ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, April 9, 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: C. Commuri, D. Schecter

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • C. Commuri – Teaching and Learning Center Update – The TLC’s mission statement is to support holistic faculty development at all stages of their career, including pedagogy, teaching online, self-care, and work-life balance. The concern raised two years ago was the lack of support some centers have in pedagogy. The TLC has no assessment review. There was never a budget and no accountability. The draft assessment will go before the TLC Board and then to the Interim Provost’s Office. Soon, there will be three people in Instructional Design. The TLC’s structure needs to be revisited. The role of the Faculty Director of TLC should be substantial. It would be desirable to make it a development center offering service, shared training, GECCo, leadership academy, etc. Most campuses have several learning communities with specific tasks that last a year. Even if it’s not teaching on line, there are learning communities that can support other things like bottleneck courses, and curriculum redesign. The departments need to encourage attendance. The Antelope Valley TLC board member attends meetings via Zoom videoconferencing. The Strategic Plan has five groups assigned to five goals. Goal #2 group is assigned to faculty and staff excellence. One aspect is the on-boarding orientation and development of faculty and staff excellence. There is discussion about having development centers for faculty, and for staff – of perhaps a Professional Development Center for both. The strongest concern in faculty and staff excellence is to have a culture of comprehensive professional development. Goal #3 is working on high impact pedagogy. The group flatly rejected that teaching on-line and hybrid courses support pedagogy. Possible ways pedagogy can have a positive impact on the local populations may be workshops at the TLC, Kegley Institute of Ethics, etc. BPA had five excellent speakers on GE courses and that is the type of learning that has broad applications. The skills are not limited to GE courses. There is an interest in doing an encore of the event. C. Commuri is interested in collaborating with GE. One idea is to have a Teaching Commons where course recordings can be stored and shared. The Self-assessment report will be complete in a few weeks. D. Boschini thanked C. Commuri for the TLC self-assessment.
• Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23, 2019
• April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30 to meet with President Zelezny
• Budget Forum May 14, Tuesday 09:00 – 10:00 Student Union Multi-Purpose Room – It has to conform to the budget calendar in the future; the third week in spring.
• Calendars – there is little time to move proposals through committee this academic year. Interested parties need to have developed their case and submit in July to have EC consider the priorities before school starts. Meeting schedule to complete current business:
  o EC: April 23, April 30, May 14
  o Sub-committees: April 11, May 2
  o Senate: April 25, May 9

