



Academic Senate: Summer Senate

Minutes

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2025

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Location: Dezember Leadership and Development Center, Room 409-411

Zoom link: <https://csu.zoom.us/j/81479949372?pwd=4crVHi8WguwHYMJB2FVwwSQLzXwpm4.1>

Members: M. Danforth (Chair), D. Solano (Vice-Chair), J. Rodriguez (Interim Provost), A. Hegde Immediate Past Chair, C. Lam (ASCSU Senator), N. Michieka (ASCSU Senator), J. Deal (AAC 24-25), T. Tsantsoulas (AS&SS 24-25; AAC 25-26), D. Wu (BPC 24-25), Z. Zenko (FAC 24-25, 25-26), A. Grombly (BPC 25-26), L. Kirstein (AS&SS 25-26), and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst).

Guests: D. Cantrell, J. Mabry and A. Gomez-Navarro.

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Chair Danforth called the meeting to order at 10:02 AM.
- II. Announcements and Information
 - a. Discussion on Advising w/ Strategic Enrollment Management & Student Support (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)
 - i. Chair Danforth presented the concerns voiced from faculty that have been raised regarding the challenges of the implementation of the Advising Case Management model.
 1. Positive notes:
 - a. Appreciation of the vision and focus on student success
 - b. See value in providing students with year-round availability to see advisors.
 - c. Those with experience at other institutions with case management models have seen how it can be well-implemented.
 2. Specific concerns voiced:
 - a. Rapid implementation:
 - i. Specifically, the speed at which the implementation is expected (in a few weeks) and lack of guidance on how to implement the model.
 - ii. Issues are already arising due to the rush, like mistakes in the new checklist template.

- iii. A lot of stress and anxiety related to how quickly this model is being rolled out and the lack of clarity.
- b. Lack of training and adequate time for learning new concepts and programs.
- c. Lack of communication and consultation with various constituencies (Senate, chairs, CFA, faculty and staff advisors, etc.).
- d. Concerns that the quality of advising will suffer due to rapid roll-out, lack of training, and having someone double-check work (under the presumption the case manager does everything).
 - i. Many concerns have been voiced regarding students ending up taking the wrong classes, delaying time for degree completion. Examples were provided of incorrect advising by both faculty and staff that delayed graduation for some students.
- e. Programs should not have to object to continue their current advising models
 - i. Some feel like the model is punishing programs that have already worked out successful collaborations between faculty and staff advisors
 - ii. Almost everyone with a good advising model wants to continue collaborations between faculty and staff
- f. No clarity on how the dotted line reports to the colleges work and how the college associate deans are involved
- g. Workload concerns and inequities for both staff and faculty
 - i. Raised particularly by faculty advisors; if advising is extended to the full academic year instead of the advising weeks in the academic calendar.
 - ii. Specifically for the professional advisors: balancing the caseload. It is difficult to distribute incoming student workload evenly because not all students who submit intent to enroll end up enrolling.
- h. Assigning staff advisors by last name letter group eliminates having one advisor who is an expert in specific program(s)
 - i. Losing the staff experts for specific programs. Cross training all staff advisors in a college center will lead to an advising game of telephone; non-experts do not fully understand programs at the same level the current experts do.
 - ii. Questions on whether a student can change their case manager and what that process looks like.

- i. Clarity is needed on who can lift holds and how to get a student to see a faculty advisor if their staff advisor has already removed the advising hold and vice versa.
 - 3. Recommendations provided:
 - a. Advising Council to take this matter up in the fall to develop clear implementation plans with clear goals and guidance. For example, defining roles, responsibilities and expectations for all parties involved.
 - b. Provide training for all advisors (faculty and staff) and adequate training time
 - c. Allow programs with successful advising models to continue their partnerships between faculty and staff advisors.
 - i. Consider retaining the concept of having staff advisors be an “expert” in specific program(s), with some cross-training to provide redundancy but not expecting all advisors to know all programs in a college.
 - d. Case managers should be coordinating a “care team” that includes faculty advisors (collaboration and teamwork were repeatedly mentioned by multiple groups).
 - e. Gradually transition to the new model, instead of fully jumping in with all programs. Gradual transition would also give sufficient time for training and learning about programs.
 - ii. D. Cantrell – VP for Strategic Enrollment Management & Student Success:
 - 1. Strategic Enrollment Management does not have any oversight or authorization regarding Faculty Advisors and does not plan to change anything.
 - 2. Advising Case Management Model is not new; there’s angst because there is change. There are similar programs on campus in athletics and Guardian Scholars Program.
 - 3. Are working to slowly roll out this case management model. Things can be slowed down if needed to do things together and collaboratively, however, progress does need to happen per the directive given by President Harper.
 - 4. Staff advisors’ workloads have significantly decreased; as their prior caseloads often involved other responsibilities outside of advising.
 - 5. Coordinators and chairs are not losing staff; no advisors are being moved from any colleges. They do want to ensure that there is appropriate knowledge and coverage if someone is out on leave, etc.
 - 6. Clarified that the case manager is not working alone; they are the connecting piece for the execution of service through funneling out resources.
 - iii. Q&A and Discussion:

1. J. Deal asked clarification questions regarding the faculty role, specifically the release of advising holds.
 - a. D. Cantrell: Some nuanced details. Intent is for there to be a support system. Vision is that as soon a student submits their intent to enroll, they are connected with an advisor, who connects them with a faculty advisor, then will follow up and check in with the student. Some additional discussion ensued regarding the release of holds and curriculum advising.
 - b. J. Mabry agreed that there were issues with the initial phases of the implementation, particularly in programs such as those in BPA where the faculty advisor sees the students initially instead of a staff advisor. There are procedural challenges for ensuring or forcing the students to see their faculty advisor. They are currently using a specific type of hold for this, however, there may be other solutions. J. Mabry agreed that more discussion and collaboration would need to take place to find those alternate solutions, if any.
2. Z. Zenko voiced concerns about losing advisor knowledge and expertise as it is imperative for students to be guided and directed to taking the appropriate courses. It would be very difficult for professional advisors to learn and become experts in all the areas. Z. Zenko recommended slowing the process down, developing standard operating procedures, which would be written down and disseminated as part of the consultation process. Recommendation was also given that anything affecting faculty workload should go through the meet and confer process with CFA.
 - a. D. Cantrell agreed with the recommendation to document the vision and have shared oversight in the review and development of procedures. D. Cantrell acknowledged the challenges of slowing things down but emphasized the need to make progress. D. Cantrell reiterated that President Harper directed him to show progress, and that doing so is both his responsibility and part of the evaluation of his job performance.
 - b. Chair Danforth added that the lack of clarity is really the issue and that even existing procedures are not being followed correctly in the rush to create new processes.
3. A. Hegde: Communication, Coordination and Collaboration
 - i. Understands that the President wants action and results; however, President Harper has always been a champion of shared governance. Advising will also be an academic affair, no matter where it is housed. Communication, coordination and collaboration have been lacking, which is problematic.

- ii. A. Hegde suggested that Chair Danforth or the Academic Senate Executive Committee would be more than happy to talk to President Harper regarding the request for the process to be slowed down. Faculty can decide what to do next if the President is not in support of that.
 - iii. D. Cantrell assured Summer Senate that the President supports shared governance which is why he is engaging with the Senate. While Academic Operations falls under Enrollment Management Enrollment management doesn't touch the catalog or make decisions about curriculum. Instead, Enrollment management is responsible for staffing and ensuring things are running and operational.
 - iv. Chair Danforth added that the catalog has also had issues because of the division between Academic Affairs and Strategic Enrollment management and poor implementation.
- b. C. Lam had questions about the pilot roll out. Specifically, for the graduation roll out, which students are being targeted and what mechanisms are going to be used for collecting feedback?
 - i. D. Cantrell: Advisory Council will include an expansive team of voices and representation.
 - ii. J. Mabry: The pilot has begun with all new students. The students will be assigned an advisor, given a welcome packet and common outline (which feedback has been received for) and personalized email, and one-on-one appointment with their advisor. Some logistical hiccups have occurred for those in the smaller programs or those where the students need to see a faculty advisor much sooner.
 - iii. A. Gomez-Navarro: Students have been contacted anyways, which has not changed. The main change is that it is now consistent across all centers, which is aimed to increase the engagement between the students and their advisors and improve the student experience.
 - iv. D. Cantrell: Agreed that it would be helpful to share information with faculty about how students are being contacted, clarify the current process, and stress that not a lot has actually changed.
 - v. Discussion ensued regarding issues with the rapid roll out of the common checklist, which has led to the errors that students are facing.
- c. T. Tsantsoulas spoke in support of the case management model and echoed what others have suggested with the need for more and written

down communication to be distributed. The timing of the roll out is also challenging because it is happening at the end of the academic year. Faculty are off contract over summer, which is likely exacerbating the concerns, and some may feel like perhaps they are being left in the dark intentionally.

- d. J. Mabry asked what the best way would be to get out in front of the faculty and collect feedback. They are trying to keep communication and collaboration open by attending DCLC, and Senate. What other avenues are there? Understands there was perhaps some misunderstanding, and is striving to express their openness to discussion and feedback, however, it does not seem it has been received.
 - i. Chair Danforth provided some suggestions such as organizing an advising Town Hall in the fall, reaching out to R. Weller in FTLC for collaboration on perhaps a training workshop series. Chair Danforth reminded J. Mabry that faculty are off contract over summer, so some type of stipend would need to be on the table. In addition, as suggested, something written that faculty can refer to that outlines resources, roles, changes and what might be coming next.
 - ii. Some discussion ensued regarding the procedure for identifying programs like Economics that require the faculty to meet with students early, etc. J. Mabry: Through the centers.
4. J. Deal reiterated that documentation would be necessary and appropriate for showing that shared governance and collaboration is being implemented and that policies need to come from the Advising Council, not Enrollment Management.
5. T. Tsantsoulas addressed the resolution that passed in Academic Senate (**RES 242518** "Academic Advising Structure is an Academic Endeavor") which President Harper did not sign. The President asked that the Senate collaborate with D. Cantrell. Some concern over why it was not signed as it speaks to the idea of shared governance.
 - a. D. Cantrell explained that his concern was with the broad definition of "purview" noting that it implies supervision and control by the Academic Senate, which does not imply collaboration. Advising falls under his job responsibilities now and he is held accountable for ensuring there is progress. Believed there is room for conversation there.
 - b. Z. Zenko/ T. Tsantsoulas: Discussed the "purview of the Academic Senate" language, which would be similar to how the catalog is under the purview of Academic Affairs. If there are any changes, there is

collaborative process and approval through the shared governance, such as consultation and resolution if needed. D. Cantrell suggested the consideration of changing the language to highlight the collaboration. T. Tsantsoulas confirmed and expressed hope that D. Cantrell would be willing to come to Senate or EC in the future if there are similar concerns before an item goes to the President.

- c. D. Wu: Several of these issues were brought up at the beginning of the semester, which are still happening. It is important to determine what can be done now between summer and the fall before the Advising Council meets and how to address the issues that need to be resolved and improved for the future. How can the information be shared in a way with advisors in an effective fashion and ensure everyone is aware of the curriculum changes. Suggestion was made for regular meetings between program directors, advisors, where discussions regarding curriculum changes, trends in industry careers, etc. that would help advisors be prepared. The suggestion was made for in-person meetings to ensure communication flow and feedback. Many of these conversations are happening but are very informal.
- iv. D. Solano shared that she is in a very complicated major where faculty need to meet with students early. Their relationship with advising has been immensely improved through Glenda's efforts. D. Solano recommends cross training for faculty advisors. Some suggestions were also made for how to reach the faculty that are available during summer. Suggestions were also made for the development of guidelines for faculty that want to be involved and how the process can be fine tuned to ensure proper process.
- v. D. Cantrell asked which faculty would be appropriate to reach out to regarding collecting some of this feedback and developing some of these guidelines. Chair Danforth said that department chairs and summer chairs are on summer MOUs and some Program Directors may also be on summer contracts. It is important to respect the faculty contract. For those that are interested in and available for the development of guidelines over summer; a stipend would be appropriate.
- vi. J. Deal asked for clarification on the June 2nd deadline and the expectations. J. Mabry clarified that departments that do their own curriculum advising would want to ensure someone is on contact to meet with the students over summer.
- vii. D. Wu provided suggestions for communication to be sent out to the Program Directors and students for whom to reach out to resolve issues and how to provide feedback.
- viii. Chair Danforth brought up that the common outline footnotes are a current and urgent issue, which the Summer Senate will discuss further. There will be a referral to the Senate to discuss this matter in the fall and the policy on double counting.

b. Events:

- i. Wednesday, May 21- Summer Senate Retreat; 12 noon – 4 PM; Seven Oaks CC
- ii. Friday, August 22 – Save the Date for the General Faculty Meeting
 - 1. Chair Danforth confirmed the time and location:
 - a. Time: 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM
 - b. Location: Student Union MPR
 - c. Note: University Day will take place on Wednesday this year.

III. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:02 AM**)

- a. Z. Zenko motioned to approve the agenda; seconded by A. Grombly. Agenda approved.

IV. Approval of EC Minutes (deferred)

- a. April 22, 2025
- b. April 29, 2025
- c. May 6, 2025
- d. May 13, 2025

V. Continued Items (deferred)

VI. New Discussion Items

- a. Elections and Appointments (D. Solano)
 - i. At-Large Appointments for University-wide Committees – 2nd call (handout)
 - 1. Advising Council: John Deal – Economics (on sabbatical in Fall 2025; A. Hegde agreed to serve).
 - 2. Mobile Steering Committee: Heidi He - Nursing

VII. Open Forum:

- a. Items for Summer Senate Retreat:
 - i. May Budget revise.
 - ii. Scholarship and Creative Activity Task Force and the impact that federal funding changes will have on scholarship. Discussion ensued regarding charging the 2025-2026 task force with addressing these concerns.
 - iii. Grant issues
 - iv. RTP Guidelines and considerations for extensions of tenure due to limited scholarship opportunities
 - v. Exceptional Service Award criteria; possible development of a rubric.

VIII. Adjournment

- a. Chair Danforth called for a motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes; the majority voted in favor. Meeting extension approved.
- b. Chair Danforth adjourned the meeting at 11:38 AM.

