ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, October 1, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100

Absent: D. Boschini
Visitor: D. Solano, L. Zelezny

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Faculty Forum with President Zelezny regarding Provost Search was held this morning. Those in attendance were called on. There are 13 Provost searches in the system, currently.

   Budget Forum October 21, Student Union MPR 11:00 am – Noon – BAS to post the budget book at least a week in advance

   WCUSC meeting with the EC October 8, 11:00 -11:45 – SCI III Rm 100

   Program Review - Danielle Solano, Senate University Program Review Committee (UPRC) liaison. The pressing issues are that people are not turning in reports, and/or people are asking for an extension. The suggestions from EC:
   • Expand the Program Review Schedule to include when program reviews are due to the UPRC.
   • Send reminders to the departments when the program reviews are due.
   • Have a DCLC item every fall to review the next two years of programs up for review
   • Remind DCLC that the schedule is always posted on the website.
   • Release time to programs (it creates an obligation to review in a timely manner.)
   • Celebrating review completions
   • Celebrate reviews completed on time (using a small reward from the Provost’s Office)
• Post on website: exemplar programs completed and willing to share with chair(s) in a confidential manner. Perhaps confine faculty review of files to the Academic Operations Office.
• Post on website: the number of programs to be reviewed, per year
• Offer instruction on how to answer certain kinds of questions (ie. Data)
• Addressing program weaknesses by showing remedy
• Streamline the process as noted in DCLC meeting, eliminating (or justifying) things. Some programs don’t need to submit the same as others.
• Feedback loop on what Administrators receive and subsequent action(s)
• Whether the Program Review Template needs to be modified, and then approved by Senate
• UPRC look at the minimum requirement to meet federal guidelines and the current template and then bring their suggestion to the EC.

The program review, at its best, allows for looking at things systemically, for assessment and appraisal. In the past, it was marketed as a way to get more resources in the future for departments. D. Solano replied that it’s no longer the case. J. Tarjan –Perhaps it could be used to establish the minimum requirements for learning outcomes, other programs that would better meet the desires of the students and the community. It’s important to make the process worthwhile. D. Solano - It’s an opportunity to get feedback on program. If we’re not getting resources, present it as an opportunity for direction. A. Hegde – The chairs want to know how much work they’ll have to put into the review to get the feedback. Someone from EC suggested that perhaps a one-course release would make it worth the effort. When we get federal guidelines on the minimum requirement, look at the recommendation from UPRC and send both documents to the FAC. M. Rees asked what happens to programs that have been turned in late. D. Solano replied that the schedule is set for the next review. It’s on the academic master plan. But they’ll probably ask for an extension. A. Hegde said that every year the Senate receives the Academic Master Plan with a request for approval. At that point, the Senate can suggest changes and the affected department would contact Academic Programs, answering to the Provost. He thanked D. Solano for being on the UPRC and informing the EC.

Search Committee for Provost and VP AA – L. Zelezny joined the meeting briefly to request the EC’s assistance in selecting the Staff member to Search Committee for the Provost and VP of AA. Per the University Handbook the EC receives the Staff recommendation and then makes their recommendation to the President.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
M. Danforth moved to approve the September 17, 2019 Minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
M. Danforth requested to add item, Mode Changes for Courses. The issue is that there are inconsistent policies across the schools and nothing in the Handbook. Discuss whether there should be a university-wide policy about course mode changes.

M. Rees moved to approve the agenda with the amendment. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
         ▪ Referral 01 Distributed Learning – B. Carlisle spoke to the committee on what DLC does: assure quality of the online platform and not the content. The DLC is complementary to those activities of the Curriculum Committee (CC). The CC is more concerned about the quality of the content. The DLC is concerned about the structure of the online class, not content. AAC will first create the committee charter and membership to have it formally added to the Handbook and then later add sections on how the curriculum is approved. The membership to be more faculty oriented: one from each school and a couple faculty at-large members, the Faculty Director of TLC, and someone from IT knowledgeable of the on-line platform. J. Tarjan suggested that the distributed learning policy be accessible. Policy can’t force people to teach in a certain mode of instruction. A. Hegde said policies would be added to the future portal which V. Harper had proposed. M. Rees sees that the purpose of the DLC would enable member to rotate instead of same people staying for years. AAC’s plan is multi-stage. Formalize the committee and then change the sections in the Handbook.
         ▪ Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – suggestions, corrections, and questions have been merged and will be forwarded to the Kinesiology Department. The committee is addressing the check list of items required by the Chancellor’s Office. The joint meeting with BPC is on October 17, 2019.
         ▪ Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report (deferred)
         ▪ Referral 14 New Course Forms and Process (deferred)
Referral 15 Interdisciplinary Studies New Course Proposals – The content is agreeable. The proposal was sent back to address some inconsistencies and add some needed things. It won’t make the hand-off to GECCo by their October 1 deadline. (Catalog copy deadline is December 1.) A. Hegde said that Interdisciplinary Studies faculty sent the submissions for course syllabi outlines late. He thanked AAC for rearranging their agenda to review the new course proposal. J. Tarjan heard that we are moving toward an Ethnic Studies Program. Chicana/o Studies, etc. are gone. Ethnic Studies has to exist in a/multiple schools. V. Harper responded that there are degrees in the AMP. It will go into Interdisciplinary Studies. It’s not housed in any school. AAC is the curriculum committee for Interdisciplinary Studies. The BA degrees are currently on the Master Plan. The charge of the Faculty Director is to initiate the process to take those degrees off the Master Plan and get those degrees underway.