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   E. Correa moved to approve March 26, 2019 Minutes with some edits. B. Street seconded.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   D. Boschini added Faculty Athletic Representative to NEW ITEMS. D. Schecter moved to add Academics Calendar and BC/CSUB Partnership to the Provost Update. E. Correa moved to approve the Agenda as amended. B. Street seconded.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) The primary topic of next meeting is
         Referral # 22 Immediate Reinstatement after Academic Disqualification – One joint meetings with AS&SS took place. The draft resolution is in progress.
         Referral # 17 Distributed Learning Committee - AAC is looking at the information received from AS&SS and FAC committees.
         Referral # 20 Continuous Enrollment Course is tabled until the committee hears from BJ Moore and D. Jackson.
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
         Referral # 05 Campus Pilot is pending communication with F. Gorham. There isn’t much time to work further on the issue.
         Referral # 11Textbook Ordering Process may not go far due to issues with money and the complexities: It’s expensive and complicated whereby students have to opt-in and opt-out and has an impact on the timely management of their financial aid.
         Referral # 22 Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification – The committee is working on changes to the draft resolution.
      iii. BPC (B. Street) RES 181913 CSUB Tenure Density Priority Second Reading this week. There will be questions to T. Davis about what happened to the GI 2025 budget and spending 2016-2019 at the Budget Forum. The context of the GI 2025 and the materials need to be available on the Budget Central website by
the first week in May. It’s not true that 75% of the money went to AA. There is a big difference between the lines being reported at this stage and the discussions that were held in the GI 2025 task force meetings 2016-2019. There will be a lot of discussion of the differences during the Budget Forum. It would be beneficial to have a sub-section, GI 2025 funding, on the Budget Central webpage. T. Davis reported that GI 2025 funds used in the last three years were used to fund 30 TT positions. This came as a pure surprise. In the three years that the GI 2025 task force committee has been meeting, the TT hiring has never been part of the discussion. The task force discussion was about using the funds to create the initiatives, to add extra sections of courses and to use the money to hire PT faculty to fill the sections so students can get the courses that they need to graduate on time. There was heavy emphasis on block scheduling, advising, programs like 15 to Finish, Finish in Four, etc. TT hiring was not part of the conversation until T. Davis introduced the spending of the GI 2025 funds 2016-2019 at the last BPC meeting where he explained, retroactively, the plan of how that money was spent. Business and Administrative Services (BAS) can’t tell the task force in 2019 that discussions took place in 2016 on the hiring decision of 30 TT lines. The office that prepared those reports for BAS was directed to put 30 TT lines in the report because that’s what they intended to share with the campus. D. Boschini asked T. Davis for the report that was sent to the CO during 2016-2017 that specifies how CSUB would spend the GI 2025 money. That report would clarify whether the GI 2015 spending plan in 2016-2019 is mistaken communication (failure to communicate that there was TT hiring) or an untruth. B. Street was told that hires were made even though we didn’t have the money. Now, we’re being told that we had the money, from the GI 2025 allocation. D. Boschini is alarmed that the answer to certain questions is to focus on looking forward, as if to say those questions don’t matter. It has been CSUB’s habit to make decisions that not everyone understands, then drawing lines so it can’t be discussed, change the story on how decisions are made and things were done, and then state that the people who ask about the past are disgruntled. We can’t keep drawing lines and refusing to talk about the fact that there wasn’t honesty about how things were done. We need to look back at the GI 2025 report that CSUB sent to the CO and call out any untruths. There is a need to check how 30 TT hires are counted; how many were replacement positions? For example, BPA lost positions a decade ago that have never been replaced. We did not spend $5M of GI 2025 monies on faculty and an additional $1.52 on faculty. Faculty is not creating a problem. There is a problem with continuity of the narrative. Certain BPC members met with T. Davis when he said that the campus overspent. Part of that was the overspending of $400K for commencement. At the next meeting, T. Davis said that the Provost’s response was that the $400K was not for commencement but for some advising. The narrative changes and the hole keeps moving. Another
conversation took place with BAS about an extra $1M that President Mitchell committed to TT hiring. BAS told the President that we didn’t have the money. President Mitchell then said “do it because it’s important”. In other words, we overspent by $3 M and now that CSUB has $6M, we are filling back the money. There is also the $5M the campus overspent from the base budget. No one knows where that came from or who fills that in. According to T. Davis, we are still in the hole by $5M. $3M is a one-time fund. And we are in the hole by $5M because of TT lines. When discussing the 30 TT lines, it matters what base one starts with. According to T. Davis, the base is 2016-2017. If you start at the low-point, everything looks like it’s additional. They should start with the number of TT lines in 2005 instead of at the lowest point. It’s a way for BAS to have position control and of waiving everything in the past. The response is that administration can’t speak to the time before they arrived. In other words, one way to move forward is to redefine the original conditions. No matter what is said about the additional eleven lines allocated, the discussion of what happened to the five we didn’t get has stopped. The rest of the money is to back-fill the holes (described as high-impact practices): $200K Kegley Institute, $200K for the Career Center, $100K for the Dream Center. The Student Health Center needs funds. Getting our profoundly depressed students into counselling is a high impact priority, but it’s not getting funded. The money is fungible and it keeps moving. The Budget Forum is where we can state the need proper explanations. While there are reasons why 2016 makes some sense (Q to S transition) yet there is still a communication problem. The best case scenario is that CSUB spent wisely and can’t organize their information and share it in a way that makes sense. The AS leadership and the Provost office needs to prioritize things. Three positions per school is a political answer. To run effectively, the campus needs prioritization from AA and not what the Cabinet has decided are the priorities. The USP & BAC is set-up to communicate the priorities. D. Boschini – the loudest voices are not necessarily representing the greatest need. She will follow-up to receive the GI 2025 spending report sent to the CO. If it says TT hiring, then it would be satisfying. There is the need for conversation on the actual spending of the $5M here and the $1.52 there. How we track, report, and share is another, related issue of transparency. CFA members noticed that the President is renovating her office. Those who have been there recently have seen that the office is not opulent. It may be in need and in the budget. D. Boschini will look into it.

iv. FAC (M. Rush) A friendly amendment to move FAC reporting before BPC was made. Approved unanimously.

RES 181909 Faculty Award Process approved by President. However, the resolution omitted the Millie Ablin award. Clearly, the intent of the resolution was that FHAC could contact references for all awards. Since RES 181909 was signed and approved, it could be placed on the Consent Agenda to include the
Millie Ablin Award. The President will have an opportunity to sign the second resolution. D. Boschini will inform the President that it is coming.

FAC would like to remove the discrepancy in the Handbook that states that the scholarship award is decided by the URC. It’s not what we’ve been doing. FHAC has been deciding all the awards. The general conversation about faculty awards can be taken up by the EC in fall.

Referral #21 Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee (FHDC) Structure and Process Improvement - The intent is to solidify the process and make sure that the current structure is correct. The RES 1213029 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate and Selection is not in the Handbook. D. Schecter commented that a lot is not driven by faculty. The President and Cabinet give their final blessing but they want the campus to have some say. M. Rush sees FHDC as part of the process that doesn’t belong to faculty. J. Tarjan has served on many Honorary Doctorate committees at the system level. When nominations come in from a campus, there is always the question whether the Senate Chair gave his/her blessing. It’s a degree. Confidentially is essential. His recommendation is to have the EC or a sub-set of EC handle this. At some point, the faculty needs to put their blessing on the recommended awardee. D. Boschini said that one of the things that would solve it is taking the group (EC) meeting early in year instead of puling FHAC together for the first time to participate in the FHDC. J. Tarjan said that’s how CSUB used to handle it. A. Hegde suggested to also look at the EC’s involvement in the Wang award. In both cases, it’s the President’s decision and a faculty group vets the candidates. In the fall, FAC could take up the suggestion that those special awards go to the EC.

b. Provost Update (D. Schecter on behalf of V. Harper)
   i. Academic Calendar 2019-2020 - K. Knutzen received correspondence from B. Street. Her perception is that the decision on Spring Break is delaying its final approval. D. Boschini said that the Calendar Committee asked for something and it was given the results of a straw poll with the caveat that it was not inclusive of faculty and that the poll didn’t include staff or students. The Senate will take up the Academic Calendar in fall with an inclusive conversation and decision to be made before Winter Break.
   ii. BC/CSUB Partnership – (handout) Basically, there are ten administrators/staff and ten faculty members. F. Gorham to be added. Senate has alternates. There have been several requests to be on the committee. They could be faculty alternate(s). The committee expects to meet by the end of April. All BC/CSUB members to be invited. The modules and parking are expected to be in place in the fall while the building is developed. J. Tarjan suggested that the committee needs a budget person because of the charge-backs and other financial issues. V. Harper is the conduit to T. Davis and Cabinet-level money decisions. E. Correa mentioned that there is a need for weighted SS&E faculty representation. A call went out. Perhaps there wasn’t any one from NSME
because there may not be any programs that start at BC. J. Millar suggested students be involved. D. Schecter will relay to V. Harper that there is a request for a NSME faculty and student representation.

c. Searches (deferred)
   i. AVP EM
   ii. AVP Academic Programs
   iii. Director of Academic Operations

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. ITAC Report (deferred)
   b. Academic Calendars 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 (handout)
   c. ROTC/ASI Resolution SB 204 (handout) ASI produced the resolution independently. D. Boschini has met with veterans twice in the last three-four years. She was very clear that we do not have a ban on ROTC. The Academic Senate office provided the most recent discussion (EC minutes) to the ASI President. ROTC is linked to a degree program. Someone needs to propose a military science degree. At that point, the Senate would take up the process. There is no program on the table. The ASI resolution does not require Senate action.
   d. Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) - Roy LaFever’s term is expiring. The President is interested in reappointing him and wants to consult EC. There is no review of the position. It’s a committee appointment. Send out an open call stating that it requires knowledge of the NCAA manual. D. Schecter was FAR for years. Continuity is important. Consider a full professor above the fray, and one who understands students’ mental health.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING APRIL 25, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   **Announcements**
   UPRC Report - D. Solano (Time Certain 10:05)
   FHAC Faculty Awards – M. Rees (Time Certain 10:10)
   GECCo Report – pending confirmation
   CPR Report – pending confirmation
   **Consent Agenda**
   RES 181909 Faculty Award Process - amendment to the resolution recently passed.
   **New Business**
   **Old Business**
   1. RES 181912 CSUB Academic Senate / General Education Task Force Proposal Second Reading. J. Tarjan sent his recommendations to M. Martinez and D. Dodd. It’s up to M. Martinez to bring back to Senate. A. Hegde will remind him.
   2. RES 181913 CSUB Tenure Density Priority Second Reading
   3. RES 181914 Graduate Director Term Limits and Review – Handbook Change Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
* Changes to the University Handbook