ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, February 12, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), J. Millar, J. Tarjan, M. Rush, E. Correa, B. Street, M. Danforth, V. Harper (Alt.)

Visitor: D. Schecter

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

2) ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
- V. Harper is off campus today.
- April 30 Executive Committee is an extended meeting with President Zelezny, 11:30-12:30
- President Zelezny’s Senate report scheduled for February 21 and April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
- Andrew Maiorano, General Counsel, will be attending the Senate meeting on February 21.
- Trustee Larry Norton visits on February 27 and Trustee Romey Sabalious visits on April 23
- OWL meeting, February 14, 2019, noon to 1:00 p.m. features President Zelezny.
- Celebrate CSU will not be taking place this year due to the need to recalibrate the showcase of the departments.
- The Jazz Festival will not occur while there is thinking about who the new lead would be and who is responsible for the budget. Since the Jazz Festival has been a venue where scholarships were awarded, what other venue will award the scholarships. Part of the communication piece is informing the community why these annual events are not occurring.
- The Rowdy Cart Race will still occur the last Saturday in April.

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The January 29, 2019 Minutes were approved by email.

4) APPROVAL OF AGENDA
D. Boschini suggested to add Gen Faculty Meeting debriefing, and the review of IRB’s recommendation as items for New Discussion. E. Correa moved to approve modified agenda. J. Tarjan seconded. Approved.

5) CONTINUED ITEMS
a) AS Log (handout)
i) AAC (M. Danforth) Reference the discussion at Senate about the catalog copy. The proposal is to move from a two-year catalog to a one-year catalog. The impact on faculty would be an increased workload. D. Boschini stated that the DCLC would foresee departments’ volume and types of catalog changes, and workload. If DCLC expresses deep concern, then perhaps FAC will take it up.

ii) AS&SS (E. Correa) (deferred and embedded in discussions)

iii) BPC (B. Street) There will be a brief report to the Senate on the modifications to the Academic Calendar that has been processed since approval of RES 181907.

iv) FAC (M. Rush) The DLC discussion revealed that there needs to be a mission or policy statement about how we decide whether a course goes on-line or hybrid. Currently, the view of DLC is a “how to” committee, and not a “why”. D. Boschini replied that whether a course goes online is a stand-alone curriculum issue. M. Danforth shared that within NSME, the request to do a mode change would go through the school Curriculum Committee (CC). M. Rush replied that that is not written anywhere. FAC thought of it as an academic issue. M. Danforth – AAC sees interdisciplinary courses that have multiple curriculum committees’ need to answer to it. If NSME wants to change from an on-line to hybrid class, or face-to-face to hybrid – all those mode requests had to go through the CCs. That would relate to the course change form, at Academic Operations and we’re not aware of what’s happening campus-wide. That would be the policy issue. A. Hegde asked why would there be a policy for approval if a department knows the discipline and decides this would work best – as online, hybrid, or other? M. Rush replied that the committee wants to give it back to the faculty and not to individuals. For example, a department chair says, rather than dropping the class, the faculty member teaches the course on line. Is that convenience for scheduling? There hasn’t been any pedagogical discussion. There are protections to consider. D. Boschini stated that FAC raised a good point. Perhaps the purpose of FAC’s review whether to add DLC to the Handbook is whether DLC has control over what can and can’t be online. Yet, that’s not DLC’s purview. It goes to the CC process and Academic Operations. D. Boschini asked M. Danforth about when she looks at catalog copy and process, in terms of CC policy and procedures – where does the information comes from? M. Danforth replied that currently the only consideration is whether the CC approval occurs and what the work order will be. It’s a mode (PeopleSoft) issue indicating whether it’s a face-to-face, hybrid, or online course, not a catalog issue. NSME had a friendly agreement that departments wouldn’t change things online unless their CC reviewed it and made sure that the pedagogy lined up for having it online. D. Boschini said that this is a question for CCs. Many do not know their school CC policies and procedures. M. Danforth suggested that in the Resolution, clarify who operates at which phases and the timeline, so chairs don’t get a request for catalog copy past deadline. M. Danforth will talk to L. Zuzarte about mode changes. M. Danforth will look into whether there is just a need for clarity and communication – or if there are policies and procedures that are lacking that need to be addressed. She will talk to the Associate Deans because they are the ones who are typically in charge of the CCs. D. Boschini requested that CC policies and procedures be added to the next EC Agenda, NEW DISCUSSION, and for M. Danforth to report back her findings.
b) Financial and strategic planning transparency – B. Street reported that the Strategic Budget Planning committee is meeting February 14. The meeting will break out into focus groups on priorities. He reached out to V. Harper and T. Davis on what are the best practices and what are the monetary components. V. Martin messaged that the Capital Campaign group is developing procedures. A consultant group has been asked to help. At some level the Capital Campaign and the Strategic Planning will merge.

c) Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC

d) Workload - What constitutes workload? (deferred and embedded in discussions)
   i) Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.
   ii) Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)
   iii) Schools have different workloads based on different criteria
   iv) What constitutes a one WTU release?
   v) Is release time consistent?
   vi) Timeline for grant writing and approval
   vii) Committee load

e) Hiring Procedures (deferred and embedded in discussions)

f) Time Block Schedule update

g) Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee process (possible FAC referral)

6) NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

   a) Leadership Academy (deferred)
   b) Financial Aid moved to BAS (deferred)
   c) GRASP and AARC (deferred)
   d) Searches (deferred)
      i) Proposed members Search - AVP for Enrollment Management (handout)
   e) Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (see previous handout) (deferred)
   f) Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification (handout) (deferred)
   g) Faculty Meeting debriefing Follow-up on Gen Faculty
      i) The non-tenured faculty appreciated the comments about hiring, classroom size,
equipment, course sections, etc. The meeting dynamics lacked TT who can speak about the
issues without risk. There was support on a suggestion to hold a meeting of TT faculty and a
request that they make comments on general faculty’s behalf to make a difference to the
folks coming up.
      ii) An attendee made the point of how many people give up because things don’t change,
and then they become demoralized. There was general agreement on that item.
          Motivation requires more than just, this is wrong and this needs to be fixed. It
          requires 1) a thank you for what you are doing 2) yes, we have issues that need to be addressed 3) still be
          polite and respectful that people are doing the best they can.
      iii) What are the high-impact practices that the President has allocated funds toward? What
          are we not doing? What are we doing that needs improvement?
      iv) There will be a windfall of money from the state coming into the campuses. CSUB needs
to fight for its share. Now is the time to think of our hiring needs for the next five years.
v) High Impact Practices have already been identified and discussed within University Council. V. Harper is charged with looking at them. One is Block Scheduling. As with other things, there’s little evidence of faculty input. At the end of the day, the administration can identify high impact practices based on literature, data on a national level, etc. However, case remedies are not appropriate here. Faculty members teaching the classes know the students and what works and what doesn’t. It’s important to have faculty provide input on what resources are needed to implement faculty solutions. According to the President’s opinion, we are no longer a Rural University. No matter how we may be classified, the TT has to be higher than the CSU system because the institution doesn’t have the talent individuals to teach as adjuncts like other “metro” areas. There are qualified lecturers, however insufficient. We can’t be compared to the system.

vi) Consider having Faculty retreats whereby people get to know each other and the talent we have here at CSUB. What makes Joel Haney a rich faculty member? Getting faculty together is great for improving morale.

vii) Block scheduling – How are the decision made and which departments participates?

viii) If one’s department isn’t chosen, there may be way of developing cohort in the department to resemble block scheduling. The department has majors and can work with advising to instruct students to “enroll here”.

ix) It was suggested that University Week include presentations from people involved in the classroom to provide teaching tips from TLC and GECCo. Hold a nice faculty social to set the tone. Signal the fact that faculty is important.

