ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, February 11, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100


Visitor: D. Schecter
Absent: J. Millar

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • Faculty Open Forum – Canvas LMS Wednesday February 12 – HCCR 1:00-2:00 p.m.
   • V. Harper is in meetings at the Chancellor’s Office (CO) today.
   • Welcome D. Wilson to the EC. D. Boschini invited her to attend the Senate, and it is understood that there may be schedule conflicts.
   • D. Schecter’s last day is next month.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The top concerns voiced in yesterday’s All Faculty Meeting are tenure density and composition (diversity) of tenure density. A. Hegde requested to add All Faculty Meeting follow-up under NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
J. Tarjan requested that the Wakeforest Wellness Study be added to the Agenda.
M. Rees moved to approve the modified Agenda. M. Danforth seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) (deferred)
- Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report
- Referral 14 New Course Forms and Process
- Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement
- Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas
- Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal
- Referral 19 Winter Term Courses and Units Policy
- Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering
- Referral 22 Criteria for Dean’s List and Graduation with Honors

ii. AS&SS (D. Wilson) J. Millar is finishing 13 and 17. D. Wilson
- Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain
  D. Wilson will begin working with the committee on this item.
- Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – J. Millar is finishing this item.
- Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas - J. Millar is finishing this item.

iii. FAC (M. Rees) (deferred)
- Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined
- Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change
- Referral 11– New Regulations on Consensual Relationship - Handbook Change

iv. BPC (B. Street) (deferred)
- Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas
- Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering

b. Interim Provost Update (D. Schecter)

i. Enrollment Management (EM) Change schedule dates when students are officially on campus, when they apply, when they’re accepted, and when their materials are reviewed. EM changed the date so there would be more information about the students when they register versus having them to change things in the Fall.

Summary of action: effective spring 2020 registration dates for new students will be June 15 for new transfer students and July 15 for new freshman. Enrollment forecasting will be shared with chairs to support their course planning. M. Danforth asked if transfer students with transcripts in hand and who want to enroll in April be told they have to come back in June? Her upper-division Computer Science class fills up around registration. If there are six weeks of continuous enrolling, she won’t be able to do anything with upper-division transfer
students. It’s an ADT problem. She’s already having issues with ADT registering one week behind the current students. Students coming in with a pending ADT assume that they are going to pass those classes they’re currently in. There are classes saved for freshmen, but not saved for transfers. D. Schecter will pass along that the concern is with transfer students.

ii. Mentorship Programs – BPA Academic Certification Program and RAMP (deferred)

c. Searches - Update
   i. AVP Faculty Affairs – the selection is soon so they can shadow D. Schecter.
   ii. AVP Academic Programs
   iii. Dean Antelope Valley – V. Harper is scheduled to visit campus 2/26.
   iv. Dean SS&E – nothing new
   v. Associate Dean SS&E - nothing new
   vi. Dean Library – A. Hegde had explained the process to the librarians and they were happy to be included as appointments by the Interim Provost.
   vii. Faculty Ombudsperson - deferred
   viii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability - deferred

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation - deferred

e. Handbook Error Log - deferred

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

   a. RTP – levels of review - The Provost is the Chief Academic Officer. President Zelezny’s time can be spent on other things that only she can and must do. It’s not unreasonable. Other campuses do it. We don’t have to do what other campuses do. We would want to hear more from her and discuss, especially if we were to change the process. The President can do whatever she wants; the Provost can be overruled on anything. There is an advantage to faculty. Perhaps we can cut some steps. It would be a lengthy process. Look at the CBA where they may dictate the process. Where there is promotion, it has to come from the President. At the very least, it’s a form letter with the President’s stamp or initials, even if it’s truly the Provost’s office that works through the decision. Review the Handbook and CBA language to consider possible delegation to the Provost to formally make decisions related to RTP, tenure and promotion.

   b. RTP Issues: Implementation and Handbook Language (handouts) M. Danforth asked whether to look at the issues that C. Lam raised about the URC process. D. Boschini recommended a look at other campus’ processes. What the CBA says is what the Handbook says. If other campuses have figured out how to handle it, we could learn from them. D. Schecter has a spreadsheet on that. Refer to C. Lam’s email for important points about URC. Wrap those ideas into it. There are parts of the
Handbook that never got updated. D. Boschini asked for two referrals drafts: 1) President & Provost decision making as the final step in the RTP process. 2) The clean-up of the Handbook language. The representative sample of SOCs, determined by some small group no longer applies. The CBA says all SOCs. The first two reviews may have one semester. Should they have the first year in with the second semester second year review? D. Schecter asked to wait on the referral because the Deans have been asked to come up with a better schedule. M. Danforth said that the URC from C. Lam’s perspective, one review only goes to the Dean’s office and the URC doesn’t see year-one materials. If they only look at the second semester, year-two, the URC never sees year-one. D. Wilson recommended looking at multi-year reviews. The format has to be different for a five-year review. What the Handbook says to do, one can’t possibly do. D. Boschini said that the changing from Q-S has substantive consequences.

b. Ethnic Studies Call for Feedback – Task Force – J. Tarjan referenced the information on the list.serve. “The Chancellor’s Office invites campus input on AS-3403-20/AA Recommended Implementation of a California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Requirement. Although we welcome general comments, in particular we ask for your feedback on three specific sections of the resolution: (A) the ethnic studies learning outcomes; (B) a 3-unit requirement at the lower division and an upper-division “reflective element” requirement; and (C) evaluation of courses by Ethnic Studies faculty.” The feedback is on the proposal, not to restructure what is currently in place. We need to be careful that the people who respond represent the whole faculty. The EC requested that V. Harper form a group to form a response. It would be helpful to have coordination between GECCo and Ethnic Studies. Looking at other campus’ response, there are strong voices with departmental concerns and then there are those who don’t want to go through the work of the change. J. Tarjan said the Chair’s Council may be interested to know that CSUB has designated official voices of faculty, the Senate, and they did not weigh in on EO 1100 revised and EO 1110. He feels it’s being bypassed.

d. GECCo overview - deferred

e. All Faculty Meeting follow-up (handout) D. Boschini collected the faculty concerns that were entered on the registration form and those verbally expressed at the meeting. The themes are Workload, Faculty Hiring, Equity, Shared Governance, Communication, and Ethical culture. Ethical culture can be interpreted to mean academic integrity of students. Ethical culture touches different areas, i.e. equity, shared governance and shared communication. There were specific comments about class sizes.
Two strong themes emerged: 1) Communication and the lack of creates all kinds of problems in perceived lack of fairness, shady decision-making, and people not following process. The basic concern is the lack of communication. 2) Increase interest in talking about equity and fairness between schools, individual faculty members, workload, between minority faculty and other faculty. D. Boschini’s impression is that whatever the topic is, make sure that it’s transparent, clearly communicated, and done fairly. M. Danforth said looking at the workload and equity issues, she came out from the meeting with the sense of disparity between the schools in handling large class sizes. Some schools give extra WTUs if one’s class gets above a certain number and other schools may or may not be compensated accordingly. We’re butting-up to the classic problem that we don’t have the resources to address the enrollment growth that we’re already experiencing. We have large class sizes and don’t have the tenure-track density. Kern County is growing. There are going to be more students coming out of the high school district. CSUB enrollment is only going to increase. It’s very difficult to teach all of them. D. Boschini asked that D. Schecter relay the take away to the Interim Provost: 1) class size can’t increase with no boundaries. It’s an equity concern because some schools and departments are feeling pressured to have massive classes. There are other classes that are more in keeping with what the GE classes have adopted. The class size issue will need to be addressed by the Senate next year if there aren’t some limits put in place. We should not be pressured to increase our workload endlessly. Classrooms can only handle a certain number of students, but teaching should be based on the content and what the students need, not by the size of the classroom. 2) If the budget doesn’t increase next year, it means that we end up with the same budget and the same number of students to serve. If we are deciding this far in advance that there will be no faculty expansion hires, we should also see the decision that there will be no staff expansion hires and no MPP expansion hires. To completely cut-off improving our faculty situation while we entertain MPP requests and see that the Cabinet is creating new positions, the Senate will take a strong position for Academic Affairs to have the same opportunity for expansion hires. It’s not time to fight about it because we don’t know the budget yet. A. Hegde added 1) for the last three years the barrier has been the budget, at the same time there isn’t a visible commitment from the Administration to find some money—even one tenure-track line. There always seems a way to move people from soft money to stateside because we need people in UA to be on stateside. Also, there is the elevation of positions to AVPs. When it comes to the Academic side, we have to make a strong case for hiring, but the Staff and MPP doesn’t have to fight for their new positions. 2) Maybe it’s time to push back. There is the Capital Campaign.
Perhaps we can get some money to do the things we need to do. The school of BPA has close to 1400 students, 50 FT faculty, 50 PT faculty, and only two ASCs. When asked, the response is we think you need it, but we don’t have the money. The response should be that the Administration will find the money-externally or by some other means. We cannot continue the operation without the proper support. The school keeps adding students even though we don’t have enough faculty. The average introduction class size is 75. It doesn’t count for two courses because we can’t afford to have it count as two sections. A. Hegde is going to ask his department to stop taking oversized student load. Unless it affects graduation rates we’re not going to get any action from the Administration. It’s all about improving the numbers. If we offer limited lower division courses, the students will to BC or ask why aren’t we getting these sections. When that starts affecting graduation rates, then something will happen. D. Boschini suggested that if there is a stagnant budget and no faculty hiring, the EC create a resolution this spring to call on the Administration, the Cabinet, the President, stating that if there is no faculty hiring that there be no additional positions across the university. It would be fantastic if they find the money for faculty hiring. J. Tarjan said that there is a very high number of graduate students who are taking courses from Part Time (PT) lecturers. BPA has the largest graduate program. Other departments hire lecturers to teach foundational courses. BPA hires lecturers to teach across the board. He has asked repeatedly about the criteria for hiring positions. BPAs classes are four to five times the size of other majors. We have the highest ratio of graduates and lowest cost in the university. We have severe budget restrictions we need to look at. We took on AV on marginal cost and we can’t make that up unless we get a center allocation. The state has to make a commitment for some of that. Athletics is chewing up more than 10% of our budget. It is an unbelievable burden. It is greater than any other campus in the system. How do we to recover from the increase in hiring of administration and staff? It has ramped up dramatically in the last twelve years while the faculty numbers have gone down. We need to look at impaction. The President doesn’t want to do that. The Provost doesn’t want to do that. We cannot offer quality education without qualified faculty. M. Danforth concerned that only B. Street and she represent faculty on the Space Management Committee and alarmed that they may dictate class sizes. The committee speaks in terms of classroom utilization when instead, the decisions should be faculty driven. The committee consists of administrators from every school and others. Only 2/10 voting members are faculty. D. Boschini observed that the non-voting members, are the people who help make good plans and are the support staff for implementation. Faculty doesn’t need to be involved in the non-teaching spaces. M. Danforth said
that 80% of the Space Management Committee’s conversation was about classrooms utilization. Some of the deans are more numbers oriented than pedagogy oriented. D. Boschini asked that D. Schecter pass along the request that V. Harper talk to the deans. Do they understand what they are supposed to do? She would hope that K. Madden is fighting for what faculty need. M. Danforth said that classroom utilization as a pathway to obtaining more buildings seems to be more important that pedagogy. D. Schecter said there is a Dean’s Council meeting next Tuesday where this can be an agenda item. D. Boschini would like to hear from the Deans on what is their perceived purpose as a member on the Space Management Committee and what is their position on space and how faculty’s agenda and Dean’s agenda intersect. J. Tarjan suggested that once a report or recommendation is received, this could be referred to committee. The system level impacts Academic Operations. The Senate could weigh in on how the policy is implemented. B. Street recommended that the topic stay within the umbrella of academics; Teaching decisions and spaces. He agrees that the main focus of the committee was on utilization. While it’s important to maximize in order to get more space, he worries about what the number means in the long run. The Capital Campaign may accelerate things and it would be bad to be left behind. M. Danforth shared that the Space Management Committee also talked about time blocks, which is definitely faculty’s purview. A. Hegde suggested revisiting the charge of the committee. We don’t want the Space Management Committee to come up with time-blocks. M. Danforth and B. Street consistently say that faculty needs to look at the topics brought up. While the committee has problems they need to solve, they are skipping steps, coming up with solutions that are not always in the best interest of students and faculty. J. Tarjan said when there are functionally designed communication (versus holistic) it gets done at the top and siloed. There needs to be a mechanism for collaboration – committees, task forces, a liaison, etc. He suggested that the information flowing back and forth is overwhelming under the current mechanism. How do we facilitate the kind of communication by EC and the other units where decision-making can be informed by everyone. It’s clear that there is a structural problem. We’ve become excessively siloed. The extreme solution is to instill job rotation between units. D. Boschini said that some of us have relationships with people; there is some direct communication to other groups. When one has those relationships, a lot can get done. However, it can raise a perception that some people have deferential preference, privileges, etc. There was agreement in the room that faculty complaints about other units have been rising. The discussion to be continued at next EC; Communication Silos and Collaboration Mechanism.
Assigned Time - There was a question at the All Faculty Meeting about Assigned Time. The person was referred to the Academic Affairs website, document and forms. The 2019 list will be posted after the ABD reports from each department are processes. It normally posts each summer after the AY. There is concern that not everything shows up. Some school issue 6 WTUs for large class, it shows up as release, and that leaves questions. The type of data doesn’t answer all the questions nor fall into the classification code that’s needed. D. Schecter asked for suggestions. M. Danforth repeated an issue that was discussed in DCLC. The way the school is coding into the system creating inconsistencies across the campus. Each school’s Budget Analyst is coding into the system differently. D. Boschini said there is an opportunity for the Budget Analysts for the four schools to get together. The school analysts are dealing with what the department level analysts enter. D. Schecter will ask about the double sections.

