is an opportunity not fully realized. If we’re not talking about changing what we do in the classroom we’ve missed the core function of what we’re all here to do. Even if we create more sections, we’re going to be doing the same thing in the classroom. For example, if the Nursing department gets a list of students who are at risk and the department has the largest staff on campus. If she didn’t know that – it would create a series of important conversations. We’re not even aware at this point.

The President stated that she wants to support any reaction to what D. Boschini described. She recognizes that the campus has problem classes where people are not passing, and it’s aggravated by ethnicity. There is the social justice issue.

D. Boschini replied that there are many who want to be part of the solution, but we need to know where the problem is coming from. We don’t want to point fingers and we don’t want to be blind. We want to know the sources of data.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING FEBRUARY 7, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
   - RES 181907 Academic Calendars
   - Old Business
   - RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

* Changes to the University Handbook
Following is the proposed steps and timelines schedule for completing the strategic plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Primary Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation</td>
<td>President and Advisor</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Revise Vision and Marginally Update Core Values and Mission if/as Needed</td>
<td>Vision Subcommittee</td>
<td>Early/Mid-February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify Goals*</td>
<td>University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (USP&amp;BAC)</td>
<td>Early/Mid-February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop Desired Outcomes</td>
<td>Goal-Based Task Forces and USP&amp;BAC</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formulate Strategies*</td>
<td>Goal-Based Task Forces and USP&amp;BAC</td>
<td>April – Early May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop Implementation Plan</td>
<td>President’s Cabinet</td>
<td>Early/Mid-Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Post/Publicize Strategic Plan</td>
<td>On-Site Coordinator; Office of Public Affairs and Communication</td>
<td>Late Summer – Early Fall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional Town Hall Meetings are generally held at these points in the process to provide updates and opportunities for campus feedback.

2.

1-16-19 Draft
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Expected To Grad</th>
<th>Potential To Grad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Grad Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSME</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP 4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to Grad</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target Grad Rate:**
- 18%
- 17%
- 26%