x) V. Harper’s power point identified some changes in TLC. The TLC is moving toward bringing more focus on teaching.

xi) Many concerns were expressed without providing solutions. It’s a path that’s unhealthy. There has been progress in some areas. Even when the communication is going well, people don’t see it. For example L. Sakomoto received the CA Music Educators Assoc. (CMEA) award for Kern County. The CMEA members were there. We need to communicate more about the positive things faculty are doing.

xii) The term “High Impact Practices” was introduced during the creation of the semester curriculum. It was about teaching; what we do in the classroom. Faculty understand the term in relation to what faculty can do in the classroom. The term has since evolved into a catch-all to describe anything that someone may be doing to help. Block-scheduling is a part of the High Impact Practices. EC’s recommendation to the Administration is to 1) communicate what are the three classroom high impact practices, and 2) specifically how much money was spent on those from the money that was intended for the new faculty TT hires.

xiii) Until we acknowledge we have growth issues and that the resources aren’t meeting the growth of students, the band aid solution will continue. Why did it take meetings between V. Harper and Dean Madden to get one more work station for the computer lab? Why didn’t those resources appear last summer so plans could have been made for the AY?
There were ten students on the waitlist and now there are nine that couldn’t get into the course because the workstations weren’t there. Some faculty aren’t speaking up to get what’s needed for the students and the internal and external data are not being used to predict needs. Are there priorities, or do you have to catch people at the right time?

xiv) The last couple weeks feel like a set-back in shared governance. The comments made at the General Faculty Meeting shows that the situation is not anywhere near where it needs to be. Doing the best we can isn’t good enough because there is a standard bar yet to be reached. Based on the proposed funding to CSU, Brian Street recommended 22-25 TT to V. Harper, and T. Davis. The money goes to Academic Affairs first, and then other areas. In the last decade, it seems as if it’s been the other way around.

xv) A. Hegde said the reason it looks like two steps forward and three steps back is because we don’t have the processes in place. Some still operate as if we’re still a small campus, and some operate as if we are a large campus. The band aid resources appear to be going to the people who speak the loudest – whether the request is warranted. One could talk about the need for faculty lines at the department level, at the school level, and at the university level. Suppose the Deans are told they get the lines; they decide what the priority is. If I’m not the vocal person with the Dean’s office, I get left behind. Hopefully, V. Harper will be using data to make decisions. Hearing from other faculty, it appears that we start with outcome and then look to see if the process supports it. When faculty is told you have a chain of command and you can’t speak, it doesn’t make sense for supporting shared governance. The President said, on many occasions, she listens to the students. With the tutoring money, that’s exactly what happened. Enough students got her attention and the deficiency was rectified. M. Danforth’s workstation appeared because she was vocal. The faculty majority is unhappy but don’t say anything because they feel that it’s business as usual. It’s the Senate’s work to follow the process and hold people accountable.

xvi) E. Correa received notification from IT today that the online SOCs have a glitch. Apparently, there was an on-line SOCI pilot this winter. There is a problem getting the online SOCs to people and their departments. IT wasn’t aware that chairs needed to see SOCs so they just sent the SOCs to the instructors. IT wants to make a decision on the online SOCI pilot, but they haven’t talked to sufficient number of people about it. It’s another case of IT moving forward (like BB, and Canvas LSM) before there’s been faculty input. M. Danforth said that the NSME rep on ITC received the same slivers of info on BB auto-enroll. E. Correa said that when the IT reps came to AS&SS, their interpretation of the committee’s responses was that it as an OK for IT to go ahead with the changes. She said, absolutely not, this is just the first level response. Next, IT has to go before the Senate. M. Danforth said the movement from OneDrive to Box occurred without discussion of how to move files over, whether OneDrive is going to go away, whether files stored on SharePoint are going away, etc.

