ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Extra
Minutes
Tuesday, October 27, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:35 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, M. Martinez

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Q&A RES 202109 Feedback for Second Reading, October 30, 1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m.
   RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirements – Ethnic Studies - A. Hegde said the First Reading is on October 29. He proposed that the EC provide an open Q&A session to the campus. Nobody is happy with the process of responding to the CO GE Breadth requirements, even people at the CO. It’s based on what the legislature thought was the best outcome. Obviously, the legislation doesn’t dictate Area F and other things. It’s up to the system to implement what they think is the wishes of the legislation.

   A. Hegde received three emails in response to his campus faculty outreach for feedback on the CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised. He received feedback on the impact of reduction of three units from Area D chairs (Anthropology, Sociology) and expects to hear from the other two (Economics, Psychology). They’re going to lose FTES. For most of these programs, the Area D classes are feeder classes. ECON offers 16 sections per year and will lose about three or four sections. Psychology is expecting to lose about eight sections. CSUB will need about 30-34 ES sections. Area D will lose 30-34 sections. The greatest impact will be on Psychology, Sociology, Criminal Justice, Economics, Anthropology, and English, in that order. English Composition is Area 2. The majority are in Area A. This will have serious impact. Everyone agrees we need ES. We look to the ES faculty for their specific feedback and recommendation. Scheduling a Q&A session after the First Reading of RES 202109 is another opportunity for the faculty to understand the proposed implementation of ES units. The session is
for unit implementation, only. What courses and how they are approved will be addressed later. Nonetheless, we have to give the feedback to the CO by Nov 2. We can be very strong in our feedback. It comes in two parts:

1) Unit implementation to which the resolution speaks. The reduction of Area D primarily affects four to five departments. We will include feedback from the other sources. (refer to Chart 1). The language M. Danforth recommended is very good and all of it will be included in the campus response.

2) The core competencies and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) relies on ES input as they are the experts. We are open to others’ input. (refer to Chart 2) The all campus Q&A Feedback on RES 202109 follows the First Reading on October 29. The feedback will be compiled for AAC’s discussion on November 5 and for their preparation of the Second Reading to be presented at the Senate meeting on November 12. J. Millar will use some of the feedback compiled for the ASCSU meeting, even though it’s likely that campuses’ resolutions will not change the CSU implementation plan. A. Hegde presented the two components in two flow charts representing tasks, parties involved, and the aggressive timeline. (See attached) He walked the group through the simultaneous process of the two components. He expects ASI to provide feedback and present their own resolution in response to the CO GE Breadth Revised. GECCo has been asked to provide their feedback on the same. A. Hegde will compile the feedback over the weekend. J. Millar thanked him for offering faculty so many opportunities to respond. V. Harper will send the feedback to the CO on Nov 2.

R. Gearhart said that the feedback that comes from the open Q&A could be contentious and could put a lot of pressure on AAC. The feedback will be on the proposed resolution, only. A. Hegde said should we draft a resolution in opposition, it should come from the EC. But in the meantime, we need a plan, given that the CO is not likely to budge and advising for students’ academic plans starts soon. It would be a disservice to the students if we didn’t have a plan. We can change it in every catalog. Fortunately, we already have two ETHS courses. At least one will move into Area F. We can change or alter the plan in the Spring. As a member of a department that’s going to be more adversely affected by this, A. Hegde said the only way to implement ES is to sacrifice a few FTES. Before we get to the second component of getting courses into the catalog, there is need for more structure to what is to be the ES Curriculum Committee. There are about four courses in the pipeline. At this point, the ES faculty will have to go to GECCo. As you look at the resolution, think about maybe making edits to incorporate another Resolve, speaking to the structure of the committee looking at ES courses.
A. Hegde turned the discussion to opposition of AB 1460 Implementation of GE Structure and CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised. He shared some CSUs resolutions complaining about the reduction of Area D and creating an Area F. The law doesn’t say that, nor does it give the SLOs. There are other CSUs that oppose CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised because the timeline was not enough to have faculty feedback and consultation. The concern is that this is another instance, similar to EO 1100, were there was policy implemented without faculty consultation. It is not urgent that CSUB submit a resolution in opposition to AB 1460 Implementation and CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised. It should come from the EC. A. Hegde asked whether the EC was interested in opposing the plan implementation, albeit faculty has been working on implementing the plan. R. Gearhart attends the systemwide AAC meeting. 15 of 23 campuses are in the process of passing or have passed opposition resolutions. It appears that the Ethnic Studies (ES) faculty is very unhappy with the process. He received a request from CSUB faculty member to oppose. C. Lam was asked by [CFA leadership] D. Gove, why not? M. Danforth said that there are certain things of the CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised policy that need to be pointed out, such as the Administrative overreach. The CO is doing a lot more with this draft policy than just implementing ES. Why are they even touching Area C, or some of the preamble portions?
A. Hegde asked if it was the will of the committee – yes or no - in favor of drafting a resolution opposing the implementation Draft policy from the CO. He shared the resolutions from SFSU, CSU Sonoma campuses. The issues are the lack of collaboration with faculty with the ES Council and the CO, the timeline, and reduction of three units in Area D, ETHS in lower division versus upper division, Title V changes, autonomy for implementation of ES. A. Hegde noted that the legislation didn’t dictate that the three units had to be taken from Area D. It just said that three units of ES is required for a student to graduate. The law doesn’t say much about the SLOs. It says what programs can count. M. Danforth said the basis is the law. It just says three units of ES. It doesn’t say where it goes. Once again, the CO is being prescriptive without appropriate faculty consultation. She thinks that would be the foundation of a resolution. Add faculty voice to the range of disappointment, annoyance, and anger. The CO’s response to the law is, once again, dictating policy instead of consulting with faculty or giving campuses the autonomy to figure out how to meet this requirement. We are given autonomy how to meet Government and U.S. History requirements. These are state law requirements that we fit into our GE
package without the CO telling us it had to be in Area C or Area D or anything of that nature. They could have gone with that approach. Such as, we must require three units of ES, you must not take your GE over 48 units, go forth and figure it out. M. Rees said the complaint is the timeline. It was imposed on the CO by the legislation, so to oppose that part is pointless. If they are mandating certain ways we incorporate this into our GE program, she is comfortable opposing those actions until the CO learns their lesson. M. Rees inquired if there is another resolution that we feel akin with whereby CSUB Senate can join in solidarity. Are the things we want to say that have already been said, are there things we want to say that haven’t been said before, or do we want to send our agreement? A. Hegde responded that we could 1) draft certain things from scratch, in light of what others have said, or 2) draft two resolves in support of what other institutions have said about lack of shared governance and campus autonomy with a little rationale. J. Millar agrees to support other resolutions. We want the support of campus autonomy to register with the CO. Find a couple resolves that represent CSUB view. A. Hegde said he’ll take M. Rees’ suggestion and draft a resolution and bring it to M. Danforth and R. Gearhart to finalize next week and bring to Senate November 12. It won’t be too late and we’ll have said something true: This is not shared governance. B. Street agrees to put together a resolution to do what we can to inform CO that they keep adding more policies and interfering in faculty areas. It seems to have gotten worse. He thinks it’s appropriate for CSUB to have our own voice to add to the list of other campuses in the discussion. We need it to stop, especially under the circumstances of COVID-19 when there is so much to do. The timeline isn’t entirely due to the CO. Yet, some of the things they dipped their hands into have made this mandate more difficult than it needed to be. If it were less descriptive or prescriptive in how we implemented ES, this would have been much easier for the campuses to do. C. Lam agreed with B. Street. We may want to say what we wanted to have happened. If we don’t say anything, then the CO can say, look at Bakersfield – they got it done. We need to voice our concerns. A. Hegde said M. Danforth articulated it well. The basic issue is the lack of autonomy that the campuses have. The CO could have said, you need to have three units in ES without raising the 120-unit requirement or increase the GE requirement and go figure it out. We could have spent time figuring it out for our campus rather than fighting something that the system is implementing, one size fits all. So, the resolution will be opposing the lack of collaboration and the lack of autonomy for campuses to do this. The legislature established the timeline and they said it had to be so. The CO has to follow that. M. Danforth requested that A. Hegde
forward the other campuses’ resolutions in opposition. (SFSU Proposed Resolution Opposition to the Title V Restructuring of GE, etc.) M. Rees suggested a change to the SLO. Remove the word “active”. It sounds like students are required to join a movement. A. Hegde will forward the resolutions from other campuses to the EC members. If anyone asks, CSUB is opposing the Chancellor’s Office memo: CSU GE Breadth Draft EO Revised.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   R. Gearhart moved to approve the October 20, 2020 Minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved by a show of hands.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   C. Lam moved to approve the Agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved by a vote.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS** (deferred)
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart)
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Provost Update – V. Harper
      i. Wellness Wisdom – He thanked J. Millar and the others who helped with the development of activities. Activities extended through Spring.
      ii. Provost Pandemic Research Group – Thanks to all faculty who are going to be on that body. Money will be allocated this week so they can start doing some RFPs to study the impact of the pandemic on our community.
      iii. Registration for Fall begins
      iv. FAC meeting – V. Harper enjoyed attending the meeting last week. It had its moments. He assured the members of his commitment to make things equitable, in terms of workload. There will be follow-up on that.
      v. Institutional Plan Spring – D. Jackson should have a draft available for the Senate soon.
      vi. GI 2025 Symposium was last week. It was good in terms of the system’s progress. However, equity gaps are stubborn systemwide and at CSUB. We are doubling down on that. We made startling progress on our other four goals. V. Harper will distribute the details to the EC.
      vii. DCLC – V. Harper was candid about his commitment to make sure that the sacrifices are not borne by faculty alone. They will be across divisions, including management.
viii. Q&A and comments: M. Rees felt the FAC meeting was productive. She’d like to share the work at the Senate. It was fruitful. Feelings were expressed and handled well. A. Hegde said it’s always good when Administrators come to meetings.

c. Searches – V. Harper
i. Interim Dean NSME - He had discussion with chairs about the prospective selection. M. Danforth already discussed with him. C. Lam hasn’t heard any feedback. No concerns came forward in the Provost’s selection on the Interim Dean.
ii. AA Budget Analyst - L. Bishop is in the position. P. Miser will stay until December 31 and L. Bishop will shadow her. V. Harper said P. Miser has been awesome and will be greatly missed.
iii. AVP Faculty Affairs – The search takes place in Spring 2021.
v. Dean Library – The first round of interviews are taking place.
vi. Permanent Dean NSME – The search committee has met with the search consultant. V. Harper will be following up with the consultant.
vii. AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs – V. Harper to meet with the search committee this week.
viii. AVP Institutional Research – The announcement of the Interim was sent today. M. Malhotra will relocate to the area while serving in the position.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Pandemic Budget Task Force – (PBTF) V. Harper met with those great individuals last week. There were some tense moments as one would expect. Their recommended reductions are expected by the end of the term so that we can apply a lot of that before registration for Fall 2021. That’s important. He appreciates the congeniality while discussing a difficult topic.

e. Online SOCIs – V. Harper stated that using paper SOCIs brings staff to campus. The recommendation is for all SOCIs to be electronic. M. Rees said that people assume they will be online. R. Gearhart is in support of all online SOCIs. A. Hegde asked whether it requires Senate action. B. Street suggested that because of the timing, it might be advantageous for the EC to make a call so the Provost can get the communication out to campus. The decision to have all SOCIs online was done in consultation with the EC. A. Hegde looked at Handbook 305.4.4 and found that it does not stipulate whether the SOCIs are to be paper or electronic. RES 192014 Emergency Resolutions Related to the Transition to Alternate Delivery does not address SOCIs for S2/Hybrid courses. M. Rees said RES 192020 RTP Guidelines was about whether or not to include SOCIs in RTP. It didn’t say
anything about whether they were paper or electronic. A. Hegde asked the EC for their position on whether a resolution is necessary. All were in favor of the Provost sending a message that all Fall and Spring SOCs will be online, given the situation and the policy of not having people on campus. It was done in consultation with the EC.

f. Ally Software (deferred)

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. Fall 2020 Calendar Changes – B. Street said that the original calendar had advising and registration for new students on the same date. D. Cantrell, Chair of the Calendar Task Force, met with the advising leadership team. There was a request for change because the date for advising was November 2 and the date for registration was the same. The timing is such that the changes need to be made now rather than go through the normal channel of BPC. B. Street consulted with IT and the PeopleSoft contact regarding the systemwide effect. They say it can be done without any negative consequence. The change is to allow the new students to have a week of advising in Fall prior to when Spring registration opens up. M. Danforth asked if anyone from SSD is on the Calendar Task Force. It was noted in the ATI meeting that the change made to in the Spring to Summer and Fall registration dates greatly affected the time to get SSD materials ready for the students. It reduces the time frame for SSD office to get accessible resources for the students, especially new students. The advisors are driving the calendar more than other considerations. She suggested someone from SSD be on the Calendar Task Force Committee. B. Street will pass along the suggestion to D. Cantrell. The change to Spring 2021 calendar is to add specific dates for orientation and advising for new students and for new transfer students. The change to make it earlier may be for veterans to have time to get financial aid. M. Danforth added that the rationale given to the Student Success Network was the 1) time to get final transcripts from community colleges, and 2) the need time to evaluate the transcripts by the representative departments. On the other hand, the date is in June, Chairs are not always on contract to process transfer articulation requests during summer. It may make sense to start doing advising before the grades are finalized so we can start the process. The new students will be informed that they aren’t officially in the classes until the grades are finalized. We do that for continuing students. M. Rees said at that point (proposed new date), upper division classes are full. B. Street said that the larger issue is the problem with ad hoc changes to calendar. He’ll take to D. Cantrell. Not enough eyes on the calendar. It goes against the process of
having calendars in advance. It’s problematic to bring calendar changes needed in a week. The EC advises the Calendar Committee that it is 1) Okay to make the change in Fall 2020 calendar, 2) Not okay for changes to Spring 2021 calendar. V. Harper thanked B. Street. V. Harper talked to CO and the calendar change doesn’t require resubmission to the CO.

b. RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies - R. Gearhart presented RES 202109 to the group. AAC signed off on the Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force (ESUITF) recommendations. Their recommendations, with a few modifications, are in the first Resolve of the resolution. The second Resolve is the safety net that the resolution only triggers under the proposed CO policy (aka EO). If there are any changes after November 2 to the final CO policy, then this resolution would be null and void. A. Hegde said it would be ideal if everyone in AAC would have signed off. He thanked R. Gearhart, the ESUITF, and the AAC for putting out a very decent resolution. R. Gearhart shared that most members of the statewide AAC group said that working with their chairs was awful and an impediment to campus wide acceptance. He thanked V. Harper for taking all the calls from him, related to that. A lot of campuses are not even doing the safety net. Their curriculum committees are hoping that they will get campus autonomy. A. Hegde said the First Reading is on Thursday. We will receive feedback on Senate floor and in the open Q&A Feedback session.

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
   i. School Elections Committees (deferred)
   ii. Committee proliferation (deferred)
   iii. Appointments to TEAC, USP&BAC, and UPAC
      - Michael Harville – Counseling, to serve a two year term October 2020-October 2022
      - Zachary Hays – Criminal Justice, to serve a one-year term, October 2020-October 2021

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. UPRC Changes (deferred)
k. Wang Award – FHAC recommendation (deferred)
l. Campus Data Needs (deferred)
m. BS in Public Health Proposal (deferred)
n. Master of Science in Accounting Proposal (deferred)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 29, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   
   **Announcements**
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   
   **Reports**
   
   **Resolutions**
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies
   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**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:35.