ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, March 5, 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

Absent: M. Rush

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
   - Faculty 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
   February 26, 2019 Minutes approved electronically.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Priorities were put toward making referrals and the adjusted agenda approved. E. Correa moved to approve the modified agenda. A. Hegde seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa) E. Correa reported that F. Gorman informed the committee that IT is postponing the roll-out of the Campus Climate online SOCI program. Thus, the referral is tabled. IT is looking at revision of strategy and the roll-out of initiatives. There is an issue of getting faculty participation on the Canvas LMS pilot and planning. The reason the faculty doesn’t have a strong presence is because of timing. Faculty do not know if they will be teaching online. The dialogue will continue, but not over summer break. D. Boschini stated her appreciation that F. Gorham is making great effort to connect IT solutions with faculty. E. Correa reported that J. Oberlies, C. Morris, and Richard from the bookstore came to the committee meeting to discuss making IncludED accessible to students. If pursued, it would bring a lot of complexity to students’ processing of books, reimbursements, and effects on financial aid. It may not be
an appropriate piece going forward. The committee is still compiling data to put a recommendation forward.

iii. BPC (B. Street) The draft resolution University Hour is being reviewed by committee. It did not receive unanimous support in the committee. There were issues with the design of the survey, thus results of survey. Given the outside data, it calls into question the issue of capacity. We are at 75% utilization. The campuses that have university hour are at 100% utilization. Looking ahead, it makes it difficult for the campus to ever be awarded the requisite funding to build another facility of size at CSUB. If University Hour were implemented, the long-term impact is detrimental to future capacity and students. Also, there will be a negative impact on undergraduate and especially graduate students. Classes will have to start earlier in the morning and the graduate students will be attending classes later in the evening. It’s a time block of at least two days, increasing students and faculty length of time on campus and can limit choices of classroom instruction. The Interdisciplinary Studies Proposal has been withdrawn. There was discussion with T. Davis on the high impact practices in relation to GI 2025. Dr. Novak presented his budget for EEGO. I. Ebong from GRaSP has been invited to the next meeting.

iv. FAC (M. Rush) (deferred)

b. Provost Update (V. Harper, Interim Provost)