Faculty hiring - D. Boschini said the feedback at the All Faculty Meeting was that the 34 faculty hires appear to lack diversity. She couldn’t respond. She requested data regarding diversity to show that there is progress. D. Schecter will share the data. People don’t identify their race and ethnicity when applying. The strategic group is discussing the sensitivity to releasing it and how and who should receive it? We’re lacking in African American faculty and have improved in hiring more women. D. Boschini said that the permanent Provost will want to spend time on this. Strategy Plan Group #2 had the discussion. There is a challenge in sharing even the good news. Consider having a faculty hiring diversity symposium. Those interested can get into the data. The call continues to come up and we need to respond. D. Schecter’s committee monitors how we’re doing. M. Rees noted that the institution can’t hire based on their race. It seems that the conversations and the pressure goes to what we’re not supposed to do. The objective is to have students graduate and move on. D. Boschini sees the need for a conversation with everyone in the room so the issue is laid out from the perspective of the law, and then communicate the guidelines we’re following. M. Danforth is part of a group being trained on how to attract a diverse pool. The wording of the advertisement for a position and how candidate applications are processed makes a difference. The focus is on community and diversity and dynamics to get across to potential candidates. What are their academic strengths relative to where they are right now. Their ranking ABD relative to an assistant professor. The group has their final training in March and the plan is to train others on campus next spring and the following fall. She found that since she updated the hiring language there were 25% females applying, yet only 15% of females getting their Phd. The problem is the timing – we’re losing to other campuses that are ahead of the process. D. Boschini
said hiring is a great topic for DCLC. The law says certain things. Training would be helpful and useful. There are pressures to do things. What do we do and what’s acceptable. There is a challenge in hiring American Ph.D when faculty positions pay much less than what candidates can receive elsewhere. A. Hegde suggested include increase efforts to improve diversity when talking about tenure-density. J. Tarjan said we still need to hear from the Provost what numbers are needed to justified hiring of faculty and how the positions are allocated. D. Boschini calls on the Provost to make it transparent. How are the number of positions per school determined? Can we send the issue to FAC to come up with recommendations? A. Hegde when the school isn’t getting the needed number of lines, it’s hard to decide the allocation within the school. M. Rees said it’s hard to standardize when there are different needs that don’t match the metrics. SFR would be a legitimate reason to consider. Sometimes it’s a small program trying to expand, or another program trying to meet California credentials, etc. We have to be flexible with that. We need to hire more FT Lecturers so as to not take advantage of PT Lecturers. Make FT Lecturers part of the conversation when discussing tenure-density. Discussion ensued. The hiring habits are enshrined. There is a pattern over the years where schools who “haven’t gotten their fair share” then all of a sudden their things get weighed when a temporary Dean is placed. Soft criteria is used and it often doesn’t seem justified. Now we are zero, based upon hard data. We put all this data in Tableau and it doesn’t get the proper attention. Even if FAC provided a formula whereby 50% of the positions were filled using this data, and that other set of criteria, when it gets to the Provost’s office, the decision will be made according to that purview. D. Schecter said that there was significant amount of data presented at the hiring meeting than anytime before. It doesn’t mean the outcome was any different. The decision process was using data. Before any referral is made, let us have V. Harper discuss what was considered and what is his plan in April and May for new hires. There can be discussion about process and the data. D. Boschini heard from V. Harper that he wants to provide more transparency. Discussion ensued. Not all the chairs have been asked to produce data. There is a difference per school. The Provost needs to work with the Deans and learn what their school’s process is. Hearing from chairs from different schools, the process has changed and it’s different from one school to another. The suggestion is for the schools to use the same position request form.

Resources are needed for Counseling Faculty, Staff Advisors and Faculty Advisors.

f. Wakeforest Wellness Study findings shows high level of anxiety and low engagement at CSUB. J. Tarjan suggested compare with other schools in the Central Valley.
7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING February 20, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
     - President Zelezny’s Report – Time Certain 10:05 – 10:20
     - Enrollment Management Updates: Dr. Dwayne Cantrell – Time Certain 10:20-10:30
   - Consent Agenda
   - Old Business
     - RES 192009 Faculty Membership on Search Committee for the Provost & VP of AA – Handbook Change
   - New Business

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   - Invite R. Weller to the Senate. Send some questions and ask about DLC.
   - Invite L. Paris to the Senate next year.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**