ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, December 3, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100

Visitor: L. Zelezny
Absent: M. Rees

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
 o President Zelezny attending 10:30 – 11:30
 o Response to First Reading Ethnic Studies - Open Forum December 10, 2:00 – 3:45
   Location: HCCR. GECCo and the JDYR members will be discussing the topic at their respective meetings in advance of the Open Forum. D. Boschini thanked M. Danforth for being the lead on the campus’ response.
 o Trustee Jane Carney Visit December 17 – an invitation for EC to meet is forthcoming
 o Vice-Chancellor Loren Blanchard coming to CSUB December 16 to meet with the Leadership Team. The EC requested some time to meet with him.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
B. Street moved to approve the November 12, 2019 Minutes. J. Millar seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Items for the President added to the agenda under New Items.
J. Tarjan moved to approve the Agenda. M. Danforth seconded. 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 21 Minimum IELTS and TOEFL Scores for International Graduate Students

ii. AS&SS (J. Millar)
   - Referral 05 Canvas Pilot
   - 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 09 Faculty Membership on Search Committee for the Provost & VP of AA – 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 (deferred)

c. Searches – Update (deferred)
   i. AVP Academic Programs
   ii. Dean SS&E
   iii. Associate Dean SS&E
   iv. Faculty Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
   v. Faculty Director of the Teaching and Learning Center
   vi. Faculty Ombudsperson
   vii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – D. Boschini expressed concern that the budget information is unavailable to the department Chairs. V. Harper responded that the budget information has been made available to the Deans this week. The delay was due to the BAS being short staffed. See 6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS b. iv. Budget Transparency

e. Handbook Error Log (deferred)
6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

a. President Zelezny made announcements and offered discussion items:

i. President Zelezny showed the trophy awarded to CSUB by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). The [Christa McAuliffe Excellence in Teacher Education Award](http://example.com) recognized CSUB’s Teacher Education Rural Residency Program as the top achievement amongst all programs in the nation. Congratulations to K. LaGue, who wrote the proposal, and thank you to Academic Affairs for bringing visibility to our institution.

ii. Dream Resource Center Grand Opening is today at 2:00 p.m.

iii. The Presidents Faculty and Staff Holiday Reception is today at 3:00 p.m. Thank you in advance for contribution to the Food Pantry

iv. The Provost Search is on schedule. The search firm, [Storbeck/Pimentel](http://example.com) was selected by the Search Committee. Storbeck/Pimentel will be meeting with the committee members before the national posting at the start of the new year.

v. Executive Vice Chancellor, L. Blanchard, will be visiting the campus on December 16 to look deeply at our progress on the Graduation Initiative. President Zelezny thanked V. Harper for doing an amazing job with projections and getting the campus on track to meet them. Our report card still has some “not-met” items, because of where we started. She is happy with the collaboration on the Graduation Initiative.

vi. Trustee Carney is visiting CSUB December 17. Both Vice Chancellor and the Trustee will focus on equity gaps. Please share your involvement in the many campus initiatives that address equity gaps.

vii. Quantitative Reasoning (QR) proposal for fourth year instruction was debated at the Trustees’ meeting. Students are debating QR in ASI. Dr. M. Barlow/Superintendent of Kern School was invited by the CSU officials of QR. Dr. R. Shire is working with others at the CSU office to present QR to all Superintendents to reflect and deliberate on it. They met with all the Superintendents K-12, and deliberated independently on that proposal after the CSU members left. After consultation, Dr. Barlow had questions for the Chancellor’s Office, she wrote her letter of support for QR for Kern County Schools. ASI requested to see the letter. President Zelezny can ask Dr. Barlow to avail the letter to the Academic Senate. Dr. Barlow’s reasoning behind the strong support aligns with Kern Pledge and improving math scores. An independent letter also came from [Dr. B. Schaefer](http://example.com), Kern High Schools Superintendent. He wrote that the QR proposal has no impact since the alternative courses are already offered in the district. He agrees that it’s beneficial to have the additional preparation.
b. Items for President Zelezny

i. Capital Campaign – President Zelezny said the process requires professional development. We have gaps in prospecting data and skills. Training is necessary to effect a successful five year campaign. She will be transparent on costs. President Zelezny is working behind the scenes on a number of $5M gifts. The needs identified in the feasibility study are more than we can afford. What we can purchase, and the roles and duties will be shared. She expects a six month window of work with CCS Fundraising. The professional development is very important, since we’ve never been in a capital campaign. A. Hegde suggested that the consultants work with faculty. Many faculty members have taught here for decades and have developed connections in the community. President Zelezny said that the consultants will help prepare campaigners how to set expectations in certain areas, and how to ask for specialty expertise from those faculty members willing to help with the campaign, including junior faculty. It’s important to learn community relations and the varied roles in the campaign. This capital campaign is historic. CSUB is being recognized more frequently than ever before. UA has been working on improvements.

ii. Student Misconduct- D. Boschini and President Zelezny have met about student misconduct and how it’s handled. President Zelezny is not personally involved. Complaints are routed through the official channel. She asked the EC members to voice their concerns. Discussion ensued. The points and suggestions made are

- Have clarity around Title IX and equity, and the interplay between student discipline and Academic Affairs. People say they’ve been treated unfairly and circumvent the normal chain of command and go directly to the Title IX office. It’s unclear how Academic Affairs and Title IX cooperate and those roles. Students can go outside the process by claiming something even if it has very little basis and came as a result of some rule they didn’t like rather than administrative bias.
- President Zelezny’s team is trained to send the disgruntled person to the right person in the hierarchy. Sometimes it’s complicated. There are a couple “frequent fliers”. We need to follow policy and treat the situation fairly.
- It takes one student to get their way, and then other students follow.
- Have a campus wide conversation about academic integrity.
- President Zelezny said that the road stops at Academic Affairs. It may seem like nothing is being done. It’s confidential and time consuming to follow protocol.
• J. Millar, T. Wallace, and R. Alvarez are scheduled to meet to clarify the protocol when students violate the Student Code of Conduct. There are levels of consequences, leading to expulsion. Sometimes there is pathological behavior that steps outside of the norm.
• President Zelezny asked for consideration of utilizing the student success grants and faculty expertise on ethics and psychology to look at best practices on educating about plagiarism and cheating, and the institution’s expectation. It would be a pro-active educational component; a faculty-driven innovation we could share. Capitalize on the research opportunity and the benefit to our broader student population.
• M. Burroughs and the KIE have offered workshops for students on ethics and academic integrity.
• Present ethics and academic integrity to students and faculty during University Week.
• It’s relevant to have President Zelezny in the discussion since faculty issues span cabinet members. Faculty feel that their case goes into a black hole, especially when the student reappears. There may be good communication between two cabinet members, yet faculty feels that there is no follow-up.
• Consider separating Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. If academic integrity is the bailiwick – the standards of one cabinet member and those of another – it may call for a liaison to coordinate.
• It’s incumbent on Academic Affairs to 1) have a policy based on best practice and 2) make sure it’s enforced consistently. Educate students that academic integrity is a core value. It’s also a fairness issue when students who work to earn their grades see others cheat and get away with it. The good students feel disadvantaged. It’s a bad life lesson for them.
• The policy is unworkable without definitions and gradation of the types of offenses. It’s significant when students are caught, and a lot of work to prove it. State the consequences clearly, every step of the way.