i. Sustainability position – He has received mixed feedback. There doesn’t appear to be support of a full FTE of instructional faculty devoted to an interdisciplinary sustainability position or a department anchored sustainability position. He is referring to the approach as “Plus 1”. There are numbers of instruction faculty allocated to Academic Affairs in the next cycle. Whatever that number is, it would be Plus 1. For Fall ’19, the idea is one for each of the four schools, one for AV and one for the sustainability line. No work has been done on the sustainability line, but work has been done on the other positions. He recommended that the sixth position be added to the pool of positions that would then be directed to Fall ’20 pool, marked as a left over from 2018-2019. J. Tarjan said that based on the budget the campus needs thirty positions. A. Hegde asked if the conversation about the remaining five – CO called for eleven has stopped? V. Harper views that as a separate conversation; how the money was deployed. A. Hegde said that the legislature clearly stated that CSUB was to use the $1.52 million for eleven TT lines. The campus conversation is superseded by the CO’s conversation. If the additional funding that has been fed into the system translates to twenty-five TT for CSUB, “Plus six” positions should be added to that for ‘20. J. Tarjan said that the President and Provost were left in tough times and there is not enough transparency to understand that. He is willing to cut the new administrations some slack during this
transition. He reminded the group that when the previous administration left, they left a $5 million “gift”, converting temporary staff (assisting quarter to semester transition) to permanent employees. D. Boschini remains unsatisfied with extending funds to other areas. The best she can be is disappointed, and hopeful that we’ll find a way to dig out. She is concerned that the President made the zero hire decision last summer, and then it went to six versus eleven hires when the funds became available. To be in better shape, our hiring has to outpace enrollment growth. Now, the plan for this year is to hire five instead of six. It does not meet the current need for expansion hires that the administration should have made years ago. She understands that there will be an EM plan that will eliminate unmanaged growth, but it doesn’t eliminate the need to hire more faculty to serve the number of students we have. It will come up when WASC comes to campus. The TT conversation has gone unresolved. V. Harper said he will send out a memo on hiring to give some transparency. T. Davis is working on scenarios on the 2019-2020 budget. Estimates for the entire university based on 2% (or higher) enrollment growth as stipulated by the CO. That will spin off a number for faculty hires, and then harness a rank list by schools into the office of Provost. A hiring decision matrix uses 15 school-based measures. The process will be summarized and posted on the AA website. D. Boschini said that by looking for 2% enrollment growth the Provost office should be able to calculate the number of TT positions to keep up with enrollment growth. V. Harper and the President agree that one of their goals is to increase tenure density. She will be making the decision on the allocation of the funds across the university to hit target. She may allocate to different areas to address constraints for university. He said he is an advocate of AA. The other VPs are advocates for their areas. D. Boschini agrees that the campus needs 20-30 TT lines. The deans are going through the top three for each school. That’s 12 new hires. V. Harper said the list will go beyond the twelve ranked positions. It goes into the matrix. The deans and the Vice Provost agreed on the process. V. Harper will give the deans a raw number for their school and leave it up to them and their chairs to decide. He will do everything he can to address tenure density with the funds allocated by the President. D. Boschini asked how much money will we be spending on the new MPP position in BAS, and on AVP line that’s been opened? How many faculty positions would that fund? J. Tarjan interjected that it would cost two faculty positions. V. Harper said it was the President’s decision. He is an advocate for Academic Affairs and for the faculty. The President’s role is to see across all divisions. E. Correa asked about the eleven positions. She’s the only Tenured faculty member in her department, her numbers are growing, and the work falls on her back. CAFS didn’t get a line. We are disappointed. At the grass roots level students aren’t getting the courses they need to graduate on time. In the meantime, we have the pressure of GI 2025. She thinks the issues are very
connected. The optics are that the administration is not getting it, and it feels like faculty have to walk faster-on crutches. We need classes, and we need faculty to teach those classes. Faculty are being asked to do a lot more with a lot less. The morale issue is connected. They intersect and point to the need for more lines. People are getting burned out. V. Harper agreed with everything said. D. Boschini said that for E. Correa to get relief for her department, she needs to speak to a process where we don’t know what it will yield yet. The answer to the problem is far away and plagued by uncertainty while others are getting their problem solved. T. Davis asks in the middle of the year for an AVP and gets the go-ahead while faculty members don’t know when they will find relief. By the time she does, she could be gone. A. Hegde appreciates that V. Harper is an advocate. CSUB was allocated 11 lines from the legislature based on need. The other CSUs are fulfilling their funds as allocated for TT. If this is where the President is using her authority, it’s very disappointing. The extra money coming is more discretionary. The 11 lines from the initial $1.52 million were specific stated as allocated for Faculty Lines. D. Boschini reminded the Interim Provost that the Senate passed a resolution with at least a consultation on new MPP hires. Having another MPP hire without conversation on why it’s necessary becomes a shared governance issue. At some point, the Senate will get more vocal and active about this. It’s the Senate’s job to be direct and forthright on their responsibility to faculty. V. Harper expressed his appreciation to be brought to the EC’s table. J. Tarjan said that the Governor proposed 8% increase. He spent two years on the former President’s task force developing criteria to allocate positions. There is a department on campus with very low SFR and very few majors whereby their numbers sabotaged the process. He could take any program and he could weight any criteria to be listed as number one. It would be very disappointing not to use SFR, class size, the percent of PT teaching courses, -weighing them heavier- and looking at potential growth. The top number of positions should be a clear reflection of SFR, then the campus is very likely to get them. The most recent tenure density chart reflected ten years of data. Prior to that, the trend shows we went from the top of the system to the second worse. The poor position is being used as a base year when it shouldn’t. When the argument is made, get the historical perspective. D. Boschini said it’s a big topic being discussed all over campus.

ii. Leadership Academy- There is a meeting this week. The budget was discussed with B. Street. It is targeted to faculty, below chair level. There will be a process to apply for the event. The goal is to harness campus talent. The staff academy will be separate.

iii. Time Block Schedule Update – There isn’t a committee or group looking at the issue. The investigation should begin at the start of the academic year.
iv. Financial Aid moved to BAS - The audit of Financial Aid required expertise located in BAS. “Park-and-Fix” for 18 months to decide if Financial Aid stays in BAS or not.

v. GRASP - The compliance expertise is in BAS. “Park and Fix” post award compliance issues. AARC is moving into Academic Programs, reporting to AVP. It’s moving to Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, D. Jackson. D. Boschini said the EC is not taking actions on the above items.

c. Searches

i. Proposed members Search - AVP for Enrollment Management (see previous handout) Members are K. Knutson, B. Street, V. Bethea, K. Krishnan, student board member, and V. Harper’s appointment of an additional faculty member, M. Danforth. V. Harper will not be sitting on the committee; there will be a chair. The job description is being written.

d. Academic Calendar: Scheduling Spring Break –The question is whether it should be midterm or aligned with the K-12 break. The 2019/2020 calendar did not align with either. We, as a campus, failed to satisfy anyone’s preference. The CO’s edict is that the calendar cannot be changed. J. Tarjan suggested using committee-as-a-whole to bring informal discussion and straw vote at Senate. The Senate will give feedback to the calendar committee for standardizing the scheduling of Spring Break.

e. Workload - What constitutes workload?

i. What constitutes a one WTU release? There is graduate thesis supervision of reading, independent studies, and all sorts of things that are uncompensated. There needs to be an accounting and tracking of activities to support a WTU award. Tracking the assigned time that is actually awarded versus the activities that get awarded.

ii. Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)

iii. Is release time consistent?

iv. Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.

v. Schools have different workloads based on different criteria

vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval

vii. Committee load

Referred to FAC.

f. Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee (FHDC) process - The FHDC includes the Faculty Honors and Award Committee (FHAC) and the Senate Vice Chair. There is a need to solidify the process and make sure the structure is the correct one. Look at adding CSUB criteria of extra consideration to people who have served the area, and campus. A. Hegde is a good resource for M. Rush. Referred to FAC.

g. BC/CSUB Partnership (deferred)

h. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation (deferred)

i. Hiring Procedures (deferred)

J. Tarjan moved to extend the meeting. J. Millar had to leave. A. Hedge seconded. Approved.
6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a. Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (see previous handout) M. Danforth is of the understanding that a CSUB class rises to the level of the University Curriculum Committee (CC). BJ Moore’s intent of sending the 7000 course to the EC was for the university to consider review. AAC looks at all curriculum. A course description is needed. Referred to AAC.

   b. Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification (see previous handout) The previous academic jeopardy referral went to AS&SS and AAC. There is a memo from V. Harper to accompany the referral. Referred to AAC and AS&SS.

   c. Possible Referrals
      i. Distributed Learning Committee Policies – Whether the DLC continue to be a committee, and does it decide if classes go online or are taught as hybrid, and the policies around the approval process and who is responsible at each step. There is a need to formalize the DLC and put it in the Handbook. The EC removed the existing referral from FAC to make a new referral to AAC.
      ii. Graduate Directors Term Limits and Review – Handbook Change The issue is to avoid programs becoming person dependent. Graduate Directors are not reviewed, and they don’t have term limits as do Department Chairs. Referred to FAC.

   d. GE Task Force Final Report (see previous handout 1-16 pages) (Pages 17-23 contains lists of members and references.) One of the big issues for NSME is no double counting of units. For those who have accredited programs, there are undesirable consequences. If there is not double counting under the proposed structure, it looks like we may lose units but we may actually add units. The History and Political Science departments are particularly upset. D. Boschini has received dozens of emails from other Senate Chairs. Some are very offended because their campuses have redesigned their General Education (GE) program twice, and the Task Force wants to change it without looking at what faculty has done in response to EO 1000 and EO 1100. There is suspicion on why the GE Task Force Report is coming out. Could there be another EO? J. Tarjan said the discussion amongst ASCSU is for each campus to draft a response. Here, GECCo is a good resource. He recommends that there should be a statement from the Task Force on what they intended, and the impact. Another group, campus based, should make a statement too. Whether there is double counting or not, many don’t understand there are no requirements for any units in American Institutions. It could be demonstrated by examination. There are a lot of nuances to the GE Task Force Report; why silent on GWAR? He would like to see a statement of questions and background to help people understand. Some things are missing. For PEAK, it could be an issue. There is a diversity requirement for lower division GE. The Weber Bill states that campuses must have a course in ethnic studies. If that were mandated in the GE program, we would likely have a second course in business to cover disabilities, gender discrimination, politics, religion, etc. D. Boschini said if Nursing lost all the double counting, the degree would immediately go to 129 units. M. Danforth said with any ABET accredited
program, one would have 35% GE, 25% Math and Science, and 7.5%... J. Tarjan said that the report doesn’t have any standing. However, it is signaling to move in a specific direction. It should be brought up very strongly that we believe your program... M. Danforth said if one believes a program (EBET minimum) we keep double counting but reduce the number of units... J. Tarjan the CO’s GE Task Force is not a decision-making group. D. Boschini said that the GE Task Force Report will be a topic for Open Forum at the Senate this week. The GE Task Force report is #1 for many Senators.

e. Faculty Marshals (deferred)
f. University Week (deferred)
  i. Faculty Meeting

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING MARCH 7, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   
   **Announcements**
   **Consent Agenda**
   Scheduling Spring Break (Time Certain – 10:30)
   **New Business**
   RES 181911 Annual Catalog
   **Old Business**
   RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change * **Second Reading**

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook

The meeting adjourned at noon.