ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, March 26, 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 (Alt.)
Visitor: D. Schecter

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   - President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   - Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23, 2019
   - April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30 to meet with President Zelezny

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   March 12, 2019 Minutes approved electronically.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Addition of IACUC recommendation for Veterinarian. M. Rush moved to approve the agenda as amended. B. Street seconded.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
         1. Referral #20 Continuous Enrollment Course – Continuous Enrollment Report (handout) BJ was invited to AAC to speak about her course request, yet it became more complicated. The original idea was to make the new CSUB 7000 course as a place holder for any of the majors that don’t have a corresponding 7000 course, for students to take while finishing their thesis. D. Jackson summarized discussion with Graduate Coordinators (page 1) and what CSUB is doing compared to other CSU for their 7000 courses. Questions arose: What is the course description? How much should EEGO charge, what location, how to split the fees between EEGO and the program such that the request become greater than the referral’s intent. The fees become a BPC question. The University versus stateside funding needs a more in-depth look. D. Boschini said all the answers to the questions should be contained
within the proposal. Rather than trying to dictate something, it should be a department issue. M. Danforth will respond that PPA can move forward on the original issue when it has a complete proposal.

2. Referral #17 Distributed Learning Committee Policies – the committee received information from AS&SS.

3. Referral #22 Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification – A joint meeting with AS&SS is scheduled for March 28.

ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)

1. Referral #10 Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal Policy. There hasn’t been a response from C. Catota or J. Watkins that they have accepted the committee’s recommendation sent a month ago.

2. Referral #16 Faculty Participation in Information Technology Matters - F. Gorham put a hold on things. He and B. Chen will be attending the committee’s meeting on March 28.

3. Referral #22 Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification – A joint meeting with AS&SS is scheduled. K. Knutzen attended prior meeting. She feels that the policy language around WUs and the Fs is causing confusion; it’s not complete, and she’d like the Senate to look into it. After some discussion, the committee recommended that a message be taken back to K. Knutzen: 1) what problem is K. Knutzen trying to solve? If students have abused the system, it’s not for the Senate to take up. 2) If she thinks people aren’t using it correctly, the first step is to send out a memo to faculty two weeks before grades are due. Put the topic into a separate email to re-educate faculty.

iii. BPC (B. Street)

1. The Academic Calendar: Discussion on how faculty input weighs into the timing of spring break. K. Knutzen put together two drafts: Spring Break is in week eight 2020-2021, and the other falls to lunar calendar in week twelve 2020-2021. The Calendar Committee can’t finalize until Senate has submitted a decision that represents faculty. Discussion ensued. There is no wrong answer. There are many compelling reasons why spring break should occur either way. Some are about convenience and not about the logistics and implications to the institution. More time is needed to uncover all the issues to find a permanent solution to when spring break is scheduled. Do what is good for the entire university. It’s important that the formal process be used. If we can’t this year, then take it up next year; deliberate in committees and take it up to the Senate. If we decide to change it, it will be a permanent change. The Calendar Committee asked for Senate to weigh in with the faculty voice. D. Boschini suggested that BPC inform K. Knutzen that the Senate took a straw poll and it was in favor of a mid-semester spring break.
2. Rescheduling of Budget Forum. B. Street teaches on the morning that the Budget Forum was scheduled. The presence of the CFO and BPC Chair is the normal. The meeting is to be rescheduled with at least a two week notice to campus.