ii. AS&SS (J. Millar) She is in the process of reviewing documents since elected chair.
   - Referral 05 Canvas Pilot – The report from CIO due today.
   - Referral 03 ASI Executive Director as Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member of Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - Bylaws Change – A resolution is needed to add the additional member.
   - Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain J. Tarjan said that the University Handbook addresses grievances. It doesn’t address the distinction level. The catalog indicates that Graduate Grievances go through the Coordinator instead of the Department. He suggested that the committee needs to align the two policies, or state where the student’s grievance should be directed; where is the policy. J. Stark is a reference.
   - Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – J. Millar will invite members of the Student Misconduct Task Force to discuss their report.

iii. FAC (M. Rees)
   - Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined (deferred)
   - Referral 05 SOCIs for Summer Courses The discussion concerned whether summer and winter evaluations go into the Personnel Action Files (PAFs) or RTP files. FAC is in favor of having them, but then what happens? D. Gove (CFA President) is on the committee. Even if it’s voluntary, have better information out to the faculty so they know that they could get SOClS. They could request of the Dean’s Office if they wish to get feedback from the students.
   - 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

The EO says there has to be a procedure in place to reassign people. There needs to be a line in the Handbook. J. Millar suggested looking at Handbook language on nepotism and the EO language on consensual relationship. J. Tarjan suggested including other conflict of interests, such as financial relationship, familial relationship. The committee will address the typo in 303.12, and 303.13 and make the Handbook and the EO verbiage consistent.

iv. BPC (B. Street)

Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – the committee is still working through the proposal in preparation of the joint meeting with AAC.

Referral 07 Academic Calendar – Spring and Fall Semester Breaks – B. Street spoke with D. Cantrell, AVP EM. D. Cantrell is receptive. The Calendar Task Force could be charged with working on the process. The Calendar Task Force has been asked to have a Calendar to BPC by October 31. A. Hegde requested that the Calendar Task Force suggest a solution and then bring to the EC. B. Street said the draft is for the 2021-2022 and the 2022-2023 calendars. J. Tarjan suggested that the process involved feedback from campus. Present the options; the pros and cons. People know what they want, yet there isn’t knowledge on the cons.

b. Interim Provost Update (see Searches)

c. Searches – Update (V. Harper)

i. AVP Academic Programs - no update

ii. Dean SS&E - conversations with SS&E individuals to start in week eight and the time table with the President for the Search for Dean.

iii. Associate Dean SS&E – the decision will follow the decision on Dean SS&E.

iv. Faculty Director of Interdisciplinary Studies (INST) - the Call is out. A. Hegde saw that the release time was posted as 12 WTUs for the position. In BPA, chairs get 9 WTUs. He asked if the position is equivalent to chair of a department. V. Harper responded that the Advisory Team discussed release time in depth. There are three degrees on the AMP related to Ethnic Studies, and because of AB 1460 there is the potential for a resolution to come from the legislature with the mandate of having Ethnic Studies as a department. This individual will have to manage the three degree proposals off the AMP, and then have a proposal developed. He feels that the significant undertaking warrants the extra three units. Outside of the management of the faculty associated with Interdisciplinary Studies and the INST courses, the Faculty Director will be asked to play a significant role in student success. We have students who get to the
end of their degree and they use INST in Make Your Own Degree as pathway out, as well as taking these degrees and get them through the academic process to have a sizable increase to have demanded it. A. Hegde said that last year’s discussion concluded that the numbers are not there to be consistent (including EEGO students). This could be setting a precedent for 12 units. FAC is working on Workload – what constitutes a one unit release. Interdisciplinary Studies is a lot of work at the beginning. We are responsible for the resources long term. We can’t use potential growth. The position is based on current enrollment. M. Danforth’s idea is to base WTU on current enrollment and then more WTUs in a MOU for writing proposals and shepherding them through the process. Thus, it wouldn’t add WTUs to the base. The additional WTUs are for an activity. A. Hegde doesn’t want people doing it for the release time. Instead, people should be motivated by the program. It could be from any school. V. Harper will be thoughtful about that with the other positions.

v. Faculty Director of the Teaching and Learning Center – The call is going out mid-October.

vi. Faculty Ombudsperson – The call to go out at the end of October.

vii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability - The call to go out at the end of October.

d. UPRC Recommendations (handout) See discussion under ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION – Program Review. The item was referred to AAC. Invite a FAC liaison to attend and take back some information, if needed. Consider release time to do reviews. The Interim Provost will forward a copy of the federal requirements for review he received from WSCUC to the EC.

e. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – on going. See ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION - Budget Forum

f. ATI Faculty Coordinator – A. Hegde will work with F. Gorham on the roles and responsibilities based on the recommendations of his report to the CO. All academic materials need to be accessible. There is a two-year plan in place. Initially we were told that the CO would pay for the improvements. However, that is no longer the case. CSUB identified the issues, and the funds must come from the GI 2025 funds.

g. CSUB AV Course Policy – The normal practice of the university is to restrict enrollments to those matriculated to each of the campuses. For example, Antelope Valley (AV) has programs that are for that campus. AV students have first right to get into those classes, because the university doesn’t offer every class, every semester. PeopleSoft will show “Campus Designation”. If a student is registered at AV, that’s the only way they can add a class. Many times, if a student from AV is willing to come to CSUB main campus to take a class (because they want to graduate
early) an override can be used to add the student. Conversely, if a section is full at main campus and there is a section open at AV, (and enough time has passed) we allow a student to add. BPA had a particular situation. A segment of students did not want to take a required course on the main campus taught by a particular instructor. The instructor has a reputation of being hard on cheating. There were multiple sections available at the main campus, taught by that instructor. Some of the classes fit into the students’ schedule. Yet, they wanted to take the class in AV, taught by someone else. They went to their Advisors to request an override. The Advisors said “no” since they are enrolled here and there is room at the main campus, so you take the class here. They went to Title IX Officer, under the pretense of discrimination. Because there is no written academic policy, he commanded the Advisors to enroll them in the AV class. Subsequently, the Advisors came to A. Hegde. In the catalog, there is a section that deals with AV. It says to take classes in AV one has to be an enrolled AV student and go through the process of being accepted by that campus. However, it doesn’t say anything about enrollment for specific courses. All it would take is one line in catalog: “Courses offered through the Antelope Valley campus are only open to Antelope Valley registered students, unless there are exceptions to be made.” BPA hasn’t gotten an official letter from Title IX Officer to explain 1) here’s the law, 2) here’s the mistake, 3) here’s what happened. The question is open – is this something we do for any student? V. Harper informed the group that once a student triggers a Title IX discrimination issue complaint, the Provost’s Office cannot get involved. Title IX operates independently of the university. Once he has located a finding, there will be a letter to the Interim Provost. A. Hegde confirmed that the students are in the AV class already. Is there an appeal process? V. Harper responded that while he is not an expert, the appeal would be made by the students. The institution may have an appeal. It’s not designed for a department to appeal. The students see it as discrimination against them. M. Danforth said there may be so much fear about lawsuits that people are stretching the definition of discrimination. People who are strict about academic integrity are not discriminatory toward academic freedom. A. Hegde summarized his issue: the Title IX Officer has created an academic policy. V. Harper said he’d need counsel to determine if that is the fair use of Title IX. A. Hegde said the question remains, what is the basis of the finding from the Title IX Officer? It could be referred to AS&SS and maybe AAC to change the language in the catalog. It should be straightforward. We can’t get it done for Spring Registration. The EC will wait until the letter comes before a referral is sent to AS & SS. The issue is separation of academic policies and other things. Students should go to the Provost’s Office first.
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Mode Change for Courses- M. Danforth brought the issue as a result of discussion in AAC about what is in the catalog, etc. Questions came up: What constitutes hybrid? How does one go from face-to-face to online courses? Each school has its own policy. For example, NSME has to go to the Curriculum Committee, but in other schools, the chair decides. Some faculty are pressured to go to online when they don’t want to go online. There is a need for campus-wide policy on how to approve classes, change instruction, and put a new framework in the University Handbook to enable each individual school to build their own unique policies. M. Rees said that Music Appreciation is taught face-to-face and online. The class itself doesn’t have a mode, but different teachers choose their mode. M. Danforth said that in the build of PeopleSoft, each class has a default mode. The ASC changes the mode. Should the mode be left to every individual faculty member? If a course is to be taught in multiple modes, could it be up to the instructor or decision of the Department? If a class is taught in one mode, and there is interest in teaching in another mode, does it have to go to review? Do we want a campus-wide policy where courses are in one or another mode, and if there is interest in changing mode(s) what is the policy? J. Tarjan reported that there has been discussion at state level GE, approved college courses, and CID process. He suggests not to have a campus policy. We already have a policy to get a course approved. Any course taught online has to be certified. A. Hegde agreed that it’s better to leave as is. It’s good for departments to decide, pedagogically, what is the best mode.
   b. Policy – Winter Term: appropriate courses and units (deferred)
   c. Summer Service (deferred)
   d. GRaSP post-award – BAS (deferred)
   e. Financial Aid (deferred)
   f. Senate rep for Alumni Association -Isabel Sumaya is in appointed term through May 2020.
   g. Committee list in Handbook (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING October 10, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   Budget Forum – October 21, 2019 11:00 a.m. – Noon SU MPR
   Consent Agenda
   New Business

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR