ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, October 15, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100

Absent: D. Boschini

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Budget Forum October 21, Student Union MPR 11:00 am – Noon
   Trustee Fong October 24, 1:10 – 2:10 location TBD – if cannot attend forward questions to A. Hegde.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Danforth moved to approve the October 1, 2019 Minutes via email. B. Street seconded. Minutes to be approved by email.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   A. Hegde suggested to move NEW DISCUSSION Commencement Ceremony to first order, item a. M. Rees moved to approve the modified agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
         ▪ Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – the committee has a joint meeting scheduled with BPC. She will invite R. Dawson from EEGO.
         ▪ Referral 10– Ethnic Studies as a GE Requirement – Response to the Task Force Report – It will be addressed after Referral 04, as there is a deadline for campuses to submit their response. AAC’s plan is to bring up the Ethnic Studies Report  A. Hegde doesn’t have access to the site for campus response because it was sent to the Academic Senate Chairs. When he receives campus response, he will send it to D. Boschini. J. Tarjan suggested that M. Danforth consult with GECCO because that’s
where the campus’ current diversity requirements are housed. M. Danforth plans to have GECCo Faculty Director L. Paris or J. Tarjan attend AAC’s meeting. J. Tarjan said that the response is urgent because Senator Pan is trying to be CSU’s advocate to find a way forward without passing through the legislature. Faculty doesn’t want government to legislate the curriculum. Senator Pan has asked for 1) An update on the response to the Task Force Report. That’s already been done. 2) What do campuses want to do? For example, does CSUB want to have discretion to handle diversity (like sexual studies) the manner we want, or do we welcome a mandate to include in the GE requirement? If CSUB doesn’t weigh in, the campus will not have a voice in it. The bill has been suspended so that campuses can work together to say what learning outcomes are important. Senator Pan wants the ammunition to weigh in. M. Danforth will request that GECCo provide written feedback to AAC. GECCo meets 10/18. J. Tarjan said he would probably write the response. A. Hegde said it would be appropriate because J. Tarjan sits on both the ASCSU committee and GECCo. D. Boschini will send the response, if needed.

- Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – AAC plans to invite M. Palaiologou to walk the committee through the report.
- Referral 14 New Course Forms and Process – looked at it but the committee ran out of time.
- Referral 15 Interdisciplinary Studies New Course Proposals
- Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement – ran out of time but the committee and the strong recommendation to look at what other campuses.

ii. AS&SS (J. Millar)
- Referral 05 Canvas Pilot - J. Millar met with F. Gorham. J. Millar’s perception is that Canvas doesn’t have anything substantively bad or threatening to students or faculty. The procurement law is that every five years a software program has to go out for rebid. J. Millar is concerned that if CSUB was at the tail end of the system-wide rebid process, that this campus would not get the best software. Per F. Gorham, Canvas hasn’t peaked in its effectiveness to add tools and be responsive. The difficulty is that it is a big change from Blackboard. It’s not helpful to say in five years CSUB will make another change. If Canvas were adopted, there is a way to work with Procurement to extend the five year rebid requirement by adding annual license
renewal. He thinks that part of the resistance is that the pilot went too fast. The IT industry does move fast. The license expires June 2020. The decision has to happen quickly to get all the support in place. Blackboard has not been investing in its program adequately. It takes longer to get new tools. Canvas is reinvesting in its program development. J. Millar advised F. Gorham that some of the resistance is that it appears to be a done deal without proper faculty input. M. Danforth said that when CSUB moved from Web CT to Blackboard, instead of IT saying here’s Blackboard, there was a task force committee that evaluated Blackboard and other LMS to conduct a more open conversation. M. Danforth said that this is just not about process. It’s also that the particular software program does matter. The LMS does affect how online classes are taught and capabilities to handle homework. Canvas can’t replicate chemistry symbols, thus can’t represent course handouts, so instructors are back at the photocopier. It’s not just resistance to IT’s presentation of their solution, - there is a need to identify the problems and tie them to the solution. The functionality of the LMS matters in the delivery of the content. Another example is the online SOCI tool. As long as the SOCI content is the same, it doesn’t matter if one uses Survey Monkey or Qualtrics. A survey is a survey. However, for LMS the functionality matters in the delivery of the content. A. Hegde replied that the EC’s lengthly discussion underscores that need for the AS sub committees to deliberate. We have the Canvas Pilot Report and we’ll refer to committees. J. Tarjan observed that organizations have “loser effect” whereby a group builds a commitment to something, and if one doesn’t agree, then that dissenter is wrong. The effect is an escalating commitment. That’s why it’s important to collaborate early on. Also, sometimes staff see it makes their life easier but they don’t consider the end-user. The service function is missed. We don’t have sufficient communication and support at the core of what we do – teaching, learning, and research. The best we can do is follow the process of going through committees. M. Rees requested that the rubric for decision making presented in the Canvas Pilot Report be clarified whether it’s the way the decision is going to be made. It shows 40% faculty voice, 40% student voice, and 20% ecosystem. J. Millar inquired whether the resolution from ASI will be counted as the 40% student voice. M. Rees shared that Canvas costs more. What will we not have
if we adopt Canvas; how will it affect our Budget? In the meantime Blackboard training has disappeared. It has been replaced by Canvas training. Thus, it looks like the decisions have been made to use Canvas because that’s where the support is. A. Hegde said that the features in Blackboard are breaking down. M. Rees said that Blackboard offers more flexibility in grading tools. That’s important. Knowing the pros and cons beyond “students are used to one thing”. College is about learning new things.

- Referral 03 ASI Executive Director as Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member of Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - Bylaws Change. J. Millar said the minutes contained the language for the resolution. The resolution will be forwarded to make the October 24th Senate meeting.
- Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain – pending discussion
- Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – R. Alvarez (Students Rights and Responsibilities Director), and BJ Moore will be invited to attend. M. Palaiologou, Ombudsperson teaches a class so she’s unable to attend. J. Millar will forward the minutes of AS&SS’s conversations with the Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibility (OSRR) R. Alvarez, and BJ Moore to AAC Chair, M. Danforth.

iii. FAC (M. Rees)
- Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined – the committee developed questions to ask. She got some information from DCLC.
- Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change - pending discussion
- Referral 09 Faculty Membership on Search Committee for the Provost & VP of AA – Handbook Change - pending discussion
- Referral 11– New Regulations on Consensual Relationship - Handbook Change - pending discussion

iv. BPC (B. Street)
- Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – the joint meeting scheduled for this Thursday. Discussion will determine the need for another meeting.
- Referral 07 Academic Calendar – Spring and Fall Semester Breaks – Brian asked for the Calendar Committee minutes. November 14 they are to present 20-21 and 21-22 calendar drafts. General senate presentation of the 2020-2021 Calendar. From Commencement Committee request that
the date be removed from calendar. Next year’s fall commencement will be determined based on how many graduate. It is fluid due to number of students and the constraint of prior commitments to space. M. Danforth suggested that the Calendar Committee can provide a revision date. Omitting it from the calendar creates student confusion and inconvenience. The commencement committee could add one person to the calendar task force. I the end, the Commencement Committee chooses the date.
b. Interim Provost Update (handout) AMP two stages to the approval:
Academic Master Plan – It contains proposed and existing degree programs. This needs to be approved by AS, signed off by President, and sent to CO to approve the development proposal. Then the faculty in the department develop the degree proposal to be approved. Then it gets sent to the CO to approve the degree. There was a campus-wide email to announce interest to receive program proposals to be put on the AMP. New program proposals are underlined. The focus is on the changes (underline). M. Danforth asked if a department elevates a concentration to a degree, if it has to be on the AMP. V. Harper’s response: No, the concentration elevation is a separate process. It goes to the CO and not the BOT. Please have Senate approve by the second to the last meeting. As degrees are making through the curricular process through the schools, we make a determination as to the funding. For example, if the Masters in Accountancy is approved by the school, then the BPA Dean could ask for hires to support the new lines. Not every program that goes forward gets implemented. To be referred to AAC and BPC upon receipt of the program process forms.
c. Searches - Update
i. AVP Academic Programs – no update
ii. Dean SS&E – start consultation with SSE next week. B. Street concerned with timeline. Composition of committee and whether the schools are comfortable for Spring hire. Announcement February 1st.
iii. Associate Dean SS&E stable to the end of the year
iv. Faculty Director of Interdisciplinary Studies applications received
v. Faculty Director of the Teaching and Learning Center advisory board finalizing that call
vi. Faculty Ombudsperson - call out at the end of month
vii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability – call also at the end of month
d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a. Commencement Ceremonies - Faculty Marshals The discussion was on how to decide who performs as Faculty Marshall at the three events: Fall, Spring, and Undergraduate Commencement. One idea is to ask for preference. A. Hegde will email individuals.

   b. Bring Your Own Device Task Force – there was only one response to the call. M. Danforth was appointed as the Academic Senate Representative

   c. Canvas Pilot Report (handout) Referred to AAC, and BPC.

   d. Staff Recommendation – Search Committee Provost & VP AA – HR sent out the call and ran an election. J. Tarjan moved to approve J. Paschal.

   e. Interdisciplinary BS degree in Public Health Proposal (handout) T. McBride, when he was faculty, invited BJ Moore and A. Hegde during the planning. This was a faculty-driven proposal, even though T. McBride is currently the Associate Dean of NSME. AAC serves as the Curriculum Committee (CC) on interdisciplinary proposals. M. Danforth will invite BPA CC chair BJ Moore, NSME CC chair J. Trigos-Arrieta, and the SS&E CC chair R. Dugan to AAC. J. Tarjan recommended inviting the PPA chair. Referred to AAC. They will make recommendation to the Senate.

   f. Policy – Winter Term: appropriate courses and units – A. Hegde said that during a recent DCLC meeting, J. Patino of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO) and oversees Winter Term said that in the past, students were limited to one course in the three week term. She does not see why students should be restricted to one course. Policy needs to be developed. If faculty doesn’t have a policy, people outside of academics will make decisions about academics. Originally, Winter Term was intended for remedial courses and special interests only. To go from three units to multiple units puts pressure on students that won’t have an opportunity to digest the material. J. Tarjan gave a statistics class as an example. It reduces the probability that students will have passing grades in three weeks when the learning builds from section to section and they are doing five sections a day. M. Danforth suggested that there be a statement from the faculty saying that students can only take one course per Winter Term and that certain types of courses are not suitable for Winter Term. For example, one could not expect Math 2200 students to pass, let alone take another class. Referred to AAC.

   g. Summer Service – People are expected to be on campus for meetings while not on contract. M. Danforth was asked to attend several meetings this summer and she had to say no, it’s not part of my compensation. She had only 40 hours of chair duty allocated to her, even though it takes more time. A. Hegde said that
poor planning on the part of administration should not impact faculty. Example: ATI Task Force. The letter from the CO arrived in March. The committee did not request faculty participation until late early May, to address Instructional Material. He volunteered his time without compensation. J. Tarjan said that we are asked to do all these extraordinary things to get students through, and we do. Yet, it undermines the Collective Bargaining Agreement in the long run. M. Rees said certain offices aren’t aware or they forget. J. Tarjan suggested that Summer Service be put on DCLC agenda. The discussion ensued. Not a referral yet. The Interim Provost will remind administrators that the faculty are not available during the summer to attend meetings. Please don’t ask faculty to

h. GRaSP – the park and fix in BAS has resulted in moving management of the department back to GRaSP. However, the Post Award is still in BAS

i. Financial Aid – the park and fix in BAS has resulted in moving management back to Enrollment Management.

j. Committee list in Handbook – AAC in the process of putting DLC in Handbook and noticed other issues in the Handbook. Example: CARS was discontinued but it is still listed. J. Tarjan said that J. Kegley was part of a task force that saw that the committee list out of date and the functions of the committees are not in the Handbook and some shouldn’t go in there. A. Hegde sees that the implementation of resolutions needs follow-through. J. Millar did some updates years ago. Possibly refer to FAC for committee update and then have a summer task force and take a portion of it. J. Millar volunteered to take a section. So did A. Hegde. J. Tarjan suggested that the Handbook be signed off by the President and the Chair of Senate. Broader group that answers what faculty can do. The repository of Faculty Issues is not a “University Handbook”. The item is tabled until the next meeting.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING October 24, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   - Announcements
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
     - RES AS Exec Director add member on AS&SS
   - Old Business
     - RES 192002 Distributed Learning Committee Handbook Changes - Second Reading
     - RES 192003 SOCIs for Summer and Winter Courses - Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**