ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, October 20, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:32 a.m.
Videoconference

Members: A. Hegde, M. Danforth, J. Millar, M. Martinez, M. Rees, R. Gearhart, C. Lam, B. Street, D. Boschini, V. Harper
Absent: D. Boschini

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Ethnic Studies Update – A. Hegde is part of a statewide committee of Economics Chairs in the system. They started discussion. The proposed changes are to remove three units from Area D to go to form an Area F to meet Ethnic Studies (ES) requirement. The Economics departments understand that ES should be in place, sacrificing some courses and sections. These Economics chairs are working on drafting a letter to the CO opposing the removal of units from Area D. A. Hegde emailed all Area D faculty at CSUB to provide feedback to the CO. There are five CSUs Academic Senate’s that oppose timeline and unit implementation. The systemwide CFA has drafted an opposition letter. A. Hegde asked the body if anyone is in favor of the CSUB Senate opposing AB 1460 implementation. We can move ahead on implementation and still oppose. We don’t need to have an opposition. We have a plan and we’re still going to move ahead because we need to have a plan anyway, if the resolution doesn’t pass. M. Danforth very greatly dislikes the timeline, and they are using this as an opportunity to touch other parts of that EO that have nothing to do with ES or Area D. It’s administrative creep. It may not rise to the point of needing a resolution. It’s highly concerning and it’s a continuation of activities where the CO has changed things without faculty consultation as they did with EO 1110 to get rid of remediation without consulting with Math, English, etc. Perhaps a resolution to voice those concerns. B. Street is in favor of resolution against the process. In particular the force that was put toward the timeline. He is in support of ES. The timeline crunch shouldn’t be a precedent for other orders from the CO. A. Hegde asked the members to think about it. The resolutions from other campuses will be shared with the EC. The CFA submitted their points of concern over the whole implementation and process. He is in support of continuing with a plan while
opposing the process. No campus indicated that ES is a bad idea. Hopefully, the Senators are gathering feedback from their constituents. Then, perhaps we have an information session to gather feedback on the plan. There are two components that fall under contention:

1) the reduction of three units in Area D and the creation of Area F and 
2) the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The CO said they are in collaboration with the CSU Council on ES but we’ve since learned that it’s not the collaboration as they want portrayed. The CSU Council ES is wholeheartedly supported by our ES faculty.

The last piece is forming an ES Council at CSUB comprised of ES faculty only, because they are the experts. It was discussed at the ES Unit Implementation Task Force meeting. The Council could be the ES faculty and perhaps include another faculty. There’s still a lot of work to be done on that, but it’s not urgent. We have two courses in the catalog already. M. Danforth feels that it’s an absolute necessity to start with an information session. The proper way would have been to have a forum, if we had time. If the campus needs to move forward on a resolution to oppose the Chancellor’s actions, that can be one of the things we can cite that by having this accelerated timeline, we are not able to engage in effective shared governance. Nonetheless, we need a form or some way to record the information session and provide a form for feedback. It needs to be a campus effort. Not just a Senate effort. A. Hegde isolated the requirements:

1) Campus feedback using the feedback form sent by the CO. Different entities on campus can complete the form. We can submit 300 pages, if need be. Yet, the preference is to submit as a campus.

2) Upon development of a plan, present it to campus for their feedback. It’s feedback on the plan. There is enough faculty on Task Force and GECCo to provide feedback specifically about student learning outcomes.

A. Hegde will ask J. Moraga and T. Salisbury if they have any specific arguments against the SLOs proposed in the CO memo. A. Hegde will attend the ASI Board meeting to get the students’ feedback. As a campus, we’ll have more substantial feedback rather saying it’s all wrong. We should have the weekend to think about the feedback. Then make edits on Monday. The EC meets on Tuesday. M. Danforth recalled that during the meeting last week with the two Vice Chancellors, they said to submit suggestions for language. M. Danforth’s suggestion is to not touch Area C. Make it much clearer that if a campus chooses to fold US History in, that it takes the student’s choice slot, which is what they were saying, but not how it reads. There was the same confusion about the departments. They said the first list of departments came from the legislative action. However, the statement doesn’t have double quotation marks to make it clear that they came from an external entity and
then they are adding additional departments. A. Hegde said that is good wording feedback. We can incorporate all feedback, without limits. In terms of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), let us have feedback from J. Moraga and T. Salisbury as the central point, since they are the ES experts. Then, the second part in terms of Area D changes and Area C, we can have feedback from the Area D Chairs, GECCo, the Task Force, and the EC. M. Rees referred to the core competencies, developed and approved by the ES Council and approved by the ASCSU plenary on September 17. Discussion ensued on #5: “Demonstrate active engagement with anti-racist issues, practices and movements to build a diverse, just and equitable society beyond the classroom.” Active engagement with movements sounds like there is an agenda beyond education. Student engagement is not academic. In the CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised 10-8-20, page 10. (attached) J. Miller added some context from an ASCSU AA perspective. The AA received the signed approved core competencies from the Council on ES (CES). Then, the AA looked at the SLOs in AS-3397-19/AA, side by side. There weren’t any substantive differences. She requests that T. Salisbury and J. Moraga look at those documents, side by side. The form that J. Moraga sent us was approved October 2. AA already had something approved in September. The conflict isn’t necessarily with the ASCSU or the CO. There may be some conflict within the CO as to their process. If the ASCSU resolution and CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised 10-8-20 could be seen side by side, the emphasis can be where the CES needs to go. #5 was upsetting initially to the AA. Then the discussion revealed that there are many groups and events happening every day on campus that students can do that meet what #5 is looking for. We can ask students to write about or attend or ask for a service-learning class. A. Hegde thanked J. Miller for her context at the ASCSU level. He talked to T. Salisbury and J. Moraga separately to let them know that no one is trying to run roughshod on them. We are trying to do our best within the constraints imposed from the CO. He will email them separately to remind them to read the two documents side by side, line by line. J. Miller suggested that J. Moraga and T. Salisbury look for any omission(s). There appears to be enough to enable a good joining of the two documents to meet legislative requirement. The ASCSU Academic Affairs (AA) committee meets November 4. The CO is using the ASCSU resolution to inform the draft EO revised they are developing. It would be beneficial to have the two documents vetted and the feedback ready for that meeting so the EO revised can become a final document. It is not a them vs. us conversation. M. Martinez thanked J. Millar for her clarification. He also thanked A. Hegde for his generosity in working with ES faculty. The benchmark is getting the CO guidelines that conform to the law. He sees the slides from the AVC as a benchmark. The CO is running roughshod with campuses. A. Hegde summarized the action items:
1) Think about whether CSUB needs to have a resolution that addresses the implementation process or something more specific.

2) M. Danforth and M. Rees will work on feedback about draft EO revised wording.

3) A. Hegde will reach out to J. Moraga and T. Salisbury to analyze the Student Learning Outcomes in CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised 08-10-20 and AS-3397-19/AA, side by side and then provide a short explanation of their conclusion in their feedback to the EC.

4) The GE structure still needs a lot of feedback. It will come, later.

He thanked the EC for the discussion. This work is for the benefit of the students. When people express their concerns, please assure them that nothing will happen until feedback has been collected. R. Gearhart has a document from the Task Force he will share when we reach ES Task Force on the agenda.

- Budget Forum Debrief – B. Street was looking for an opportunity for discussion. The objective was to get the information in front of people and the data so they would understand the difference between the Base Budget, Net Operating Budget, and the forecast. He thanked A. Hegde for his assistance in developing the topics. B. Street suggested that there be a way to bring questions to the presenters before and during the presentation. It’s important for T. Davis to do most of the presenting. In a lot of ways, CSUB is currently doing well. Moving forward, 2021-2022 the $290M cut from the CSU budget will cause a significant change in day to day operations. The breakdown by division showed cuts and not-hiring positions. M. Rees suggested a way to post the Q&A and to provide a narrative on the charts. M. Martinez said the forum could have gone another half hour. A. Hegde suggested making slides available beforehand.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   October 6, 2020 Minutes and October 13, 2020 Minutes
   A. Hegde offered minor edits. C. Lam moved to approve the minutes of October 6 and 13. B. Street seconded. The minutes were approved by a show of hands.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   J. Millar moved to approve the Agenda. B. Street seconded. The agenda was approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart) No changes to report.
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) No changes to report.
      iii. FAC (M. Rees) No changes to report.
iv. BPC (B. Street) No changes to report.
b. Provost Update – V. Harper enjoyed the present conversation about ES. He appreciates that our campus shares their thoughts. Ultimately, we make changes in compliance to the law. If there are any questions, contact him.
c. Searches
   i. NSME completed interviews for the Interim Dean and V. Harper will talk to NSME chairs tomorrow about the selection of an Interim Dean.
   ii. The Search Committee for Permanent Dean NSME launched yesterday. The consultant and committee will have information available in the next few weeks.
   iii. The Search Committee for AVP AA and Dean AP is meeting next week.
   iv. The Provost Office made selection for the new Budget Analyst AA.
   v. Library Dean - the committee closed and he’ll check on their progress.
   vi. The search for the Dean Antelope Valley begins in Spring.
   vii. Interim AVP for Institutional Research will be onboarding in two weeks.
   viii. Questions and comments: J. Millar thanked the Provost for acknowledging that people were already doing research on the effects of remote learning in higher education during the pandemic. The Provost thanked J. Millar for the wellness meetings with E. Callahan and the TLC. Some of the planned meeting and activities are the CSUB Café, and Halloween and Holiday themed events. R. Weller is working on it. Yoga sessions conducted by Soul Source. Art projects are in the queue for spring. ASI is offering a trivia night. J. Millar is attending trivia night to see how that works. Perhaps a scavenger hunt of things found around the home could be arranged.
d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – PBTF (deferred)
e. Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Taskforce – R. Gearhart shared the document that the AAC received from the ES Unit Implementation Task Force. (Find attached) He said that their meeting last week was second worst experience he’s ever suffered through. He was accused of being a racist and fascist. R. Gearhart thanked V. Harper for taking time out of his Friday night to talk to him and support his work. M. Martinez offered his support. R. Gearhart said one of the name-callers sent him a lovely email apologizing for their behavior. Referring to the Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force Recommendations (attached) the things that really have to be done are the recommendations #1, #2, and #3. We need a safety net if the draft revised EO is adopted by the CO. T. Salisbury is very supportive of having an ES group approve
They agree all Area F ES courses offered as oral communication reinforcement for the GE reinforcement. A. Hegde said that R. Gearhart did an excellent job for reaching out and tried to get the task force to agree even though it is comprised of difficult personalities. Having worked together, A. Hegde is familiar with R. Gearhart’s fairness and service. The things that were directed toward R. Gearhart left him quite shaken. A. Hegde said that people make mistakes. He thanked R. Gearhart for staying the course and for getting the task force to agree to a set of recommendations with a lot of strong personalities. It is a great accomplishment. A. Hegde hopes that the experience doesn’t prevent R. Gearhart from doing university service again. Grandstanding doesn’t do any good. At the end of the day, we need to support each other. He said he couldn’t thank R. Gearhart enough. V. Harper was in the meetings. He thanked R. Gearhart for his outstanding leadership. There was some inappropriate behavior. A. Hegde reached out to the individuals to discuss decorum. V. Harper said R. Gearhart’s work is marvelous. V. Harper referred to what the President says about adverse experiences. It’s a challenge of leadership that people go through. See it as a developmental opportunity. It may be difficult to see that when people are yelling at you from across the table. The Provost said that R. Gearhart has done a great job and asked that he doesn’t see this as a set-back for leadership on the campus. The work he’s done will play a critical role for ES on this campus. J. Millar gave her support to R. Gearhart. She was a facilitator at the first Community Conversation. There was a lot of negativity thrown at her for being white and a woman. Sometimes we take risks in being white at the wrong place. There were some rocks uncovered. Name calling never makes anything better. She reinforced that R. Gearhart has a lot of support for what happened. J. Millar asked about the oral communication reinforcement. A. Hegde explained that normally the GE oral reinforcement means that students have to present what they learned at least twice. They deliver once. Get feedback. And then present again. It also limits the number of students in a class. M. Danforth said that oral communication reinforcement is part of the current GE AIMS document. A. Gebauer’s reasoning is that it serves to 1) Limits the class size to avoid large format sections, and 2) Oral communication, Quantitative Reasoning, and Written Communication are Area A. Out of the two AI areas, they reinforce critical thinking and writing. Nothing reinforces oral communication at the lower division. They discussed whether they wanted to limit it to oral communication reinforcement or open it up whereby each instructor would choose oral communication versus written versus critical thinking. They also discussed whether it be large classroom
format with no reinforcement. M. Danforth apologized if she added to the angst during the ES Unit Implementation Task Force. Her issue was moving forward with a decision having only one meeting. Perhaps this is a learning opportunity going forward. We should task all task forces to have two readings over two meetings and therefore provide more opportunities for feedback if people aren’t able to attend a specific meeting. The topic gets two readings in two meetings. A. Hegde agreed with her suggestion. Few of us are excellent parliamentarians. We learn by doing.

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. Online SOCIs – V. Harper said that there are 151 S2/hybrid courses being taught on campus. 95% of the courses are virtual courses. We will be using online SOCIs for the sections of remote instruction. Paper SOCIs brings people onto campus. He recommends that the campus move forward to use 100% online SOCI’s for the Fall Term. If it needs a Handbook change, it’ll go to FAC. If it doesn’t, the Provost will send message out for guidance. M. Danforth said if there is a need for a resolution, perhaps it can be for an interim action for a specific period of time, like we did with earlier resolutions this year. The item carries.
   b. Ally software - The CSU is giving all campuses access. It’s part of the Accessible Technology Initiate (ATI) to improve the Instructional Materials requirement. M. Danforth has graciously volunteered to be the faculty member on the ATI committee. Does this require Senate action or is it sufficient to have AA inform faculty that the software is available? When Ally makes a suggestion, is it something that faculty can opt into, or op out of? M. Danforth acknowledged that she has taken over this part of the ATI. Up until TOPS training was available this summer, there wasn’t very good training on what accessibility means and what accessible materials mean. We need to approach this from a faculty perspective; They need to learn one more thing on top of everything else. It’s also a student impaction issue. The virtual environment has shown us where our accessibility goes flat. She has a visual impaired student. He had to drop a class because the textbook publisher’s “accessible textbook” was so inadequate that he decided to pay a private service to make a better audio textbook that he could use. She’s heard from other students about the increased need for accessible instructional materials. M. Danforth is concerned from a campus perspective, that it could be the last straw for some. Making course material accessible means more work getting all materials compliant. There is a competing concern between faculty having to learn new techniques and do more, and student accessibility. Discussion tabled.
c. IRB Response to EC Questions and Appointments (deferred)
   i. IACUC re-appointment as alternate member
   ii. IRB re-appointment Tunson
   iii. IRB re-appointment Williamson

d. Handbook 306.2.2.e (deferred)
e. Elections and Appointments (deferred)
   i. School Elections Committees
   ii. Committee proliferation
      iii. Appointments to TEAC, USP&BAC, and UPAC

f. APM Proposal – GECCo (deferred)
g. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (deferred)
h. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term (deferred)
i. Post-Tenure Review Requirements (deferred)
j. Time Certain (10:15) for Agenda at Senate - The committee agreed to schedule the time to amend and/or approve the agenda.
k. UPRC Changes (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 29, 2020 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   Minutes
   Agenda
   Reports
   Resolutions
      Consent Agenda
      New Business
      Old Business
      RES 202108 Master of Science in Computer Science
   Open Forum and Wellness Check
   Past Senate Chair, Jackie Kegley (Time Certain 11:15)

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
   None.

9. ADJOURNMENT
   A. Hegde thanked the group for the good discussion. We are all learning. There is an extra EC meeting next Tuesday. The meeting adjourned at 11:32.