ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, April 21, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:40 a.m.
Video Conference


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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   - President Zelezny is scheduled to attend the Senate April 23, 2020 Time Certain 10:05 – 10:20 a.m.
   - RES 192011 Learning Management System Recommendation received notice of petition for review. The Academic Senate worked with the faculty member regarding an electronic submission. No petition was received within the ten day period. The Canvas resolution is on the President’s desk for her approval.
   - Academic Grievances Annual Report - D. Jackson submitted the report to the Academic Senate Chair in compliance with policy. A total of three grievances were processed this academic year. None resulted in a formal hearing. For the size of our campus, three is a small number. D. Boschini doesn’t see an issue with the report. A. Hegde said there were more than three complaints submitted. The outcome speaks to M. Palaiologou’s effectiveness in resolving the issues. A. Hegde requested that the Ombudsperson position receive more release time. D. Boschini agreed since the issues stemming from the pandemic are creating an increased workload. V. Harper agreed.
   - Elections and Appointments - A. Hegde reported that the Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) for Dean Novak lacks representation from A&H and SS&E. The AARC for Dean Ebong lacks representation from A&H and BPA. The call for members on the AARCs will be open to the university, next week. The reviews commence in the Fall. Discussion ensued. The last round of Academic Administrator reviews resulted in findings that all administrators’ reviews were excellent and so general that the letters were counter productive. Not everyone is the same. There was specific, critical, and accurate statements provided by the AARCs. The final letters did not reflect that faculty input. The expectation was for constructive statements, like “All feedback was discussed, complimentary and constructive. The
AARC’s contribution is taken seriously and the President takes counsel on feedback. We are going to continue to work on the following areas...” D. Boschini discussed the history of AARCs with L. Zelezny. This could be a topic for the end of the semester meeting between the President, the outgoing Academic Senate Chair, and the incoming Academic Senate Chair. Whatever the President’s letter says, it has an impact on the whole AARC process.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   The April 7, 2020 Minutes were approved by consensuses.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   The agenda approved by consensus.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth) Waiting to hear back from GECCo in order to finish the resolutions regarding Winter Term Courses and Units Policy.
      ii. AS&SS (D. Wilson)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Interim Provost Update – Nothing new to report.
      i. Mentorship Programs - BPA Academic Certification Program and RAMP (deferred)
   c. Searches – No update
      i. AVP Faculty Affairs
      ii. AVP Academic Programs
      iii. Dean Antelope Valley
      iv. Dean SS&E
      v. Associate Dean SS&E
      vi. Dean Library
   d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – The Strategic Budget Open Forum meeting was directed to those who may not be familiar with the Strategic Plan. There were 150 people at some point. To improve attendance, be mindful of the time block. A. Hegde reemphasized shared governance, particularly involving faculty in fundraising. University Advancement’s response was that they already include faculty, but that’s not the case. Faculty cares about the Capital Campaign. Colleague J. Tarjan said it best: Faculty is the guardian of the institution. D. Boschini commented that raising funds during recession has challenges. President Zelezny is optimistic that the large donors won’t be affected.
6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

a. Summer Session – There was a desire to offer rich courses for summer because otherwise students’ progress is delayed. Work was done with the Associate Deans and advisors to offer a broad selection of Management and Marketing classes with consideration of the department’s rotation of faculty. EEGO and the Dean sent memos directly to faculty encouraging them to propose courses. It’s a recurring issue and it’s inappropriate. The work should be directed through the chairs. There’s a sense that chairs are being subverted and not supported. A. Hegde appreciates that EEGO tries to follow the process. All faculty need to know that all scheduling of classes is the Chair’s purview. Some departments have an equity plan and some departments haven’t had the same experience as others. V. Harper said he’d reiterate to faculty to follow the policy of their department whereby the chair schedules classes using that department’s equity policy, and then the chairs and EEGO communicate directly with each other. M. Danforth exerted a lot of effort last year to get the Chairs in the loop after EEGO cancelled summer classes due to low enrollments. Last year two critical classes were cancelled. Even though she is Chair, she learned about the class cancellations through a student – not EEGO. It set the student back a semester. There’s word that EEGO has enrollment targets for summer 2020, but she hasn’t seen what those targets are, even though registration has begun. The communication channel to the chairs could be better. The instructors may not realize the ripple effect in the curriculum. M. Rees noticed that EEGO’s recruitment of classes memo does say check with the department chair. Oddly, last year there were low enrolled Theatre/Music classes and yet at the same time EEGO was recruiting for adding classes. She recommended that they be more strategic in planning for classes. First fill the most critical courses instead of spreading students into broader offerings. D. Boschini sees that the check with department chairs first is an improvement. EEGO still needs to be reminded of the department chairs’ role on decision-making about summer courses. V. Harper will talk with M. Novak. No Senate action for now. Next year’s Senate will monitor the situation. M. Danforth will communicate directly with V. Harper on the situation this summer in real time.

