ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, February 25, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100

Absent: Brian Street

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • B. Street has a candidate interview today.
   • Continuity Planning was discussed at during the Statewide Senate meeting, in the event the Covid-19 situation cause the campus to close. D. Boschini passed that CSU AS Chairs’ conversation to V. Harper. D. Boschini is on the CSUB Continuity Planning Committee. An assessment is needed whether CSUB is capable of conducting all courses online. V. Harper said the Provost Council meeting will be focused on Continuity Planning.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Rees moved to approve the February 11, 2020 Minutes with some clarifying language on RTP Issues. D. Wilson seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   J. Tarjan requested adding Prison Baccalaureate to the agenda. See 6. f.
   J. Tarjan moved to approve the Agenda as amended. D. Wilson seconded. Agenda approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout) (deferred)
   i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ▪ 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)
- Referral 12 Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain
- Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report
- Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas

iii. FAC (M. Rees)
- 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)
- 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
i. Mentorship Programs - BPA Academic Certification Program and RAMP

c. Searches - Update
i. AVP Faculty Affairs – An offer made on Interim position. Call for Search Committee for permanent position forthcoming. AVP FA search in Fall 2020.

ii. AVP Academic Programs – no update.

Dean Antelope Valley – V. Harper will visit AV campus tomorrow to talk with faculty and staff. Appointment for Dean AV expected this semester.

iii. Dean SS&E – The Search Committee met, and the job description should be posted by the end of the week. Appointment for Dean SSE expected this semester.

iv. Associate Dean SS&E – no update.

v. Dean Library – Search Committee meets next week. The position is expected to post in the fall.

vi. Faculty Ombudsperson (handout)

vii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability – no update
d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Budget Forum March 9, 2020, 11:00-12:00, Student Union MPR
e. Handbook Error Log – no update
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Ethnic Studies (ES) Call for Feedback – Task Force The deadline for feedback to the CO is Friday. The question to EC is what to do with their report. J. Tarjan and M. Danforth served on the ES Task Force committee. Is this an All Campus response, or “Other” to indicate the response is the Task Force’s submission? M. Danforth (member of Task Force) is concerned that the Task Force is submitting as an All Campus response because there wasn’t a forum to solicit feedback. J. Tarjan (member of Task Force) said that there was a representative from GECCo on the Task Force who wasn’t receptive to “Other”. There was a group of individuals speaking for themselves; ES, GE, and Faculty Affairs and students voices, not representative of the entire campus. D. Boschini recommended that the EC hand off to V. Harper (who put the Task Force together) and for him to consider checking “Other”. J. Tarjan is in favor of saying it was the Task Force’s response. There is a question whether it will affecting Title V language if the legislation passes. He recommended to draft something that is informative that the whole campus can support regardless of what shape the ES requirement takes, a general rather than a specific proposal. D. Boschini said in the context of the survey the questions could be answered from an individual or the campus. How they use the data is problematic. The Task Force did a good job coming up with a response, and they own it. The EC recommends checking “Other” and write-in “Task Force”.
   b. GECCo overview – There are always concerns. When Q to S conversation occurred in 2016, it was with the understanding that GECCo would be reevaluated. If we don’t look at GECCo’s structure and policies it would be negligent. It was brought up at DCLC. There needs to be a mechanism to enable certain things to be revisited. It’s been an individual committee. For the Senate to reinsert itself is a big decision. Options: invite GECCo, invite GECCo rep, invite L. Paris into the discussion, and there is GECCo expertise in the EC. J. Tarjan suggested a guided discussion scheduled for University Day. D. Boschini said that certain people have committed time to do what they were asked and we don’t want them to think their work isn’t appreciated. The Senate may or may not have authority over GECCo. Clarification could be the Senate’s job. M. Rees missed from the quarter system when each Area had faculty who taught those courses, met regularly, certified the courses and discussed whether they wanted to make changes. It feels like there may be people who don’t teach any GE who are controlling GECCo. It’s unclear what the assessment process is. A. Hegde said it goes back to how GECCo was formed. Some didn’t want it to be a separate entity. There is annual report from the Director, but no oversight. The Senate has elections for a representative from each school. The call should be more
diligent in the criteria for membership. Reconsider the structure and oversight of GE. D. Boschini said the DCLC gave feedback to V. Harper that if GECCo wasn’t communicating effectively with the chairs and faculty, that is something that could be handled administratively. It does not require Senate action. V. Harper agreed with A. Hegde’s point to have Senate oversight of GECCo. It’s best practice for all entities and individuals to have oversight at all levels, and for there be a direct chain of command to an oversight body. M. Danforth sees the disconnect from a decentralized structure. For example, the NSME Curriculum Committee (CC) and in Area B classes that were approved, and the assessment of Area B. The CC didn’t communicate very often when it was CARS, if at all. Subject Matter Experts (SME) had control over their domain. Now, we have a centralized structure instead of NSME faculty input on Area B and A&H faculty giving Area C and BPA and NSME faculty giving input on Area D. The committee has only two representatives (potentially only one representative) who reflect on the diversity of the school Areas. That may have caused some of the disconnect and discontent. If we still want to have a centralized structure, GECCo should be checking in with the appropriate CC to make sure consultation has occurred. In AAC, if she sees that something is coming through and it hasn’t gone through the CC, she reaches out to that CC. For example, Public Health Program. M. Danforth reached out to all the department chairs to make sure the consultation had occurred. Maybe it’s putting too much work back onto the CCs. Maybe not. That could be part of the conversation on whether the structure be centralized versus decentralized. J. Tarjan’s experience is that throughout the country, there are always complaints about GE, because it’s one of the few committees that can tell people yes or no. The feedback is that a lot of attention has been paid to that. He agrees that it could change to a Senate committee. If changes are proposed (number of units in GE and ES can only be C or something like that) take that to the Senate for ratification or a recommendation. If we are charged with implementation of programs that the Senate approved, such as learning outcomes, how many pages, does one have of core skills – those specific things have been delegated and should remain for GECCo. There has been a plea to have the school members attend their CC to learn more about their schools. That hasn’t been done sufficiently. J. Tarjan has been in discussion to attempt to have the money left for GECCo to support learning communities in Area C and Area D to revisit the learning outcome, skills reinforcement, themes and those types of things, and then to make recommendation to next year’s GECCo. Still, regardless of what’s been done, feature GECCo on University Day. There should be some oversight to determine if GECCo is efficient and effective. Maybe the Senate Chair could have a discussion
with the Faculty Director of GECCo. Is there a mechanism to give stipends to people to get them excited to make recommendations? Reinstitute learning communities with specific tasks and renew the conversation. Maybe have a workshop in the fall. Prioritize the feedback. People who serve on CC don’t always get what they want. D. Boschini learned as department chair, upon hearing a story, get the rest of the story. Sometimes when faculty tell her that that GECCo turned something down, it’s rarely the person describing what their process was a what has to be corrected, it’s a story of problems with faculty, department and elsewhere. It may well be that faculty is frustrated that they have to get approval for a course, and then get frustrated when they’re rejected because they didn’t follow the instructions. When people say GECCo is horrible, how much of it is not GECCo. Shed light on the whole problem. If we have to change GE ES requirement, we need to have a good system in place for that conversation. University Day is a great suggestion. There is a lot of interest in what to do about GE. ES could be sub-topic to bring campus level representation. M. Danforth said to respect the response of the SMEs on how the decision to be a centralize or decentralized structure would impact campus as a whole. If SMEs feel that they are being shot-down by GECCo that may lead to dissatisfaction with that committee. D. Boschini said Invite GECCo Faculty Director, L. Paris to the EC, then to the Senate. No referral today.

c. Graduate Commencement – Academic Calendar - D. Boschini is on the Commencement Committee. The Graduate Commencement date given to the committee in September was changed in February, but the update hasn’t been communicated. The date changed without conversation. It’s important for graduate students and their families to know dates well in advance. V. Harper said he would make sure a message gets out. M. Danforth said that AAC noticed it’s not in the Academic Calendar. The second bachelor students are invited to the hooding ceremony instead of to the undergraduate ceremony. If a student is in a degree that doesn’t have a master’s program, there won’t be any faculty present at the graduation ceremony, because there’s no one to hood. Therefore, all second bachelor Computer Science students ...can request to be moved to undergraduate ceremony. D. Boschini referred this item to V. Harper with some background. In years past, when students are classified as post-baccalaureates, the system assumes they are graduate students when they’re really enrolled into a bachelor’s program. Thus, they get an auto invite to the wrong ceremony. Change the database so that the second bachelor students should go to the undergraduate ceremony. V. Harper said that if they are getting a bachelor’s degree they should be at the undergraduate ceremony. He will handle it. Fall commencement 2020 and Spring commencement 2021 are being discussed with the President. The fall ceremony was extremely
popular. Information coming soon. M. Rees said that there is a need for a site manager to direct vendors, etc.

d. Communication Silos and Collaboration Mechanism – J. Tarjan said because we’ve reached a certain size, he senses a feeling across campus that it has become a very siloed environment. There is a need for a mechanism to integrate appropriate communication and coordination. When an organization is functionally structured (AA, SA, BAS, etc.) complex problems get solved by the cabinets, unless there are task forces and committees. Long-term, we need to think about other mechanisms. Perhaps job-rotation of managers, occasionally. If the different divisions had more of an appreciation of the insight and wisdom across the campus, we could better share ideas, etc. We don’t have a coordination mechanism to address the silos here. The deans go for training on advancement, but not faculty. Maybe this is a conversation for the President. D. Boschini saw a decline when the campus went from First Class to Outlook. She met with F. Gorham about making bulletin boards visible. It can be done in Outlook, although it takes work by the individual to set up dashboards with bulletins. The Provost’s weekly updates have been tremendously helpful. It would be nice to hear internally what other divisions are doing instead of reading it in the public news. It’s a Cabinet topic. If we are advocates for the University, we need to know what’s going on and to feel included. Sometimes the frustration is over things that are already being addresses or don’t need to be discussed. When the communication is missing, it may seem that things aren’t being done or making bad decisions. J. Tarjan suggested structure something where someone from the business-side of things, UA or BAS for example, are expected to go to staff meetings weekly and bring that perspective back to the faculty Senate. That might go a long way to solve some sense of isolation. Student Affairs, AS&SS chairs – they have student perspective. He’s seen organizations be propriety and do their thing. Yet, faculty are here, they are tenure track and they are the guardians of the institution. Others come and go. Oftentimes cabinet members fight for their own divisions and not the organization. Faculty don’t see what cabinet members do. There are too many staffers. Faculty tends to distrust them. J. Self is doing a good job with press releases. A. Hegde said it goes back to shared governance. The levels are 1) you’ve been told, 2) we’ll listen to you and we’re doing this, 3) we’ll listen to you and let’s have a discussion. #3 is a conversation about the roles of individuals. Faculty have bigger role: to protect the interests of the entire institution. Faculty are the permanent members of the institution. D. Boschini will revisit the topic of communication with the President. An Open Forum is not sufficient to disseminate information, nor gather feedback. It doesn’t get full consumption and it doesn’t need to be an hour long when there is only a slice that someone needs to get. If
President does her own newsletter it would cover the basic foundation. However, it does not meet the collaboration aspect. J. Tarjan shared that the feedback from the Committee Search consultant was that we do better than most. We are a special place. His point is that when organizations get to be a certain size it’s time to think about maintaining healthy communication. V. Harper is doing a great job. There is simply room for improvement. D. Boschini said the action item is for her to talk to the President and to V. Harper that information sharing matters. D. Cantrell is doing a good job with the Student Success network and developing a good model. His next step is to share in writing what is going on in the Student Success Network so the general faculty receive it. V. Harper has had many discussions with J. Tarjan. His approach to mentoring and coaching is to put away the fear of being criticized. If something has been said month’s ago and it changes, it’s an opportunity to build trust by dealing with challenges honestly and to make institutional improvement. He shares J. Tarjan’s point about silos. If there was rotation between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs there would be fewer issues and he’ll look at it. We should be able to fashion something for the future.

e. Course Registration during Scheduling Adjustment Period – (handout) D. Jackson asked the Senate to look at it. D. Boschini posed the questions 1) how widespread is this problem, and 2) could this be handled through the chain of command (i.e. department chair). Nursing has mandatory academic orientation and no make-up. M. Danforth said it could be the student’s confusion that they didn’t meet the prerequisites. It could be the financial aid notification due to PT status. There could be a good reason for the administrative drop. RES 171818 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy language was careful to clarify that there is a mechanism for wait-listed classes to allow faculty to manage the demands versus the students who have registered and are not attending. The language is not absolutely clear that it applies to wait-listed students. D. Boschini responded that one of the reasons it is probably true is that faculty want the freedom to apply to situations where it makes disciplinary sense. By saying it’s only for wait-listed courses, it says that I can have students miss the first two weeks of school and then just show up to start their nursing courses. We don’t want to start a policy that puts us out of compliance for the policy. M. Danforth recalls that that it was part of the discussion at the Senate. We added the clause about missing any during the schedule adjustment period applies to classes with wait-lists, but the missing the first day of classes applies to all classes. She recommended there be some rule on how quickly administrative drops are processed because they aren’t always processed during the adjustment period. She gets more complaints on that, from other departments. It could be DCLC topic and not a Senate topic. A. Hegde said that the policy may be implemented at the
department or dean level. Nursing policy is different than Economics policy. We don’t need to clarify policy, but clarify the implementation. J. Millar observed that the Advising Leadership Team does not include faculty advisors. There is a tone that feels like the professional advisors are recognizing that the faculty advisors (are less than and) are not following the rules. Whoever is advising faculty – faculty meetings during university week, we go back and say something that’s really clear to faculty, again. It’s not faculty advisors who are dropping students. It’s faculty who are teaching classes. It’s unknown whether the faculty are PT, adjunct, or stepping-in to teach for a while, etc. She supports that each of the schools have a clear policy, then have that information come from faculty leaders how to manage their classrooms. D. Boschini will refer D. Jackson to DCLC. The chair of AAC shall meet with D. Jackson first to see what the problem really is and give her advice. M. Rees said that the Academic Calendar needs to specify when is the last day to add classes. The amount of time in class is different for MWF than T/T. One can add a T/T class after two weeks. The last day for time-block MWF is one week and a third.

f. Prison Baccalaureate – Governor Newsom is proposing $1.8 million and annual increases for a prison baccalaureate degree program for those who have AA degree. Five were campuses called out and CSUB is one of them. ASCSU AA will talk about it at their next meeting. Please direct any feedback or comments to J. Millar (co-chair of ASCSU AA committee). It’s one of the governor’s pet projects. The estimated funding to CSUB to participate is $700,000. CSUB has individuals who teach courses in the prison system.

g. Ombudsperson Appointment – The call is closed. The EC makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost makes the appointment. The position reports to President. The EC unanimously recommended the candidate as the Faculty Ombudsperson.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING MARCH 5, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
     - RES Energy & Power may be ready by March 5.
     - RES Canvas LMS is being worked on and may be ready March 5.

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**