3. The resolution about tenure density aims to reinforce new tenure track lines as a priority: Identify the number of faculty appropriate to the resources and at what stage of the Strategic Plan development does that number align with the increase of tenure density that is marked by percentage, (not the number) of tenure-track faculty lines. The CO set a 70% goal from 2001 to 2010. That will be used in the rationale. B. Street arrived at a median tenure density at 75 percentile. That could give CSUB a stretch goal of 60% tenure density. Depending on the FTES growth in five years, it would mean 16 or 19 new positions per year for both percentile and percentage. CSUB has a unique student population. CSUB faculty are the one’s doing the advising, helping with research, and it can be challenging to find the right qualified people. Discussion ensued. The Senate committees put a lot of thought into, and no one is addressing RES 171809 Continue Faculty Hiring Initiative that requested $2M base budget every year just to catch-up with servicing the student growth. Tenure-track line hiring needs to be substantially more than it has been in the past. The CO allocated $1.52 million for 11 tenure-track (given the average rate). CSUB is substantially deficient in tenure-track faculty. There has to be something in the resolution about equity – one number- whereby the details can be worked out later. Ask the President to affirm that tenure density is priority #1 on campus. The concern becomes the potential lay off of lecturers. 60% tenure-density is depressingly low. D. Boschini agrees that a dollar amount makes an impression about the magnitude of the problem and to combine it with tenure density because that is the only number that is tied to enrollment growth. If CSUB’s enrollment growth is going to 18,000 students in 2025 then the $2M is far short, and 11 annual positions won’t be near enough to serve those students. We need to tie the number of faculty that would be necessary to serve the number of students. The dollar and the density calculations are to be updated annually. The Senate does not recommend that the tenure density be improved by other measures such as cutting lecturers, reducing assign time, expanding classroom size to improve SFR, and decreasing the lecturer pool to change the denominator. We want to see actual improvements. Ask for the criteria used for hiring allocation. T. Davis sent three-year data on the GI 2025 money to B. Street. The data suggests that there were 30 positions allocated 2016-2019 from the $6.2M tied to GI 2025. Evidently there were hires made with GI 2025
money but it was used for these other hires and things. The resolution should call for clear and tangible quantitative criteria on how the hires are made and that faculty input should be part of the final decision. The CO decided that CSUB would get $1.52 for 11 lines, yet only six positions have been committed. There still isn’t clarity on what happened with the other five lines. The answer has been that the money is going to ASI and others for high impact practices. There needs to be a couple of resolutions: 1) The criteria used to make decisions, and 2) what are the current high-impact practices that are said to get the money that was allocated for five new tenure track lines? D. Boschini directed BPC to write a formal memo on how the $1.52M of GI 2025 money was spent, and request that the response be delivered by such time that the memo can go before the Senate and the DCLC. The Provost’s Office and BAS are said to be presenting that information at the next DCLC. The memo still needs to go to the Senate.

iv. FAC (M. Rush)

1. Referral # 19 Faculty workload will be deferred to next year because of the many issues that need to be worked through. She will write a memo for first item for the fall.

2. Referral # 18 Graduate Director Term Limits and Feedback Review - Handbook Change – The term limits are being modeled after the term limits for chair positions. Part of the issue is that some directors don’t want to be directors any longer. Yet, there isn’t a pool of candidates from which one can become a Grad Director and there is a lack of etiquette for change. Graduate programs often are rigid and specialized. The implication is that no other person can do the job. What structure can be put in place that brings more candidates into discussion so that the transition of directors is done in a democratic manner? Some graduate programs are specialized whereby there may be only one person qualified. How do you get others qualified? It’s a problem with small departments; if there is a limited number of people to choose from, how does one get the next person ready. Someone has to do it if the graduate program is to continue. As with the duties of a department chair, a graduate program chair doesn’t have to be from the discipline. It could be part of the unit’s RTP criteria – to give some special weight to service. It would be useful to have an incentive. It depends on the program. The MBA program has a curriculum committee. Presumably, the members of that committee are teaching and qualified. However, if it is specialized, hire someone to take over. The people who teach in the program should be the candidates. Pieces of the job can be assigned to others to groom them. This is a good idea for B. Street’s Leadership Academy workshop that is being planned for
Faculty Day during University Week. D. Boschini said that perhaps FAC is being asked to solve a problem that the Handbook can’t completely solve. FAC isn’t in favor of having term limits, yet terms get people to thinking about rotating which creates a shift. RTP helps individuals see the value and logic of rotation. B. Hartsell has already prepared language for the Handbook.

3. Referral 13 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change - If awards affects too much of a change there will be another resolution.

4. Referral # 06 Distributed Learning Committee – moved to AAC.

b. Provost Update – (deferred)
c. Searches (deferred)
   i. AVP EM
   ii. AVP Academic Programs
   iii. Director of Academic Operations
d. BC/CSUB Partnership (deferred)
e. University Week (deferred)
   i. Faculty Meeting

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. IACUC – no objections to the recommendation of H. Gonzalez to serve as Veterinarian. The EC confirmed that the recommendation goes forward to the Provost’s Office.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING APRIL 4, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   Faculty Trustee visits campus: R. Sabalius on April 23
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   Old Business

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

   * Changes to the University Handbook