xvii) Student success means multiple things. Two priorities were suggested: 1) The need to balance things when we discuss student success; how fast and how many students get through and progress to graduation along with preparation for lifetime success. 2) Make the case that smaller classes are important for reaching all the student-success indicators.
The classes were designed for 30 students. The difference is felt in classes of 45 and 60. Student success is related to more TT faculty and reduced classroom size. Faculty are being asked to take students above the enrollment cap and agree to taking on students for Independent Studies. It’s a chronic problem. The tactic to getting students out this semester is increasing class size and pressuring instructors to do Independent Studies without compensation. Years ago, the campus tried to get rid of Independent Studies by making the hurdles higher. Now departments are inundated with requests from students who are being told to ask their instructors for Independent Studies. That came from the Provost’s office. D. Boschini sees that this is going to be a union issue. There seems to be an increase interest from the Graduation Initiative to have students finish fast and then while the semester is underway, when classes and workloads have already been set, instructors are pressured to sign in the box for voluntary overload, thus do it without compensation. When it happens, it’s awkward, because we are then influencing others whether to decide to spend money at the faculty’s expense. Will faculty have an additional conversation with the dean every time they say “yes” to an Independent Study? Are the Deans being told to say “yes” to more money? Are they going to be given more money? It becomes a big compensation question. The easiest solution is to have faculty sign for voluntary work at the last minute, agreeing that they will not be compensated for the extra workload. At that point, the Independent Studies are not that valuable. It does take some work. If we do want to give faculty the units, next year (even though we’re not supposed to be carrying them over) the buzz is that it’s destined for the Union. D. Schecter is working on updating the form and developing language to make sure everyone understands they are not being pressured to volunteer. We don’t want a grievance on it. No wink and nod to do this class, and it’s to help these students. J. Millar got the impression that the extra load is what was going to happen to get the 415 students [on CSUB’s GI Task Force Pilot] to graduate. D. Schecter acknowledged that the university will lose on a grievance like that. The Provost’s office has been going in the direction of eliminating voluntary instruction. Everyone needs to either be compensated for those units or have an agreement as to what is going to happen with their total units per year. D. Boschini said there are TT being told they shouldn’t be overloading, and in some cases they want to, and don’t feel they can do overloads, they are told not to do overloads – so there are work arounds involving the Chair as the evaluator. It’s not good nor is it sustainable and people are going to start filing.

xviii) The pressure to do Independent Studies is not coming from the deans. It’s from the Fall 15 cohort initiative. Where people are being asked to do Independent studies in this summer, they need to be compensated for sticking around the summer for helping the students.

xix) A. Hegde said there are variations of Independent Study. For example, Ag Business program has an internship requirement. The department can’t run it as a regular class. It’s an independent study. All that is expected of the student is to do a reflective paper on the experience and have a meeting with the instructor. That doesn’t warrant extra units. Only those Independent Studies related to a class should have unit(s). There should be a different code for an internship. D. Boschini, as chair of a department with a relatively low
SFR, she sees that if we’re trying to make sure that classes are 30 vs 60 students, the voluntary Independent Study will make the SFR decrease. D. Schecter said that Independent Studies are being tracked separately. D. Boschini said if we try to calculate workload per department that is doing a lot of Independent Study, it would not be an accurate reflection.

xx) EC will be pushing more for solutions and how the solutions will be communicated to those faculty who should be involved. We don’t want to negate IT’s efforts where they are trying to reach out to more people, albeit we’ve identified that IT is reaching out to the wrong people, at the wrong time. The request is that IT and other initiators-of-change ask the Academic Senate Chair who they need to ask questions of before making changes.

xxi) Reassign the sixth new faculty position slated for sustainability to a new counselor hire and ask for the five additional faculty hires that were allocated.

h) Institutional Review Board (IRB) re-appointment. By unanimous vote, the EC approved C. Livingston for re-appointment to the IRB to serve as a Nonscientific Member on the Board.

7) **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING** **FEBRUARY 21, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - President Zelezny Senate Report (Time Certain) 10:05 – 10:20
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
   - Old Business
   - RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading

8) **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook