ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, November 12, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100

Absent: A. Hegde, V. Harper

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
A. Hegde is at the Naturalization Ceremony, becoming an U.S. citizen.
V. Harper scheduled his alternate to be here, but today his alternate is not available.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
B. Street moved to approve the October 29, 2019 Minutes. M. Rees seconded. Minutes approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
D. Boschini suggested to skip over items that are Provost-dependent, and to address only those necessary items so the EC could attend the Naturalization Ceremony. J. Millar moved to approve the modified Agenda. M. Rees seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
a. AS Log (handout)
i. AAC (M. Danforth)
   ▪ Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – AAC is working on a resolution with J. Stark of BPC to be ready for the next Senate meeting.
   ▪ Referral 10– Ethnic Studies as a GE Requirement – (deferred)
   ▪ Referral 14 New Course Forms and Process (deferred)
   ▪ Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement (deferred)
   ▪ Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas – Joint meeting with AS&SS and BPC scheduled for December 12.
   ▪ Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal (deferred)
- Referral 19 Winter Term Courses and Units Policy (deferred)
- Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering (deferred)

ii. AS&SS (J. Millar)
- Referral 05 Canvas Pilot (pending report)
- Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain – on the agenda for November 14.
- Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – D. Boschini requested that when one hears concerns, ask the person to refer those comments to J. Millar with specific examples to the degree possible, the name of the faculty member(s), the problem they are experiencing, at what point did the process break down, and did a person mishandle their responsibility. In order to effect policy change, it requires the specifics. If there is a department chair interfering with faculty’s ability to assign a grade fairly – fixing the department chair problem is probably the start. If that has not already occurred, then make sure all those other steps have happened. If there are breakdowns that aren’t being addressed, the policies of the department or school could help. Several points were raised:
  - There are serial offenders and nothing seems to happen to them.
  - Faculty doesn’t know where the reporting goes and the consequences.
  - There may be personnel issues whereby people need direction.
  - What are the things that could be done to the serial offenders – such a policies to state in the syllabus- if you cheat you get an F in the course?
  - If yes, what’s the follow-up on that?
  - If someone has an F in many courses, at what point can the school expell them?
  - If Administration doesn’t enforce a standard, people will continue to cheat.
  - Equity is that one doesn’t cheat and it applies to everyone.
  - Is there a need for a policy that states that students taking courses at AV must be registered as an AV student?
  - Some faculty feel what they wrote in the syllabus is not protecting them enough to fail a student for the entire class, so they fail them for the assignment. Thus, the cheater squeaks through the class with a C or a D, and then is apt to repeat offense(s).
  - Faculty is afraid of the harassment if a student is given a zero on an assignment and/or the student fails in the course or the faculty fails.
  - Some faculty have gone up the chain of command, without satisfaction.
- Faculty need Administration’s support.
- The catalog policy needs to be reviewed for consistency with Handbook.
- It’s not clear which policies the grievance committee supports which policies they wouldn’t support.
- Is serial offending handled differently per program? There are severe implications when a nursing student makes a calculation error. What are the academic consequences?
- Where Academic Programs are Professional Programs, (for example, Accounting with Professional Ethics Standards) how far are we applying consequential actions when a student can’t demonstrate professional ethics in line with the standards of the profession? At what point is the student prohibited from that major?
- Even when there are clear violations, there aren’t any actions. A SSD student altered the blue form (legal document) about the test parameters when he turned it into the SSD office.
- It’s easier to cheat now.
- **Academic Integrity Policy**, “Any repeated violation of academic integrity shall result in more serious academic sanctions. Normally, this will include suspension or expulsion from the university with a note on the student’s permanent record.”
- Where is the permanent record and how does a faculty member access it?
- There are different levels of violations. Plagiarism can occur when too many quotes are in a paper, and that’s different than having someone else take the student’s exam.
- When the policy was first written, the campus didn’t experience academic dishonesty as we are currently. It’s so rampant now, that many people are not being caught.
- The character of the student is a problem. It is different when somebody misquotes – that’s a developmental issue. For a student to turn in a paper written by someone else as the student’s work is a much greater offense and it’s a characterological issue. It’s avoidance of a number of things.
- Are we or CSU set-up to deal with characterological problems?
- Changing the SSD blue card is a high offense; it is a legal document that affords some things to a person not available to others. That is a consequence of its own accord.
We see students who work two or three jobs and who do their own work to earn their grade. When others cheat without consequence it reflects on the university when the Administration doesn’t uphold academic integrity.

OSRR is treating the blatant violations as teaching situations and have moved on.

Where students know what they are doing – like texting someone in another country for answers during an exam and understanding the consequences - the student shouldn’t be handled with education and warnings.

Separate academic dishonesty and plagiarism.

If we put too much focus on plagiarism, we miss the stronger issue of behavioral problems.

There are times when faculty aren’t as supportive. We need to make sure that people who are saying you’re in trouble for doing such-and-such, need to be well versed in policy and the proper steps to take.

The Interim Provost is supportive of faculty.

D. Boschini reiterated the importance of having specific examples because as every department chair knows, the first story is not the whole story. The layers the department chair has to go through to get to the bottom of the issue may not put faculty at zero-fault. The more one looks into it, there is more information that need to be shared. We don’t want to take muddy examples and bring them forward if they haven’t been properly handled and use them as evidence that a certain person or office has failed. The muddiness creates the mess of no one knowing what should have been done in the first place and what really happened.

Suggestions to AAC and AS&SS and other actions:

1. T. Wallace attend the joint meeting of AAC and AS&SS December 12.
2. Add representative language in the syllabus section of the Handbook that protects faculty when they report academic dishonesty.
3. At the minimum, the syllabus language states that CSUB classifies any unfair advantage as cheating, and the penalties will be upheld.
4. The syllabus state that all instances if academic dishonesty be reported to the chair and the Dean’s office, etc.
5. An information campaign at campus level – define what constitutes academic dishonesty. Is it giving fake doctor’s notes to get an extension or drop a class? There are a lot of examples of what academic dishonesty
could be, yet no clarity what is potentially a teaching issue and where to draw the line on the ethical issues.

- Discuss academic integrity with the President during her visit to EC.
- Ask OSRR what happens when there is a clear violation (altering a legal document) for one reported offense and many reported offenses.
- Consider a point system where the student is expelled at five points or greater. Someone altering documents is five points. Handing in the same paper in two classes is two points. Plagiarism is three points. Having someone else take a test is five points. Differentiate the nature of offenses, establish a hard cap of tolerance, and enforce it.
- Make the process clear. Faculty and students must know if someone writes an exam for a student, the student is separated from the university. It’s over.
- Feature academic integrity during University Week to educate everyone, including PT lecturers. Distribute a handout so everyone is on the same page. Show a step procedure, where errors are identified, and where violations need to be turned in. Otherwise, the errors will happen over and over again. State a clear policy and as a campus, we all get on board to implement academic integrity. Do if for every class and support each other.
- Do the right thing.
  - Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas – waiting for F. Gorham’s feedback on the three questions. A joint meeting with AAC, AS&SS, and BPC is scheduled for December 12.

iii. FAC (M. Rees)
  - Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined - (deferred)
  - Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change - (deferred)
  - Referral 09 Faculty Membership on Search Committee for the Provost & VP of AA – Handbook Change - (deferred)
  - Referral 11– New Regulations on Consensual Relationship - Handbook Change - (deferred)

iv. BPC (B. Street)
  - Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – See AAC.
  - Referral 07 Academic Calendar – Spring and Fall Semester Breaks – The committee to review draft calendars for 2020-21, Summer 2021, and 2021-22
- Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas - B. Street will follow-up with F. Gorham on the answers to the three questions in preparation of the joint meeting with AAC, AS&SS, and BPC scheduled for December 12.
- Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering – (deferred)

b. Interim Provost Update – no report

c. Searches - Update
   i. Provost Search – J. Tarjan reported that the search committee meets again next Monday to finalize a job description and the search firm.
   ii. AVP Academic Programs (no news)
   iii. Dean SS&E – The call for faculty nominations to the Search Committee went out this morning.
   iv. Associate Dean SS&E (no news)
   v. Faculty Director of Interdisciplinary Studies (no news)
   vi. Faculty Director of the Teaching and Learning Center – the Call for Interest went out.
   vii. Faculty Ombudsperson (no news)
   viii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability (no news)

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – B. Street meets with T. Davis twice a month. Discussion ensued. The information shared at the Budget Forum was an improvement, but we do not see part of the decision process. Until we have comparison with other campuses, and our historical comparison data, we don’t have transparency and can’t plan for the future. There are IRPA critics and defenders. For the past six months, BAS said that they couldn’t keep up with what they needed to do and to make sure data was right because they were short-staffed. BAS just lost two key employees. It’s getting difficult to see improvement. While the Budget Forum’s purpose was to inform the campus what’s been done, we need additional information to be part of the budget process. There appears to be lack of appreciation of the charge of the university and the need to have more faculty lines to improve the quality of education, etc. Personnel has changed but there is still a culture of not sharing information and not valuing faculty contribution in decision-making. If comparisons are not available, on what basis are decisions being made? If comparisons are available, why aren’t they being shared? The technology tool that was touted to provide reports for analysis is still unavailable. Several campuses are in the same situation. Questica is still in the integration phase and not functional to provide the data we need. D. Boschini said that the budget sharing occurs where a President directs the CFO to interact with the Academic
Senate. Our President has a strong shared-governance background. Faculty really wants to be partners with BAS.
e. Handbook Error Log – Include the topic in Academic Senate Announcements.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Proposal for Online Catalog Management System (handout) – M. Danforth opined that is a revision to Referral #14 New Course Forms and Process: How to do course updates and program updates. Invite the person in charge to make a presentation to AAC. D. Boschini said to wrap it into Referral 14 if it makes sense to do so. M. Danforth said it’s an online system to manage #14.
b. Minimum IELTS and TOEFL scores for international graduate students (handout) received from D. Jackson based on her analysis of what other campuses require. We didn’t have a number for IELTS, and the TOEFL score needs to be increased to bring us in line with other campuses. Referred to AAC.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING November 21, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
Announcements
Consent Agenda
New Business
RES - First Reading
Old Business

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

9. ADJOURNMENT
D. Boschini adjourned the meeting at 10:45 so the members could see A. Hegde give his Oath of Allegiance as a new citizen of the U.S.