D. Boschini summarized that the coordination between divisions, and the communication lapses has led faculty to question whether the campus takes student misconduct seriously. Faculty’s resource person is housed in Student Affairs and it’s awkward for faculty when it comes to academic dishonesty. There is a trust issue when faculty don’t see the result of their filing. Some have suggested moving the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities to a different location, possibly in Academic Affairs when it pertains to academic matters. There is an effect on the communication from the President’s office. There isn’t a clear
mark between the responsibilities of the Title IX officer and the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO), and what the faculty are doing with students to promote academic integrity. When a student goes directly to Title IX to file a discrimination complaint, faculty wants to trust that Title IX and CDO are getting to the truth. When they haven’t even talked to faculty about the situation, that trust in a fair outcome weakens. President Zelezny replied that this would be a good focus during the Cabinet Retreat. In certain cases, silence is required to uphold legal/privacy laws. Her cabinet is working well and can do better through some sharing short of violating any laws.

iii. Composition of Provost Search – (V. Harper left the room during this discussion) J. Tarjan referred to the University Handbook 309.5 COMPOSITION OF THE SEARCH AND SCREENING COMMITTEES ADMINISTRATORS. It states that the majority of members be faculty. President Zelezny’s two appointments are administrators, thus making five non-faculty members and only four faculty members. A. Hegde said that it enables non-faculty members to have more influence than faculty. There was discussion on whether to start a new search committee. President Zelezny thought she was following the Handbook. She asked that faculty talk with Search Committee Chair, J. Kegley. D. Boschini said we default to the Handbook. She is open to being appointed to be the fifth faculty member.

iv. Budget Transparency – D. Boschini – we are half way through the fiscal year and the chairs don’t know what the budget is for their departments. While BAS lost two key people recently, the lack of data is a challenge for Deans and Chairs to make informed decisions. There seems to be turmoil in BAS that is undermining the budget process. B. Street said that the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) is getting information too late to function and that gets to the global issue of strategy. The BPC is getting pushback from BAS. We’re still not getting current and historical data, and comparative data to forecast spending that helps prevent us from reacting to situations. We have to have the data to be strategic about growth. A. Hegde emphasized that faculty are still not part of the budget process and forecasting, even though RES 171813 Faculty Participation in Budgetary Matters was approved by the President. Based on campus allocation, the Sensitivity Analysis method can be used to build scenarios. We have people in Public Administration that do that research and analysis, but it requires data. We don’t have the data. The Questica software tool is not functioning to produce the reports requested. There is a systemic issue beyond personnel. D. Boschini said without information sharing from BAS, faculty cannot be confident that they’re going to be making sound financial decisions. As of the last chairs’ meeting they didn’t know if they could spend for equipment or hiring this fall. President Zelezny
said that part of the problem is that the CSU system is off sync from the legislature’s funding. She doesn’t think that BAS is trying to be difficult. She asked for three things needed and at what time in the budget cycle? B. Street will provide that information to the President upon meeting with T. Davis next week. D. Boschini is scheduled to meet with President Zelezny, one-on-one tomorrow. The messaging from the President to the Provost to the Deans to the Chairs to the faculty needs to be reality based so people know what to expect and it’s unfolding in an organized way. Even if there was an anomaly, we could have communicated that better. J. Tarjan said that ideally the USPBAC provides advice – if we knew our budget then we could decide whether it makes sense to spend $50K or $200K on consultants. We can’t say OK when we don’t know the budget. M. Danforth said the level of budget detail is not what’s expected. We were told that Questica software would provide it, but it’s hasn’t performed that function for three years. President Zelezny said that the discretionary decision making pot is small and taken up by the strategic plan. Most of the decisions have already been made. For example, faculty benefits are 55%. The good news is that CSUB is covering its people.


d. Mentorship programs (deferred)

e. Role of Department Chairs in Class Scheduling and Faculty Assignment -(handout) (deferred)

f. RTP Issues: Implementation and Handbook Language (handout) (deferred)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING December 5, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   **Announcements**

   **Consent Agenda**

   **Old Business**

   RES 192006 Master of Science in Kinesiology – **Second Reading**

   RES 192007 Online and Hybrid Courses Handbook Changes – **Second Reading**

   RES 192008 Academic Calendars Fall 2020 Spring 2021 Summer Session 2021– **Second Reading** - B. Street is working with D. Cantrell on Spring Break and Commencement.

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

    (deferred)

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

    Meeting adjourned at 11:30