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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • Enrollment Management Registration Date Change – V. Harper shared the memo from the Advising Leadership Team to D. Cantrell recommending a change in the registration for continuing students start date (for Summer 2020 and Fall 2020) from April 20, 2020 to May 4, 2020.
   • The Strategic Plan Forum is April 9, 08:30 – 10:00 a.m. via Zoom.
   • Meeting Schedule for the remainder of the year is based on the sub-committee chairs. There may be an extra Senate meeting on April 30 to have full deliberation on RTP. M. Rees moved to change April 30 from a sub-committee meeting to a full Senate Meeting. D. Boschini said that the last subcommittee meetings will be April 9. M. Danforth suggested to have an EC meeting on Tues April 28. All approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   The majority approved the March 30, 2020 Minutes. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) The Masters in Accounting proposal is missing documents and it has been returned to the proposer. M. Danforth will work with the proposer to improve the proposal to be resubmitted for Fall 2020.
- Referral 10—Ethnic Studies as a GE Requirement – Response to the Task Force Report - No change. It’s a standing referral. There hasn’t been any action on the state level following the feedback given to ASCSU.
- Referral 14 New Course Forms and Process - No change - There is an important discussion to be had about an online curriculum submission system.
- Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement
- Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal – returned to proposers with comments on what needs to be improved. Do the courses have a home and would the Curriculum Committees approve before it comes back to AAC. AS Log Aug 2020.
- Referral 19 Winter Term Courses and Units Policy – preparing resolution April 9
- Referral 22 Criteria for Dean’s List and Graduation with Honors – No change. Discussion has not yet started, and the topic will probably be tabled.

ii. AS&SS (D. Wilson)
- Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain – No change.

iii. FAC (M. Rees)
- Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change – table until 2020-2021
- Referral 23 – RTP Levels of Review – the plan is to have a resolution to present to the Senate at the April 23 meeting.

iv. BPC (B. Street) – no news

b. Interim Provost Update
i. Mentorship Programs - BPA Academic Certification Program and RAMP (deferred)

c. Searches - Update
i. AVP Faculty Affairs – The search committee has been formed. Yet the search is frozen until Fall.
ii. AVP Academic Programs – No update.
iii. Dean Antelope Valley – The call for internal candidates for the Interim Dean position is open. An Interim Dean AV to be selected by the end of the semester.
iv. Dean SS&E – It is moving forward and closes in days. Interviews in May.
v. Associate Dean SS&E – The call will go out after the permanent Dean is selected.
vi. Dean Library – the search is tabled until Fall, 2020. Dean Asher will sit in as FERP. Thank you to Dean Asher for the cost-savings he is providing.
vii. Provost Search update (V. Harper was away during this portion of the meeting.) - J. Tarjan updated the EC on the Search committee activities.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – the April 9, 2020 Strategic Planning Forum time was changed to 08:30 am – 10:00 a.m.

e. Handbook Error Log – no update
6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a. **RTP Guidelines for Spring 2020** - D. Boschini said that she and V. Harper are discussing an urgent RTP topic that normally would be referred to FAC. It applies to the changing conditions faculty are working through due to the emergency order to stay-at-home and the required shift to the alternate delivery of instruction. There is a proposal regarding optional inclusion of SOCIs in RTP, an optional classroom observation, and to have the tenure clock extended for a year. The CO would not weigh in. It’s up to the campus to handle. D. Boschini has been meeting with V. Harper, D. Gove and others who are preparing information to be sent out. J. Tarjan recommended that the EC put a resolution forward. He doesn’t see any controversy. The Chancellor and the Union have already come out saying that every faculty member should have access to feedback and the option of putting SOCIs in their RTP files. Schedule another DCLC Zoom meeting. M. Rees said the second-year files are due August 28 which makes for a really tight deadline. D. Boschini forwarded a memorandum from V. Harper, **RTP adjustment**. It captures the recommendations of the group of leaders who have been discussing RTP under the COVID-19 alternate delivery of instruction situation. D. Boschini said the details were exhausted over five meetings. Examples: 1) Lectures with a three-year contract, etc. 2) A tenure track person who had a couple good years and then gets a bad electronic SOCI that goes directly to the chairs. As part of one’s review, one is supposed to go to the WPAF to view the contents. Unless we also make sure that those SOCIs aren’t in the PAF, they’re readily available to the chairs and any members of the PAF committee. M. Rees asked if SOCIs don’t get into the WPAF and the PAF, do they still pass in front of the Deans’ and Chairs’ eyes? D. Boschini replied that it was brought up in the context of a Title IX complaint. What if there was a comment that was deeply concerning to the university from an ethical standpoint, there should be a process whereby someone sees it. J. Tarjan inserted that anonymous complaints cannot be the basis of this action. He sees some of the issues as ways of slowing down the process, even though they seem legitimate to the persons raising them. D. Boschini said as the Nursing chair, she has the opportunity to see complaints. For example, faculty falling asleep in conference. If she doesn’t see that layer of information, she misses the opportunity to manage her department effectively. J. Tarjan said that students do not hesitate to contact the chair or Dean about a faculty member. They don’t wait for the SOCIs. M. Danforth cautioned to keep in mind that some students sometimes forget what class the SOCIs are for. She has received SOCIs for her department with comments about professors in another department or another school. As the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science chair, she treats SOCIs
suspiciously. As far as the PAF in the Dean’s office, they generally don’t get looked at until the time of review. If faculty doesn’t want the SOCI in the PAF, the staff member could remove it from the file if a faculty member so opts. A. Hegde agreed with J. Tarjan that there are situations that might come up. However, we make policy for broad situations. A faculty member could notify ITS (S. Miller) not to send the SOCI to the Dean or Chair until the faculty member says to. M. Danforth said that students have better options for complaints through a meeting with ASI, contacting the department chair, and anonymously contacting the Ombudsperson to act as a mediator. Students don’t have to rely on SOCIs. M. Rees will take it up at FAC. The memo, *RTP adjustment*, was made with consultation with the AS Chair, AVP FA, D. Gove, I. Kasselstrand, T. Salisbury, B. Frakes, and E. Jackson. The EC referred RTP Guidelines to FAC. D. Boschini suggested that FAC see what’s in the memo and recognize that union leaders have already vetted. FAC members D. Gove and B. Hartsell have been part of the discussions. Look whether there are new edits or suggestions. Use *AS-3418-20/FA*. All the campuses are passing similar policy. D. Boschini said to put placeholder for resolution RTP Guidelines for 2020 (working title) on the Senate Agenda for April 30.

b. Hiring Freeze resolution – A. Hegde referred to J. Tarjan’s edits to the draft resolution that was shared electronically with the EC and M. Danforth’s suggestion for a final paragraph. A. Hegde’s concern is to make sure we don’t isolate such that the university doesn’t make emergency hires. The issue is the proportion of tenure-track hires relative to other hires. For every new MPP expansion hire, there needs to be the same expansion in tenure-track hires. If the budget is cut, the hiring freeze does not apply to replacement of tenure and tenure-track positions. J. Tarjan said this issue illustrates why the Academic Senate (AS) Chair should sit on the Cabinet. It would signal clearly that making new positions year after year cannot be made at the expense of faculty hiring. In the short run, things can be justified. However, in the long run, like a hospital, if there are fewer nurses and doctors – eventually there will be more clean floors and less people to care for patients. Have the administration provide a justification of MPP expansion. Last year, each Cabinet member received one or two new hires. That seems to be the norm. Each year, VPs get one or two new hires. M. Danforth said that the rationale needs to capture what we experience after the 2008 economic downturn: Faculty lines didn’t recover at the same rate as staff and MPP lines. As we move through this economic downturn, recovery of tenure density needs to go back before 2008 since we haven’t recovered from that damage. If we have further damage, it will jeopardize our ability to function as an institution. The resolution is more of a hiring philosophy than about the hiring freeze. As we recover from this downturn, faculty needs to recover at the
same rate as other areas of campus. B. Street suggested it go beyond equal recovery. Expansion of MPP and staff were double that of faculty since 2008, especially of tenure lines. He agreed with M. Danforth that the priority is aligning the philosophy and tenure density. Tenure density and Tenure Track expansion are the priority, especially during this downturn. It’s the most important thing we can do on the Senate. J. Millar requested to attach Counselors and Librarians as priority hires. A. Hegde said that the current rationale refers to prior resolutions. RES 171809 was before President Zelezny arrived. RES 181913 attached dollar amounts to hiring. Nothing has changed since passing those resolutions. What is the purpose of the new resolution? So far, the Resolve and Rationale are presented as suggestions. We’ve done the research and agree on the data. Faculty cannot reflect ten years from now that we couldn’t change the trend. M. Danforth said that even if it’s a practice of screaming into the void, it’s important to remind the administration that we are a teaching institution and in order to teach we need to have sufficient faculty numbers. The post 2008 recovery was catastrophic. For example, Computer and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science has been a department targeted to grow. Yet on the Computer Science side, she has fewer than 50% tenure density. The Engineering side is close to 80% tenure density. As a whole, it may look like the department has okay tenure density, but she’s always scrambling to cover upper division Computer Science classes. If she’s struggling within a department that was targeted to grow, it’s very possible that departments that weren’t allowed to grow are struggling. We need to be that voice that reminds the university to focus on faculty tenure-density, counselors, and librarians. Without these people, the university doesn’t function. Even though we can’t control what the administration does, we should still put the faculty voice out there. D. Boschini agreed with M. Danforth. It’s important for the record that this has been our public position for years. A. Hegde said that the rationale should be stronger than “recommend”. To have “discussion” could mean being told what the administration decided to do. Maybe it’s time to change to more actionable language into the resolution. J. Tarjan hopes that since we have heard from leadership about how collaborative everyone has been, we can go forward with trust that when President Zelezny comes to EC she’ll know that the EC expects to learn why new MPP positions are necessary. He prefers to have the AS Chair sit on Cabinet to be involved in discussions on resource allocation. Given the current administration, here is a chance to be truly collaborative. He prefers to go with trusting the President and Provost to work with faculty. D. Boschini asked if EC needs to formally recommend that the AS Chair sit on the Cabinet. Having the AS Chair as a member of the Cabinet solves some things. However, it may signal that the AS Chair approves of Cabinet’s
decisions. A. Hegde said it points to shared governance; it’s consultation from the person who represents faculty. V. Harper commented on the process the President and he undertook regarding the current state of the Hiring Chill and what we can expect in weeks and months ahead. The President is very engaged in this topic. He advocated to move forward on all faculty positions outstanding. We were successful in preserving all current faculty positions. Other campuses have cancelled and/or rescinded hiring. He complimented President Zelezny for her consideration and leadership. V. Harper shared the decision with the Deans. CSUB has leadership who values faculty and avoids doing damage. The President supports preserving the Computer Science and Engineering programs. The campus has two individuals committed to a strong, healthy faculty, for the long-term. D. Boschini sees that other campuses are canceling searches and rescinding offers. It’s good to be realistic when things are bad and when things are better than they could be. J. Tarjan proposes a faculty liaison (doesn’t have to be on Cabinet) to enable administrators’ ability to hear the faculty perspective and the opportunity for the faculty liaison to report back to the General Faculty on what the Cabinet is doing to support our student success. One of the best things that the Senate did was to have the Provost & AVP FA on the EC. D. Boschini asked if there should be a memo that the Senate Chair be liaison on the Cabinet. The President has been open to keeping the searches and we don’t want to antagonize when things are going better at CSUB than on other campuses. Do we leave the resolution as is, or toughen it up? Or does the EC want to write a memo on the side to the President with recommendations? M. Danforth suggested keeping the resolution as a general philosophy. Don’t be accusatory to any position nor be antagonistic. It’s important to recognize that faculty lines have not recovered from the loss since the last economic downturn like other positions have. We simply don’t want a repeat. The memo and discussions between the AS leadership and the President can occur on the side. Have the public facing discussions demonstrate that faculty are concerned but moving forward in the spirit of shared governance. The resolution is in response to the current economic downturn and the resolve should recommend that the hiring freeze be limited to this current economic downturn. A. Hegde will send a copy of the resolution to M. Danforth and she will add her statement. It will go to the Senate April 23rd. J. Tarjan will prepare a memo for D. Boschini and A. Hegde to deliver to President Zelezny at the end of the semester during their one-on-one meeting.

c. Procedures for Petition Requesting Review - The Senate passed RES 192011 Learning Management Recommendation on April 2, 2020. During the review period, the Senate received a notice of intent to seek review. That process is three steps: a) the
faculty member needs to notify the Senate no more than five days after the AS Action Report has been distributed that they are requesting that the decision be reconsidered. b) The petition process by which the faculty member gets a petition with signatures from 15% or more of the General Faculty. c) Then, the Senate would have to reconsider the issue. Per Handbook Appendix C, Article 2, section 4, today’s EC action is Item b. D. Boschini proposed that if a person wanted to establish a petition, they could get a faculty csu.edu email list using the Campus Directory. An email from a faculty member with “support of petition” in the subject line is a sufficient signature. Send all emails to the AS ASC, who will verify the signature is from the faculty member. The General Faculty is defined as FT faculty and PT faculty with 15 or more WTUs for three consecutive years. There are 395 General Faculty members. The petition needs 60 signatures to result in a conduct of referendum in which the General Faculty by a vote of the majority of those voting may return the action to the AS for reconsideration. A vote on the referendum would be set-up on VotingPlace.net whereby anyone who is voting eligible would have the opportunity to say “Yes, return to the Senate” or “No, let the existing Senate decision stay”. There would have to be a majority vote. If we end up with a referendum it could arrive at the last Senate meeting. A. Hegde affirmed that the process be respected. The petition has to return within 10 calendar days which would the Sunday before Spring Break. If we have a referendum, we have to be aware of the timeline. The current conditions we are experiencing are temporary. The petition needs to explicitly state whether the reason addresses something temporary or permanent. The Senate unanimously voted for RES 192011. D. Boschini said that returning the petition within 10 days would be Sunday April 12. Spring Break begins Monday April 13. The process has to be 100% by the book. But we can’t do a referendum during Spring Break. We return on April 20. If we held voting April 20-22nd the results would be available Senate April 23. Do we extend the 10 day period because of Spring Break? Extending to 18 days is overly generous. A. Hegde said it would be helpful to respond to the petitioner listing the constraints. He suggested the Friday of Spring Break, April 17 to gather signatures, to show that we’re doing the best under the circumstances. M. Danforth noted that the EC is in favor of conforming to the Handbook. April 12 midnight is before Spring Break. B. Bywaters will need time to process the information. D. Boschini said 10 days from today is Friday April 17. A. Hegde said that the Handbook says the there is some leeway. Explain the fairness of extending the petition a few days into Spring Break to the petitioner. The final recommendation is 10 days from today, April 17. M. Rees agreed with starting the clock today. D. Boschini will inform the petitioner that the 10 day period to collect signatures starts today, April 7, 2020.
d. Summer Session (deferred)
e. EO 1110 (handout) (deferred)
f. GE Director Replacement (deferred)
g. CSU Undergraduate Admissions (handout) (deferred)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING APRIL 23, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
     - RES 192017 Hiring Freeze for Expansion MPP and Staff Hires
     - RES RTP Levels of Review FAC
     - RES RTP Guidelines for 2020 FAC
     - RES Winter Term Courses and Units Policy AAC
   - Old Business
     - RES 192013 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report
     - RES 192015 Faculty Workload
     - RES 192016 Academic Calendar – Spring Semester Break

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   J. Tarjan suggested the DCLC reinstate the Chair of Chairs position. D. Boschini recommended that it be an annual appointment.
   J. Tarjan thanked D. Boschini, the sub-committee chairs, and B. Bywaters for moving things quite well under the circumstances. D. Boschini replied it helps to have good colleagues to work with.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   D. Boschini adjourned the meeting at 11:50.