b. EO 1110 (handout) The memo was from D. Gove and the Task Force. J. Tarjan said it’s a proforma and he recommended that a referral be fast tracked through the AAC. D. Boschini referred to AAC. The Task Force is looking for statement to go in the catalog. M. Danforth will package the Task Force recommendations into a resolution.
c. GE Director Replacement – The position is appointed by the Provost. L. Paris agreed to another year. Her commitment has term. She is on sabbatical in Fall 2020. The Department of Education grant has been extended. J. Tarjan said there is a grant, and then there’s GECCo. Does the institution need 1) Faculty director to run the committee and oversee the program, and/or 2) Faculty Director to manage the grant activities? Significantly more time has been spent on facilitating the grant than on operating the academic program. His recommendation is that the two should be separated. The transition document didn’t contain language for the continuing operation. Maybe the two can’t be separated this time. GECCo has had little input into grant activities over the last several years, to the detriment of the operation. People are not aware of what is happening with the grant. A. Hegde recalled that EC agreed that GECCo interview the candidates and then make recommendation to the Provost. He agreed with J. Tarjan to separate the two activities. The candidate needs to be familiar with GECCo. This next appointment should be for both grant and the operation activities for just a one-year term. The DCLC expressed concern about GECCo processes. It’s currently dependent upon the Senate because it has representation. The topic of oversight is a longer conversation. It’s more important to get a Director in place. There should be term limits. Get advice from GECCo members, even though there has been turn-over. J. Tarjan is the best resource for the job description, etc. because of the continuity of his involvement. M. Danforth reiterated Senate’s role whereby EC has input on the decision-making process even though GECCo does the screening and interviewing of candidates. J. Tarjan advocates returning procedural responsibility for curriculum back to the faculty. There has been a lot of drift where it’s indistinguishable what the grant activities are separate from the TLC. They are similar, they overlap. Some say “it’s GECCo’s program” but it really is the General Faculty that attended all the sessions, and then voted to pass the curriculum. GECCo interprets the curriculum and then implements it. He believes the #1 priority charge of the new director is to make sure that the money spent and any activities undertaken are with the goal of faculty control of the curriculum, and the activities will continue to operate even if the grant is gone. Currently, the grant takes over everything. He is concerned that the vision of the program could be in jeopardy if it’s not funded by another grant. J. Millar said the Ethnic Studies process is still pending actions. It would be wise that the new Director interpret Ethnic Studies and have implementation in mind. A. Hegde said that if GECCo is OK with the job description then the Academic Senate Office can send out the call. D. Boschini said the correct way to handle it is to have V. Harper consult with the EC to look at it. Reinsert EC back into the process would be a stronger move than may be necessary, and it would make some people
unhappy. Have GECCo initiate the process, and when it’s time for consultation between V. Harper and the EC, the topic is put on EC’s agenda. J. Tarjan agreed that GECCo send recommendation to V. Harper and then he consults with the EC. V. Harper will ask L. Paris to work with GECCo to distribute the call ASAP. D. Boschini said it’s important to get it done and begin to look at the Senate’s role. J. Tarjan said it’s OK to task the GECCo Director with a one-year term to bridge us through the grant program. If not, it’s awkward. The grant money and oversight of the grant has crowded out the other elements. V. Harper will take the input back to L. Paris and GECCo and get a call out. D. Boschini said a one-year term seems appropriate from her point of view. GECCo is more up to date on how the Director’s role is changing. She is more comfortable with GECCo being the body that spends more time on this. The EC’s final recommendation is for the Provost to initiate the search through GECCo, and then the Provost will consult with EC prior to making the decision.

d. CSU Undergraduate Admissions (handout) (deferred)

e. Office Hours Policy (handout) Handbook 303.1.3 D. Boschini received a complaint earlier in the semester. The faculty member felt it should be at the discretion of the faculty member to work with students off campus. D. Boschini replied that the issue was taken up in 2015 and twice before that. The reasons for and against working with students off campus were widely discussed. There is an interest in talking about it again because we are conducting office hours online due to the pandemic. On-campus office hours is considered the gold standard. Given the state emergency stay-at-home order requires that office hours be held online, do we want to be that firm on the policy given that and alternate delivery may continue this fall and further? We don’t need to have people on campus more than it’s healthy to do so. Thirty percent of courses are taught by faculty over 65 years old and the current guideline is that they shouldn’t be on campus. J. Tarjan prefers that any deviation from policy be addressed through the department chair. There is no censure nor penalty for missing office hours. He requests that the Administration help in enforcing the policy. Faculty should be available when the student need faculty. D. Boschini said the policy already exists whereby faculty can work with the Dean. The issue is not urgent. This could be an item for next year. A. Hegde said that faculty not honoring office hours are the exception. The enforcement falls on the Chair but it’s unreasonable to expect the chair to police faculty. The faculty who want to be available will be available. M. Danforth said that she has seen some RTP letters where the SOCI comments about faculty not being available during office hours and those comments were formally mentioned in the RTP letter. D. Boschini summarized that some department chair issues that can be addressed in fall.

