ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Extra
Minutes
Tuesday, September 1, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.
Videoconference

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

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION**
   - Faculty Open Forum – September 2, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. Zoom videoconference, hosted by Provost
   - Budget Forum - October 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon Zoom videoconference
   - Faculty list Fall 2020 needed to run elections

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart) J. Sun offered to assist with Referral 192016 Program Review Process Improvement.
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) D. Boschini said draft resolution on Referral 2019-2020 Referral 12 Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain was presented yet it was rejected due to need for graduate policy. D. Jackson can provide some information.
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
   b. Provost Update – V. Harper
      i. Winter Session - AAC met last spring and the Senate passed RES 192021 Winter Term Courses and Units Policy. Yet there wasn’t any follow-up. M. Novak authored a letter this summer regarding the timing of Winter
Session. He wants to start EEGO courses before Winter break. It had already been communicated why it is problematic. V. Harper will forward M. Novak’s latest email to A. Hegde.

ii. **AB 1460 An Act to Add Section 89032 to the Education Code of CSU requires CSU** requiring that students take an ethnic studies (ES) course before graduating was passed. The counsel in the Office of the Chancellor issued a deadline for campuses to complete curricular changes by the end of Fall 2020 semester. V. Harper asked for the Senate’s approach as it relates to the AB 1460 and the changes to the GE Program. Intertwined are 1) The Law 2) The Board of Trustees’ (BOT) action passed before the law changed which was to create Area F by reducing Area D from nine units to six units. GE Area F is a done deal. We need a GE committee make changes to the GE program and have the catalog updated by December and reflected in the catalog by January 2021. We have to be in compliance with the law and offer the two existing Area F courses by Fall 2021. More faculty hiring may be required in order to deliver such. Since GECCo said that it’s up to the Senate to change the curriculum, what is the next step? A. Hegde responded that the deadline creates pressure on a decision that requires much thought. He met with English department this week. They want to be considered as part of ES with writing, etc. M. Danforth recalled that when the current GE package was created, it was the GE Implementation Committee (GEIC) who created the framework and it was brought to the Senate as resolution. GEIC was institutionalized as a specialized subcommittee of the Senate on the subject of GE reform; they did the leg work and it went through the Senate. The change the BOT made to create Area F will bump a few degree programs to 123 units because they have other requirements elsewhere in the law for 2 Area D classes. The way it’s designed is for American Institutions to be an Area D course and there is regulation for some programs that two more Area D classes are needed, to total nine units. Three units don’t disappear just because there is competition between the two different regulations. The CO will have to approve 123 units or open it up for campus to be inventive. We are already inventive with Area E (SELF) with zero to three units due to overlay in SELF and other GE areas, why not with F? It takes time to do it properly. For example, how to set up Area F at zero unit costs even for those people who need those nine units of Area D is problematic. If we do it quickly there will be programs left in the dust, unable to create a
pathway using 120 units and still remain in compliance with all the regulatory, accreditation, and other pressures. V. Harper acknowledged the difficulty because the CO will not allow degree programs to go over 120 units. The Title IX changes are in place. We need to know who is leading the conversation. There are degree programs that have unit requirements Area D and will have to make changes to their program to comply with the law. GECCo will not act unless they are told to act. M. Danforth reiterated that there is conflict with different parts of the law. A. Hegde said that change has to go through the Senate. He suggested to set up a task force. If we go through the sub-committees it will take too long. C. Lam repeated that what the legislature decided on AB 1460 and what the BOT expects are in conflict. Is the CO going to change anything to provide better guidance? He was on GE Implementation Committee. It took six months to satisfy interests. It is important that a task force is inclusive enough. It will take time to make sure programs are not diminished. D. Boschini opined that the Senate should take up the issue because the Senate is the prime shared governance group, and this is a prime shared governance matter. Students in the Nursing program must take Intro to Psych and Into to Sociology which are both Area D. There is no room to add another course. This is of primary interest. She suggested to refer the issue to AAC, making it the first priority item, and invite guests who are affected. We may have to decide which rule to break. A. Hegde asked the group whether they were in favor of a 1) Senate Task Force or 2) referring implementation of ES to AAC, or 3) to have GECCo handle it. J. Millar is disappointed that the ASCSU resolution, brought forth by the Academic Affairs committee last year, was not passed. The Ethnic Council discussed far more classes that would have fit the need. She supports the Task Force idea, including faculty who have ethnic studies backgrounds that can contribute. She strongly urged that the ethnic studies faculty and people who have degrees in ethnic studies, yet teaching in a different department, are not forgotten. A. Hegde said there are two issues: 1) Requiring Area F change to curriculum and 2) which courses go underneath it. Separate what doesn’t need to happen before the end of this term. If we propose a separate Area F there are programs that can’t do it because it’s adding 3 unit to their programs. Example: Nursing and Computer Science. The Chancellor said we can’t do that. One possibility is folding the three units into a Junior Year Diversity Reflection (JYDR) course. The first part that needs to be
addressed is how to accommodate three ES units in the curriculum. The second part is which courses fit the requirement, which will take more time to do and not likely to be finished by the end of this term. V. Harper said the deadline to submit catalog copy to the CO is December 1. The Catalog will have to be all sorted by then. CSUB ES courses already exist and are in compliance with ES outcomes. The challenge is who is going to make the changes to the catalog that reflect that we have Area F and a reduction in Area D from nine to six units. Yes, there are consequences and they need to be in the catalog. A. Hegde said that some faculty would like to offer courses that meet the criteria but haven’t had the chance to do so. V. Harper replied that there is time to add courses. ES will probably oppose others teaching in their subject group. M. Martinez stated that there is no formal ES department. Other programs cover the topic. For example, American Government teaches race, ethnicity, gender, etc. The notion that Political Science can’t do it will not sit well with those who teach those components. He prefers the Task Force idea. Create a body that has the good will of good number of faculty who have an ethnic studies heart. It has to be set up to have honest brokers. Work on the classes we know we’ll have pushback. We know that AB 1460 will not eliminate the American Government course. American History is not the replacement class to ES. There will be painful choices. A. Hegde reiterated that the process must include broad representation. The first issue is to deal with unit count issue. CO need to give something: either extend the catalog deadline or be willing to have campuses amend the catalog. We can’t do it all by Dec 1. We don’t want to sacrifice someone’s voice for the sake of deadline. Then, we get guidance on how to fit in three units. R. Gearhart said that A. Rodriguez is planning to propose a sizable number of courses. There is no time for personality conflicts. Focus on fitting the three units in, and later what constitutes ES. D. Boschini said that the three units needs to be the focus and how they are managed. That is deeply controversial. There is no way to make everyone happy. The catalog deadline should not drive the conversation. Consider the real deadline and what are the consequences of not making it. Make a list of degrees that make it difficult and make a list of degrees that make it impossible to meet requirements. A. Hegde confirmed that it is the will of the group that the Senate control the process. He asked V. Harper’s office to provide the list of programs that require two specific classes in Area D. That list will
provide focus. J. Millar has not heard anything on ES in ASCSU AA committee. M. Danforth said that some programs, such as Computer Science, have a waiver on Area D, and she doesn’t want GECCo to take that waiver away. Further, there is a problem how some courses appear in the catalog with the new catalog website. Electrical and Computer Engineering courses showed up under Engineering Sciences, and she had Computer Science courses showing up with incorrect descriptions, courses merged together, etc. There was a difference in what she submitted and what appeared on the website. Thus, the process is also in question. V. Harper said CO apologized for the timeline. They say it’s driven by legislation when catalog changes have taken place. Dec 1 is deadline imposed by the Office of the Chancellor. He needs to know if GECCo will have a role. A. Hegde clarified that it is the will of the group is that the Senate is in charge. The Senate will handle the structure of GE and unit implementation. We’ll take care of whether to form a task force or refer to AAC. The individual course approvals come under GECCo. There have been concerns about that process and that’s on the Senate’s list of things to discuss. Later, the Senate will address the concern about GECCo structure and process. R. Gearhart reminded the group that Academic Programs’ new form goes live this semester. That will create a host of other issues. How to use the newer, longer, time-consuming forms have yet to be shared. M. Martinez pointed out that the legislature has made mistakes before. Specifically, a number of students who took American Government in High School learned that their course did not count because it did not include California Government. The CO had to waive requirements for a lot of students. We can’t wait for the legislature to fix the conflict in requirements. We have a big task in front of us and we need to make it right. The Task Force, excluding GECCo, is a good first step. J. Millar said this is an example of why we don’t need the legislature to tell CSU how to offer curriculum. A. Hegde asked the Provost if CSUB could get an extension on the catalog. We don’t want to say we have specific classes while not having given others the chance to offer their class which could satisfy the requirement. M. Danforth asked if the Senate passed a resolution creating the new GE structure and how the new Area F is going to fit in by the end of November, would that be sufficient for the CO to show the legislature on how GE is going to work. The structure has been made, and we’re going to continue making corrections to the catalog until January. V. Harper commented on the
good discussion. Courses going into catalog need to satisfy the Council for Ethnic Studies requirements and learning outcomes. The courses are not diversity classes. The law puts the focus on four ethnic groups: Native American, Asian, African American, and Latino and Latina Americans. Social Justice did not pass. The outcomes are going to be provided to us. GECCo will deliberate on whether those courses apply. Get the unit issue resolved by December. At the same time, identify learning outcomes from ES, provide them to GECCo, and have GECCo show how to meet ES requirement. We can have requirement of each class meet. M. Danforth said it’s important for faculty stakeholders to know that there is a parallel process. AAC will build the structure. GECCo handles the ES course approval as they did with Area B and Area C courses. A. Hegde said that AAC meetings are open. GECCo members can also read the minutes. He will write A. Gebauer that AAC will start working on the unit piece. AAC may have to say, instead of taking six units Area C, maybe take three units. It is different than the courses themselves. C. Lam said that GECCo is the execution board and there may not be enough faculty there to understand Area F implementation. We may need to consider GECCo membership. M. Danforth expressed concern if there isn’t anyone from ES on GECCo, then how can they understand learning outcomes, etc. D. Boschini strongly recommended that Academic Affairs have a written record that GECCo agrees to implement the decisions of the Senate. J. Millar suggested that ES faculty can serve as consultants to this process both on the Senate and on GECCo. A. Hegde summarized that 1) the Senate will be the guiding body to address the three units. Senate will call a Task Force to submit recommendation to the Senate or perhaps AAC will oversee the Task Force, and then form a resolution. 2) GECCo develop a plan and certain guidelines on how they are going to approve courses to meet learning outcomes, which is GECCo’s domain. They can utilize GECCo fellow(s) to oversee ES by getting that started with consultation from the ES faculty. 3) The structure of GECCo will need some time.

iii. Academic Affairs Pandemic Advisory Task Force (AAPTF) V. Harper is looking for the faculty appointments to the committee.

iv. Academic Master Plan – V. Harper said given the budget constraints there cannot be additions unless there is an objection. D. Boschini objected. She needs the Masters in Nursing Family Practitioner in the AMP because the Doctorate Nursing Practitioner degree is moving to the national level.
c. Searches – no updates

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – A. Hegde and B. Street are meeting with T. Davis today.

e. Academic Testing – Faculty say we need testing, and the CO will be sending guidelines. Carried to next meeting.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Tabled AY 19-20 resolutions – The two resolutions that the President didn’t sign are RES 192015 Faculty Workload and RES 192017 Balancing the Restoration of Faculty Ranks with MPP and Staff Hiring. The President said that she doesn’t want to be involved in academic issues. D. Boschini said that the four resolutions from this summer are pandemic related, and she expects they will be signed.

Hiring Freeze – if not hiring faculty, the same standards should apply to staff and administration. Last year, the President shared with D. Boschini, Academic Senate Chair 2016-2020, that she can’t be constrictive in the planning for the campus. She didn’t want to make promises. If we can’t hire faculty, we shouldn’t be hiring new staff. The Senate’s expectation is that the President would acknowledge the resolution, if not approving it, as former President Mitchell did. There is a public stance that needs to be made. It’s disappointing the President didn’t approve the Faculty Workload resolution. Both the President and Provost heard conversation about workload; the response is that it’s being managed in the Senate. The FAC worked through the issues to present a resolution which may not have the same meaning in May as in January. We have to be able to move things through the Senate, and the Handbook says that the President signs resolutions. The President said that she is considering that faculty issues and academics could be signed by the Provost. Other campuses have Provost sign. If so, that would require a Handbook change. R. Gearhart observed that certain units are promoting individuals resulting in salary increases while there is discussion of pay cuts. A. Hegde said that in Academic Affairs, retiring faculty lines are “no replacement” where it appears that that does not apply on the MPP side. Further, positions are not captured when Student Affairs people retire. V. Harper replied that there will be changes to MPPs. M. Rees thanked D. Boschini for her remarks. She and others FAC were completely mystified by the President’s decision not to sign RES 192015 Faculty Workload because she signed other academic issues sent forth. It was a tremendous amount of work that seemed to be put aside. Is there something else (program review, WTU for lead writers, etc.) that she was not willing to reveal? V. Harper said that the President and he discuss resolutions and then she spoke her mind.
A. Hegde asked the President this summer if there was any more info needed for her to sign RES 192015. She replied that the legal counsel, A. Maiorano, looked at another campus and that President doesn’t always sign resolutions. She wanted to reflect on the role of the President and for A. Hegde to reflect as well. A. Hegde said the resolutions are written to be directed to the President. It could be a philosophical change. M. Danforth said that a decision needs to be made because of urgent matters related to Ethnic Studies (ES). Perhaps we need to change the Handbook to President or designee. A. Hegde will invite the President to the next EC meeting and let her know that it’s a concern. The 2019-20 work is done. He will start the conversation on the philosophical issues.

D. Boschini and R. Gearhart motioned to extend by ten minutes. All in favor.

b. Accessible Technology Initiative – faculty representative needed. M. Danforth volunteered because she’s constantly working with ITS.
c. Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time (deferred)
d. Faculty Rep on Alumni Board – email S. Hendrick requested approval of her recommendation D. Sandles Teacher Education in serving. Approved.
e. Sustainable Financial Task Force - reference August 5 minutes (deferred)
f. Post-Tenure Review Requirements (deferred)
g. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (deferred)
h. Unapproved Software (deferred)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING SEPTEMBER 3, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   Consent Agenda
   Reports
   New Business
   Old Business
   Open Forum

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   Topic: Ethnic Studies Task Force: A. Hedge asked the body to think about how to fill the Task Force. M. Martinez suggested A. Rodriguez or at least one person from Interdisciplinary Studies, and to consider new faculty of color who have classes that offer insights.
Topic: Exceptional Service Award, Article 20.37 Review Committee – The appropriate members of the review committee are the Vice Chair, FAC chair and someone with experience reviewing candidates for the award. The EC decided that M. Danforth, M. Rees and B. Street form the committee. A. Hegde will write some points about the selection process, (diversity, ranking submittals, etc.) and email to the members.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45