f. URC Memo: Recommendations to the RTP Process (handout) (deferred)
g. Fall 2020 Contingency Planning for Instruction - D. Boschini reminded the group that May 22 is the last day for faculty to work. If adjustments need to be made for fall, the Administration needs to begin consulting faculty now. For example, the Nursing department needs to plan now if the expectation in the fall is that faculty work remotely. It affects the chair’s selection and process of scheduling fall classes. While the leadership is discovering things within the CSU, it would be well timed for the Administration to make decisions before faculty go off campus, May 22. J. Millar recalled how the management of furloughs in 2008 had long-term impact on CSUB. J. Tarjan suggested that one person be responsible for communication and there can’t be too much communication. D. Boschini suggested that the Administration communicate to faculty that conversations are occurring here and with other campuses and CSUB is prepared to talk with department chairs. CSUB will have to decide based on our unique situation. Chairs need to communicate now to faculty. If large classes are split, then the department chair needs more faculty to teach. The chairs need to know about the possibilities before the end of this semester. If not, scheduling more classes in August will create another problem to then solve. J. Millar shared that the take-away from the meeting of CSU counselors (23 CSU counselor representatives) with the Chancellor’s Office was that Los Angeles County provides guidance for what’s going to happen in the fall. That spawns rumors. J. Tarjan recommended 1) rumor control 2) put information before the people who need it. A. Hegde said 1) consider students who need to know now. 2) Some Departments have easier time converting to alternate delivery. Transferring to Canvas LMS is another issue. D. Boschini said to start the conversation about what it may look like on our campus. People want more information. This pandemic is a frustrating experience, alone. CSUB needs to do its planning. We want to avoid being the last campus in the system to decide what’s going to happen in the fall.

h. Online SOCI Distribution for Spring 2020 – SOCs were supposed to start April 20, but D. Boschini asked V. Harper to bring the topic to EC to discuss beforehand. Let the faculty know that Senate has anticipated issues with the online SOCs and FAC has put forth recommendations in a resolution. It would be helpful for faculty to receive the message before the April 23rd Senate meeting. However, the process has not advanced to that point. There are two resolutions on the Senate agenda related to RTP. J. Tarjan would like to see communication that states that CSUB has an obligation to give students the opportunity to provide feedback and to inform faculty that means have been taken so that the SOCI doesn’t have to be in the RTP file. Encourage the students to participate in the process by providing feedback on the new teaching modality. D. Boschini recommended that the Provost’s message regarding online SOCs be delayed until next week. V. Harper agreed that the resolutions are part of a package of guidelines and communication for this time. M. Danforth said that faculty already has reduced time to work on their proposal. Further, SOCs haven’t been administered as we would have liked. It’s a chalk-it-up-to-experience situation. We don’t want to schedule ourselves so there is a problem in Fall 2020. J. Tarjan said that students have more than a month to complete SOCs. D. Boschini recommended to put RES 192020 RTP Guidelines 2020 first item
on Senate agenda, New Business. It would be important for the President to sign the resolution before the message from the Provost goes out.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING APRIL 23, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   **Announcements**
   
   President Zelezny Campus Report Time Certain 10:05 – 10:20

   **Consent Agenda**

   **New Business**
   
   RES 192020 RTP Guidelines for 2020 – FAC  D. Boschini gave President a preview.
   RES 192019 RTP Levels of Review - FAC
   RES 192021 Winter Term Courses and Units Policy – AAC
   RES 192017 Hiring Freeze for Expansion MPP and Staff Hires – The draft is circulating through the EC for edits so we can present on Thursday.

   **Old Business**
   
   RES 192013 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report
   RES 192015 Faculty Workload
   RES 192016 Academic Calendar – Spring Semester Break

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   There is a lot of business to get through the Senate. This could be a time when the introductions to the resolutions be limited to ten minutes. The principle is to complete the discussion before moving to Second Reading. Yet, sometimes we don’t have full discussion because the issue is complex. Waiving the First Reading to get to the Second Reading without time for the constituency to think about the issues is problematic. Under the circumstances, there isn’t anything we can do when the issues need urgent Senate action. M. Rees said that RES 192015 Faculty Workload is a big issue and she doesn’t want it to pass until there has been a two-week discussion. When the agenda goes out, state that it’s important to read the resolutions before the meeting. D. Boschini concluded 1) don’t rush things through. 2) Convert April 30th standing committee meeting block to a full Senate meeting.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

   The meeting adjourned at 11:40.