1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION**
   Advisory Committee for the Trustee Committee for the Selection of the President

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. Update Log
   b. Financial transparency and faculty participation in budgeting process - Budget Forum
   c. Catalogue Concerns
   d. Advising Concerns – Education Advisory Board Meeting (EAB) meeting with faculty
   e. Graduation Check and Enrollment Management – Compare the November, December, January, and February Grad check Reports for Fall 2018 (Handout)
   f. EO 1110 implementation process – Discuss progress and then invite whoever is out front on Quantitative Reasoning to accurately present what’s been happening to the Senate.
   g. *Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal (hand out)*

6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. GECCo Faculty Director replacement (hand-out) RES 1314049 *Governance and Transition Plan for GE at CSUB*
   b. University facilities use and costs (BPC)
   c. Student Debt (hand-out) *Where Debt Comes Due at CSU*
   d. Committee communications: in and out flow of electronic and hard-copy materials

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING March 8, 2018** (Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)
   **Announcements**
   **Consent Agenda**
   **New Business**
   a. RES 171819 New Emphasis – Energy and Power Engineering (First Reading)
   **Old Business**
   a. RES 171807 Amendment of Classroom Observation Policy (Second Reading) *
   b. RES 171814 Administrator Review – University Handbook (Second Reading) *
   c. RES 171815 Maximum Unit per Term (Second Reading)
d. RES 171816 Policy for Instructors Assigning Their Own Textbooks (Second Reading) *

  e. RES 171817 Hiring of Tenure Track Counselor to Support Student Mental Health (Second Reading)

  f. RES 171818 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy (Second Reading) *

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

* Changes to the University Handbook
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, February 27, 2018
09:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. SCI III Math Library

Present: D. Boschini (Chair), B. Hartsell (Vice Chair), A. Hegde, C. MacQuarrie, J. Millar, M. Rush, J. Tarjan, J. Zorn

Absent: M. Slaughter

Visitor: P. Newberry

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   o Budget/Transparency Forum – March 6, 2018, 09:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Location SU MPR
     Financial documents are posted.
   o GECCo Faculty Director – P. Newberry is retiring. The previous way the director was selected was 1) applications were turned in 2) the Provost and the EC reviewed the applications and candidates and then 3) the EC made recommendations to Provost. 4) The Provost decided. Discussion ensued about the process. Members agreed that the process to replace Faculty Director of GE will be as follows:
     1) The Senate Exec will put out a Call for Interest with a link to information
     2) EC will send information about candidates to GECCo
     3) GECCo will conduct interviews
     4) GECCo and EC need to agree that both will interview all candidates
     5) The EC will conduct separate interviews
     6) GECCo will have recommendations that EC will review
     7) EC will make a recommendation to the Provost
     8) The Provost will select the new Faculty Director.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
b. Financial transparency and faculty participation in budgeting process - The purpose of the forum is to ask questions. As soon as the president is announced, the EC should meet and show what our concerns are and mark early that financial transparency and faculty participation are top priorities.

J. Tarjan moved to re-convene after Budget Central for an additional EC meeting. B. Hartsell seconded. Approved.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   b. Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal (hand out). D. Boschini requested that EC review documents in light of a possible referral to all four committees at next EC meeting.
   c. Student Debt (hand-out) See Page 2. If the student debt report reflects student experience, we need to take this up. But the data are inconsistent with other data, so we need to clarify before taking any action.

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING March 8, 2018 (Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)
   a. Announcements
   b. Consent Agenda
   c. Old Business
8. RES 171807 Amendment of Classroom Observation Policy (Second Reading) *
9. RES 171814 Administrator Review – University Handbook (Second Reading) *
10. RES 171815 Maximum Unit per Term (Second Reading)
11. RES 171816 Policy for Instructors Assigning Their Own Textbooks (Second Reading) *
12. RES 171817 Hiring of Tenure Track Counselor to Support Student Mental Health (Second Reading)
   i. Reading
13. RES 171818 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy (Second Reading) *

14. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

*Changes to the University Handbook
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Maximum Units per Term Referral #20 Maximum Units Per Term (discarded), whereby issues contained in Referral #23 Maximum Load Semester Units became RES 161719 Maximum Units per Term.</td>
<td>Returned to EC 2/08/18</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 171815 B submitted by AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC RES 171815 A submitted by FAC Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>RES 161720 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS RES 171818 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #01 Proposal for New BPA Academic Certificate</td>
<td>In CCC</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Review Proposal’s three new one-unit classes awaits possible revised proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #15 University-wide Impact of EO 1110 Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC Assure that implementation of EO 1110 is appropriately coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #17 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering within BS Engineering Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, BPC Program rationale, Existing support resources, Additional resources required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>Sent to President</td>
<td>Approved by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Maximum Units per Term Referral #20 Maximum Units Per Term (discarded), whereby issues contained in Referral #23 Maximum Load Semester Units became RES 161719 Maximum Units per Term.</td>
<td>Returned to EC 2/08/18</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 171815 B submitted by AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC RES 171815 A submitted by FAC Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>RES 161720 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS RES 171818 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 # 11 Conflicts of Interest: Textbook Adoption Policy and Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS, FAC RES 171816 Policy for Instructors Assigning Their Own Textbooks. Consider resolution to introduce a policy which is in the best interest of students, and how policy is enforced. Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 # 12 Referral on Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS, FAC Identify a list of questions that members of the campus community need to consider when developing policies about advising. Sent to Provost 11-29-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/17</td>
<td>2017-2018 #18 - Counselor Tenure Track and Impact on Student Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS RES 171817 Hiring of Tenure Track Counselor to Support Student Mental Health Look at the impact of Counseling Departments ability to deliver student mental health services where there is a high turn-over of PT faculty members and an increasing need for specially trained counselors and a lack of TT faculty/counselors. Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Budget and Planning Committee: Aaron Hegde/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Room 100

**Dates:** Sept 7, Sept 21, Oct 5, Oct 19, Nov 2, Nov 16, Dec 7, Feb 1, Feb 15, Mar 1, Mar 15, Apr 5, Apr 19, May 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Maximum Units per Term Referral #20 Maximum Units Per Term (discarded), whereby issues contained in Referral #23 Maximum Load Semester Units became RES 161719 Maximum Units per Term.</td>
<td>Returned to EC 2/08/18</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 171815 B submitted by AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC RES 171815 A submitted by FAC Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #01 Proposal for New BPA Academic Certificate</td>
<td>In CCC</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Review Proposal’s three new one-unit classes await possible revised proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #02 BAS-CFO as Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member of BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPC Improve BAS understanding of faculty concern &amp; needs, and amend AS By-laws (Section IV B 3 a.) to expand membership. RES 171810 Addition of Chief Financial Officer as Ex-Officio Member on Budget and Planning Committee. Majority of faculty voted in favor to amend.</td>
<td>2017-11-09</td>
<td>2018-01-29</td>
<td>2018-02-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #03 Adding Faculty Participation in Budgetary Matters to Constitution of Academic Senate Article 2, Section 1 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPC RES 171813 Faculty Participation in Budgetary Matters. A majority of faculty voted in favor to change Constitution.</td>
<td>2017-11-30</td>
<td>2018-01-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #04 - CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley Center Name Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPC First reading waived and friendly amendment to utilize proposed names: California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley. Additional versions CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley, and CSUB AV. RES 171802</td>
<td>2017-09-28</td>
<td>2017-10-06</td>
<td>2017-10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #05 – Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP)</td>
<td>Senate action not required</td>
<td>BPC RES 171803 Integrated Teacher Education Program Review and recommendation to Senate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #08 – Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative to Promote Tenure Density</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPC RES 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative President responded 2018-01-03; new President to be informed that this is #1 priority, contingent on funding.</td>
<td>2017-11-30</td>
<td>2017-12-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/17</td>
<td>Dissolution of Campus Environmental Committee The resolution came directly from the Executive Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPC RES 171805 Dissolution of Campus Environmental Committee (First Reading waived at Senate 10/26/17)</td>
<td>2017-10-26</td>
<td>2017-11-02</td>
<td>2017-11-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPC - Continue Next page**
**Budget and Planning Committee: Aaron Hegde/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Room 100**

**Dates:** Sept 7, Sept 21, Oct 5, Oct 19, Nov 2, Nov 16, Dec 7, Feb 1, Feb 15, Mar 1, Mar 15, Apr 5, Apr 19, May 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/31/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #10 Office Allocation</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>Resources have been redistributed whereby instructors don’t have offices. Faculty needs privacy to work effectively with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #13 Academic Master Plan Form and Process Improvement</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>Form: line for Department Chair sign-off. Process: clear actions which Faculty, Department Chairs, School Deans, and the Academic Senate perform and when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #17 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering within BS Engineering Sciences</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>Program rationale, Existing support resources, Additional resources required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>Sent to President</td>
<td>Approved by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2016-2017 # 11 Position of Ombudsman</td>
<td>Returned to FAC 2/16/17</td>
<td>FAC On Senate Agenda 2/02/17 RES 161711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2016-2017 #20 Maximum Units Per Term (discarded), whereby issues contained in Referral 2016-2017 #23 Maximum Load Semester Units became RES 161719 Maximum Units per Term</td>
<td>Returned to EC 2/08/18</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 171815 B submitted by AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC RES 171815 A submitted by FAC Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Referral 2016-2017 #22 Recusal from Discussion and Voting on RTP Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC RES 171808 University Review Committee Membership Nomination Exemption</td>
<td>2017-11-30</td>
<td>2017-12-07</td>
<td>2017-12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #06 Classroom Observation of Probationary and Temporary Faculty Who Have Not Earned Rights Under Collective Bargaining Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Address workload and rank of observer/recommender RES 171807 Amendment of Classroom Observation Policy Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 # 07 UPRC Task Force Recommendations to Change University Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Add UPRC Charge and address UPRC recommendations to process and involvement of specific authorities. RES 171806 University Program Review Committee Charge</td>
<td>2017-11-30</td>
<td>2017-12-07</td>
<td>2018-01-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 # 11 Conflicts of Interest: Textbook Adoption Policy and Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS, FAC Consider resolution to introduce a policy which is in the best interest of students, and how policy is enforced. RES 171814 Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 # 12 Referral on Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS, FAC Identify a list of questions that members of the campus community need to consider when developing policies about advising. Sent to Provost 11-29-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #14 Unfilled School Seats Filled by At-Large Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Is an elected person from another school obligated to represent the school whose vacant seat became At-Large? Is it true for URC, UPRC, and/or Senate seats?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #16 Possible Conflict of Interest in Administrator Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC RES 171814 Administrator Review – University Handbook Policy permitting right to challenge membership, require signature of confidentiality, and consequences. Second Reading 03/08/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAC - Continue Next page**
**Faculty Affairs Committee: Maureen Rush/Chair, meets 10:00am in EDUC 123**  
**Dates:** Sept 7, Sept 21, Oct 5, Oct 19, Nov 2, Nov 16, Dec 7, Feb 1, Feb 15, Mar 1, Mar 15, Apr 5, Apr 19, May 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/24/18</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 #19 Faculty Awards – Consistent Criteria and Process Improvement</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>The Handbook needs to be consistent to eliminate self-nominations. Clarify procedures. How do Faculty, Exceptional Service, and Wang Awards criteria line-up differently than before? Are women faculty represented consistently in the awards and on the Honors and Awards Committees? Does the amount of monetary reward continue to be relevant? Should there be consideration for a Special Award for Outstanding Contributions not addressed by the current categories?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grad Check Report

**11/28/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Completed/Processed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12/8/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12/15/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>01/15/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transfer Evaluations

**11/28/2017**

- Applied: 1,222
- Admitted: 791
- Admitted, accepted admission: 480
- Admitted, accepted, transfer credits posted: 475
### Grad Check Report

**12/18/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Completed/Processed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/21/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>01/05/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>01/19/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 580 completed/processed include those that were withdrawn or denied

2 52 in-progress include those recently received; 1,756 includes those withdrawn

### Transfer Evaluations

**12/18/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted, accepted admission</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted, accepted, transfer credits posted</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Revised number to reflect transfers only; excludes FTF
**Grad Check Report**  
01/26/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Completed/Processed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2/2/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2/16/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Fall 2017 remaining 17 pending due to dept. approval or issue resolution

2 44 in-progress include those recently received; 1,823 includes those withdrawn

3 Spring and fall processing curtailed due to winter holiday and processing of fall 2017 grade posting, grade verification, and degree awarding for candidates for graduation

**Transfer Evaluations**  
01/26/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted, accepted admission</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted, accepted, transfer credits posted:</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Revised number to reflect transfers only; excludes FTF, excludes 542 redirected applications received
Grad Check Report
02/06/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Completed/Processed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Estimated Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/16/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) 31 in-progress include those recently received in January; 1,834 includes those withdrawn

\(^3\) Spring and fall processing curtailed due to winter holiday and processing of fall 2017 grade posting, grade verification, and degree awarding for candidates for graduation

Transfer Evaluations
01/26/2018 (final)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied (^3)</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted (^3)</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted, accepted admission</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted, accepted, transfer credits posted:</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Revised number to reflect transfers only; excludes FTF, excludes 542 redirected applications received
Memorandum

DATE: February 14, 2018
TO: Deborah Boschini, Chair, Academic Senate
FROM: Jenny J. Zorn, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
RE: Interdisciplinary Studies (INST) Department Formation Proposal

At the Academic Affairs Council of January 23, 2018, the Council voted unanimously to support the formation of a new INST Department on campus. On behalf of the Academic Affairs division, I am now requesting review and consideration by the Academic Senate. Please find attached the School proposal.

I support this request.

Please feel free to contact School of Arts and Humanities Dean Bob Frakes with any questions or clarifications.

c: Horace Mitchell, President
   Vernon Harper, AVP, Academic Programs
   Bob Frakes, Dean, School of Arts and Humanities
Memorandum

Date: Feb. 9, 2018
To: Jenny Zorn, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
From: Robert Frakes, Dean, School of Arts & Humanities
Subject: Creation of Interdisciplinary Studies Department

The Interdisciplinary Studies Program (INST) has submitted a request for the formation of a new department in the School of Arts & Humanities. I support their proposal and believe it is important for this program to become a department for three reasons:

1) The INST Program is currently housed in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (MLL) and the curriculum, procedures, and advising structures are very different between INST and MLL. MLL meetings focus primarily on the French and Spanish programs and INST has to coordinate their program activities separately, like another department.

2) After discussion with the Dean of SSE and the Director of the Liberal Studies program, the new INST department will also integrate and become the departmental home for students majoring in the non-teaching track of Liberal Studies, which shares considerable overlap in degree design with the general INST major. All Liberal Studies teaching credentialing degrees will remain housed in SSE as currently designed. Since the students in the non-teaching track of Liberal Studies more closely align with INST, moving these students into the new INST Department would provide them with advising more specific to their needs.

3) This department formation can occur with minimal resource commitment and with minimal system adjustments. INST is already tracked separately in PeopleSoft and there is already an identifying department code in the system. The MLL ASC currently coordinates both MLL and the INST program and could continue to coordinate both departments. As INST will now be a department, it will no longer require a “Director,” but instead will have a Department “Chair.”

I have attached the proposal submitted to me by Dustin Knepp (current Director of the INST Program who is also Chair of the MLL Department). After he held several meetings with faculty across campus who are associated with Interdisciplinary Studies, his proposal has been sent to all faculty in the School of Arts & Humanities (via the Department Chairs) for their input. There were no objections noted.
Proposal to Create an Interdisciplinary Studies Department at CSUB
M. Dustin Knepp, Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
25 October 2017

After a series of meetings that solicited feedback from key parties in both Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences and Education, the Interdisciplinary Studies faculty formally propose the establishment of an Interdisciplinary Studies Department at CSUB, to be housed within Arts and Humanities. The newly proposed department would continue to offer baccalaureate and master’s degrees in Interdisciplinary Studies where students can construct a degree plan that draws from diverse disciplines to meet their educational needs. The new department will also integrate and become the departmental home for Liberal Studies non-teaching track majors, which share considerable overlap in degree design with INST majors. All Liberal Studies teaching credentialing degrees will remain housed in SSE as currently designed. Concurrently with the proposal to create an Interdisciplinary Studies Department, we are also working to develop new BA degrees for Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies; Ethnic and Cultural Studies; and Latina/o and Latin American Studies, which will be evolutions from existing specializations and concentrations in the current INST programs.

How the changes better serve institutional needs
The proposed changes serve institutional needs in the following ways:

1. **Eliminates redundancy in INST and LBST non-teaching track degrees.**
   Both INST and Liberal Studies programs are used by students to explore issues and topics that cross disciplinary, departmental, and school boundaries. Because of the shared interdisciplinary approach, it is logical that such programs be housed in a single unit on campus. This would help eliminate redundancy and lead to a streamlined process for advising students interested in studies that cross disciplinary boundaries.

2. **Provides better clarity for degrees awarded.**
   Currently, all students graduating under INST programs receive a degree in Interdisciplinary Studies, but there is no indication of a particular specialization on their transcript. The creation of a department with specific majors and degrees in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies; Ethnic and Cultural Studies; and Latina/o and Latin American Studies will provide increased clarity of a student’s particular area of study.

3. **Provides departmental stability for students.**
   Combined, there are over 160 students majoring in INST and Liberal Studies non-teaching track programs that lack a physical department home because both INST and Liberal Studies are currently managed as programs that draw support from other disciplines. Creating a stand-alone department will provide a needed presence and better stability to effectively manage the students that are served. It will also provide faculty advising and mentorship for students, who are largely currently served only by staff advisors.

4. **Provides a faculty tenure home for Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary faculty.**
While contributing faculty for INST and LBST programs have traditionally come from existing departments, two new full-time faculty were hired last year and specifically designated as Interdisciplinary faculty. They are currently being supported by the department of Modern Languages and Literatures (along with the Director of INST), but MLL is not intended to serve as the tenure home. The creation of a department would provide a faculty tenure home for these and future faculty whose primary responsibility is to develop and teach Interdisciplinary Studies courses.

5. **Consolidates student outreach opportunities and information channels.**
   The creation of an Interdisciplinary Studies Department would allow for stronger presence on campus, both in student outreach opportunities and through increased visibility. We anticipate that this will also increase participation in the proposed degree programs.

**How the changes affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs**
Creation of an Interdisciplinary Studies department will improve the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs. Currently, it is largely advisors who are assigned to oversee the Liberal Studies non-teaching track. With creation of the new department, students will have increased access to committed faculty that can help with advising matters and help guide students through degree choices. Additionally, a department will provide opportunities for future growth to better serve students in each of the degree programs. The degrees/majors will still rely on considerable interdisciplinary cooperation, but the creation of a department will improve interdisciplinary exchange because there will be an established structure and governance to the new department that will make it easier to initiate and conduct inter-departmental exchange.

**How the changes affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload**
The proposed department would positively affect faculty affairs in multiple ways. It would provide needed administrative and academic structure. This would include both recruiting options and appointment options because it would establish a tenure home for interdisciplinary faculty. Secondly, faculty associated with the INST department would be assessed for review, promotion, and tenure processes from within their own department and by peers who are versed in a range of interdisciplinary experiences. This would be a benefit to all involved. A department would also improve student support and advising, and logically align with faculty assignments. This would result in a structured workload that has a balance of teaching and advising responsibilities from within the department. Finally, we believe that creating an Interdisciplinary Studies department will heighten programmatic awareness and maximize faculty/staff resources, which will be a positive move for both faculty and students.

**How the changes affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities and staffing**
Much of the faculty and staff support for the newly proposed department is already in place. Existing resources include the Director of Interdisciplinary Studies, an administrative support coordinator (ASC currently shared with MLL), 2 full-time INST faculty, and release time for 4 INST area coordinators. With the establishment of a department, a chair would be selected from existing faculty. It is anticipated that we would need to hire a full time WGSS faculty within the
first two years of department creation. Additionally, the ASC would need to be dedicated to the department, not shared between two departments. Depending on growth over the first five years of the department, provision for additional hires based on increases in FTES might need to be considered.

Impact the plan will have on Information Resources
Information resources will be largely unaffected. Library resources are in place because of the existing structure of the current INST programs. Potentially, if there is considerable growth in degree programs, there might need to be some resources allocated, but at this time, there are mostly sufficient resources available.

Plan for effecting the change
Pending approval from all required administrators, the Academic Senate, and the President, we anticipate establishing the proposed department by the Fall 2018 term. We will then continue with degree development processes and proposals, expecting that those will be finalized by Fall 2019 for full implementation.

This proposal has stemmed from a number of processes that have been in motion for some time. Interdisciplinary programs have been in existence at CSUB for 20+ years through minors and concentrations. In more recent history, there has been considerable time and investment in developing and formulating INST degree specializations, including developing student learning outcomes for specializations and hiring a director to oversee Interdisciplinary Studies. The receipt of an NEH grant in January 2016 allowed us to continue advancing Ethnic and Interdisciplinary Studies through faculty collaboration, course development, and program outreach endeavors. The grant also expedited events leading to this proposal. We received campus allocation for two full time Ethnic Studies faculty lines and approval for release time for area coordinators to help develop and grow INST programs. There were numerous meetings with NEH grant participants and consultation through meetings and individual discussions with faculty from across campus regarding Interdisciplinary Studies from January 2016 to May 2017. A sampling of faculty that participated through invited discussions include: A&H faculty (Jackie Kegley, Steve Gamboa, Stephen Allen, Carol Dell’Amico, Clion Murphy, Debra Jackson, Liora Gubkin, Andy Alali, Bill Kelley, Maryann Parada, Lena Taub Robles, Anthony Nuno, Alicia Rodriguez, Marie Stango, Chris Tang), SSE faculty (Luis Vega, Alem Kebede, Yvonne Ortiz Bush, Hager El Hadidi, Rhonda Dugan, Marisa Sanchez, Gonzalo Santos, Ivy Cargile, Elaine Correa), and BPA faculty (Jean West, Marcus Valenzuela, Nyakundi Michieka). There have also been meetings that discussed the creation of an Interdisciplinary Studies Department this term, which included faculty and administrators immediately impacted by the proposal including Jorge Moraga, Tracey Salisbury, Emerson Case, Vandana Kohli, Steve Bacon, Bob Frakes, Vernon Harper, and Jenny Zorn. President Mitchell has also been consulted numerous times throughout the process. Feedback and outcomes from all meetings have been positive about developing and advancing plans for Interdisciplinary Studies at CSUB, and we strongly feel that the creation of an Interdisciplinary Studies Department as outlined above would have many direct benefits for students and the university.
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends approval of the “GEIC proposals entitled ‘Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield’ and ‘Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield.’

Rationale: In March 2013 the Academic Senate approved a set of “Guiding Principles for General Education Reform at CSUB.” It also established a Task-Force to develop models for a General Education Program based on these principles with a report due back on University Day fall 2013. This report was made to the university community in fall 2013; a series of workshops and sessions were held on GE. The GE Task Force reported their recommendations to the Academic Senate. In November the Academic Senate approved the appointment of a General Education Implementation Committee with the following charge: “The General Education reform implementation committee shall develop Model 3, while paying careful attention to the most valuable features of Model 2, as reflected in the findings of the Task Force on General Education’s report to the Academic Senate. In doing so, it may wish to consult with university constituencies, such as Student Affairs and others with expertise in advising, enrollment management, the first year experience, and instruction in basic skills.”

The GEIC met during the month of December, made a preliminary report to the university community on January 10 and to the DCLC on January 15th. This committee has now submitted its recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2014
Sent to the President for approval on March 21, 2014
Approved by the President on April 3, 2014
Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

The General Education program will be governed by a General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo), chaired by a Faculty Director. GECCo will have responsibility for administering the GE program and is seen as being inextricably connected to the Senate. The GE Faculty Director will provide monthly reports to the Academic Senate.

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

1. Work in coordination with the designated administrator
2. GE program review and GE program assessment
3. Training and Support of GE faculty
4. Faculty Interest Group (FIG) coordination
5. Skills Reinforcement Group (SRG) coordination
6. Review and revise program learning outcomes
7. Review and revise GE area, skill, theme and course requirement and student learning outcomes
8. Course appeal
9. General Education Modifications (substitutions and waivers)
10. Report to Academic Senate, including requests for any changes to GE structure
11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors
12. Course review
13. Skill oversight
14. Theme oversight
15. Obtaining broad input from those involved in teaching in the GE Program and from the campus community.

Departments and school curriculum committees will initially approve course submissions. The General Education Curriculum Committee will have final course approval authority. Due to the volume of work relating to the GE program, we suggest that proper compensation be given to committee members.

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

There shall be eight voting members of GECCo with staggered two-year terms: 2 elected representatives from each school (A&H, BPA, NSME, SS&E) and a non-voting GE Faculty Director. The committee will also include a non-voting representative of the office of Academic Programs and a non-voting student representative.

Selection of the GE Faculty Director

The GE Faculty Director will be a tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. The committee will put out a call to the campus faculty and will interview candidates prior to making a recommendation to the Provost.

Responsibilities of the GE Faculty Director (to be supported by the appropriate academic administrator)
1. Chair GECCo
2. Ensure that recommendations from GECCo regarding program funding and GE resource management are implemented
3. Support GE program review and GE program assessment
4. Coordinate training and support of GE faculty
5. Facilitate Faculty Interest Groups (FIGs)
6. Facilitate Skills Reinforcement Groups (SRGs)
7. Work collaboratively with department and program chairs and faculty to schedule GE courses to meet students’ needs.

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

1. All course submissions must be approved by a department. If the course carries a school prefix, it must be approved by the corresponding school curriculum committee.

2. The information contained in proposals for GE certification must be applicable to all sections of the course, regardless of instructor. Departments and programs should carefully review all sections to ensure that they conform to the relevant Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Requirements.

3. Courses that are cross-listed as both graduate and undergraduate are not eligible for certification for general education.

4. If a course is included in a theme, or is required to reinforce a foundational skill, it must also be approved for that purpose.

Management of Themes

Normally there will be no more than 3 to 4 themes. Generation and approval of themes will follow a timeline established by GECCo. The thematic content of themes will be determined according to the following criteria: the need to meet student demand; the need to maintain coherence by limiting the total number of courses in GE; the quality of proposed themes; and their ability to support GE learning outcomes. Theme approval will be informed by comparisons among proposed themes and by balancing themes so they reflect the diverse disciplines of the campus.

Each theme will have a coordinator who will assure breadth and consistent thematic coherence. Theme coordinators should be compensated and will be elected by faculty members participating in the theme FIGs.

Because themes are interdisciplinary, they must demonstrate sufficient cross-disciplinary support for successful implementation. Once a theme has been established the proposal and/or elimination of individual courses within a theme must be advertised (e.g., through memos of intent) and approved by GECCo.

APPENDIX—Proposed Procedures
Existing Curricular Policies
Policy on course syllabi: http://www.csub.edu/facultyAffairs/files/handbook/UniversityHandbook.pdf pg. 32

School curriculum committee:
A&H http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/
SSE http://www.csub.edu/sse/documents/SSE%20Handbook%202012.pdf (pg. 19)
NSM&E http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml

Approval of New Course:
http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/

GE Course Proposals
Proposals for GE course certification will require a completed Course Certification Request Form. It is anticipated that the following information will be included:

1. the course title and number;
2. how often the department is willing to offer the course;
3. the number of units;
4. the PeopleSoft description of the course, including any prerequisites;
5. the established Course Requirements for GE Areas;
6. the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the GE Area, as well as any SLOs specific to the course;
7. the connection of all SLOs (GE area, and course-specific) to the activities and/or assignments students will complete to demonstrate they have met the SLOs;
8. a list of default texts and/or materials to be used in the course;
9. any additional course fees or costs;
10. a description of the grading policy;
11. a statement of the criteria used for evaluating students’ work; and
12. an outline of the topics to be covered.

Process for Course Submission and Certification

1. Course certification proposals will be submitted through the normal pre-established university procedures.

2. Faculty members will initiate the course certification process only after having received approval from the department faculty or other curriculum body with responsibility for curriculum development.

3. Course submissions shall contain the department chair’s signature for confirmation of departmental approval.

4. School Curriculum Committees should review courses and make recommendations to GECCo regarding the appropriateness of GE certification in a timely manner.
5. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Director to ensure that all course certification packets forwarded by the respective school Curriculum Committees are complete. A course shall be reviewed by GECCo within 30 business days.

GECCo may recommend any ONE of the following actions:

a. **Certified**: GECCo may certify the course. The Faculty Director will forward certified course packets to the office of the Associate Vice-President of Academic Programs, the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair.

b. **Revise and Re-Submit**: GECCo may return the certification packet to the submitting faculty member for revision. In this case, a letter of explanation will be provided to the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair. The submitting faculty member may revise and resubmit the proposal to GECCo indicating that it is a resubmission. Upon review by the Faculty Director, the proposal will be returned to the subcommittee for approval.

c. **Denied Certification**: Courses that have been denied certification will be returned to the respective school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair with an explanation of the reasons they were deemed to be inadequate.

6. The period for certification will be three years. The course may be recertified based upon a review of the course.

**Participation Requirements for GE Faculty: FIGs and SRGs**

A number of faculty groups will be established to focus on themes (FIGs), the reinforcement of skills (SRGs), and other GE matters. These groups are not expected to be decision-making bodies but serve to facilitate broad consultation, to give guidance to FIG/SRG leaders, to nurture interdisciplinary understanding, and to provide faculty development opportunities. Our long-term goal is to maintain a vital program through ongoing faculty participation. Toward that end, we expect faculty to participate in a minimum of one group each semester they teach within the GE Program and to rotate between groups each semester.
APPENDIX—Philosophy for Designing and Submitting a GE Course

The General Education program at California State University, Bakersfield is designed to enhance the success of students, both at the university and in their life beyond, and to share with students the core values of our university. As such, GE courses are expected to align with the senate-endorsed University Learning Outcomes (ULOs) (Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2010).

The General Education program at CSUB delivers on our promise to student success and our ULOs. Therefore, the GE program at CSUB is not merely a collection of courses representing our rich and diverse academic disciplines, but rather it is an intentional program of study that reflects the central role of the Liberal Arts as defined by the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) vision. This program of study emphasizes a commitment to preparing students with discipline specific knowledge including foundational skills; knowledge integration, reflection, and application; and life-long learning skills.

As a coherent program of study, like major and minor programs, the General Education program requires assessment, oversight, and evaluation. These processes, as carried out by the General Education Curriculum Committee and its various subcommittees, exemplify the tenets of faculty governance. The members of the GEIC share these philosophical statements in the hope that they will help to guide the process by which the GE curriculum and its courses are constructed. In particular, we urge faculty to recognize the following:

- Student success is hindered by the lack of availability of GE courses, especially when students come to expect that particular courses will be offered. Thus faculty are expected to carefully plan their GE contributions and to only offer courses for certification that they can staff and offer on a regular basis.
- Research indicates that a well-integrated and cohesive GE program improves students’ ability to learn and succeed during their college experience and after graduation. Thus faculty members are encouraged to think of the place of their courses in the wider context of the overall GE program.
- The audience for a GE course is potentially very different from that of a course designed for majors. Thus it is appropriate for the disciplines to determine the knowledge and skills that they feel are relevant and important for the general student body to have and to deliver these as GE courses with broad appeal.

Course Evaluation Criteria:

The General Education Curriculum Committee and subcommittees are responsible for certifying courses for inclusion in the General Education curriculum based on the following criteria:  
1) Student Learning Outcomes: Faculty submitting courses for certification must demonstrate how students will acquire the information and develop the necessary skills to meet the SLOs for the relevant area(s) through an assessment plan.
2) Course Requirements: Each area of the GE program will have multiple course expectations. Course requirements address logistical issues and course content. Faculty submitting courses for certification must be able to demonstrate how their courses meet these expectations.
Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

Transition from GE Implementation Committee to GECCo Governance

GECCo shall be constituted as soon as possible. Nominations and elections for GECCo membership shall occur without delay. In the meantime, GEIC is charged with seeking consultation with current and potential GE faculty and continuing to make preparations for implementation of the new GE requirements. Any proposals would come before GECCo for further refinement and ratification before taking effect.

Staggering of Terms in GECCo

Half of the initial terms of GECCo members should be three years in length to ensure continuity. The terms of the other members of the committee, and all subsequent terms of service, shall be two years.
Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

The General Education program is governed by the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo), chaired by a Faculty Director. GECCo will have responsibility for administering the GE program approved by the Senate. Changes to the structure of the program will require ratification by the Senate. The GE Faculty Director will provide reports to the Academic Senate.

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

1. Work in coordination with the designated administrator.
2. GE program review and GE program assessment.
3. Training and Support of GE faculty.
4. Coordination of faculty learning communities.
5. Review and revise program learning outcomes.
6. Review and revise GE areas, foundational skills, theme and course requirements and student learning outcomes.
7. Course appeals.
8. General Education Modifications (GEMS) (substitutions and waivers).
9. Recommend changes to the structure of the program.
10. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors.
11. Course review.
12. Skills oversight.
13. Theme oversight.
14. Obtaining broad input from those involved in teaching in the GE Program and from the campus community

Departments and school curriculum committees will approve course submissions prior to submission for GECCo. The General Education Curriculum Committee will have final course approval authority.

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

There shall be eight voting members of GECCo with staggered two-year terms: 2 elected representatives from each school (A&H, BPA, NSME, SS&E) and a non-voting GE Faculty Director. The committee will also include a non-voting representative of the office of Academic Programs and a non-voting student representative. If the GE Faculty Director is absent, he or she shall designate a voting member of GECCo to chair the meeting. The designated chair may cast a vote.

GE Faculty Director

The GE Faculty Director will be a tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost upon recommendation of GECCo and endorsement by the Academic Senate Executive Committee. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty and will interview candidates prior to making a recommendation to the Provost. The normal term of service will be three years. The GE Faculty Director will be reviewed in a manner similar to a department chair.

Responsibilities of the GE Faculty Director (to be supported by the appropriate academic administrator)
1. Chair GECCo.
2. Ensure that recommendations from GECCo regarding program funding and GE resource management are implemented.
3. Support GE program review and GE program assessment.
4. Coordinate training and support of GE faculty.
5. Oversee the operation of faculty learning communities.
6. Work collaboratively with the administration and department and program chairs and faculty to schedule GE courses to meet students’ needs.
7. Report periodically to the Senate.
8. Seek outside supplemental program funding via grants.
9. Represent GECCo on bodies dealing with issues related to GE (e.g., student success, scheduling, and accreditation).
10. Report developments related to GE to GECCo (e.g., grant activity, student success, scheduling, faculty development).
11. Ensure the GE Compendium is up-to-date and contains applicable GE policies and procedures.
12. Coordinate communication with the campus community.
13. Coordinate communication and cooperation with our community college partners and other outside groups.

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

1. Prior to submission to GECCo, all course submissions must be approved by a department and appropriate school committee. If a course carries a school prefix, it must be approved by the corresponding school curriculum committee.

2. The information contained in proposals for GE certification must be applicable to all sections of the course, regardless of instructor. Departments and programs should carefully review all sections to ensure that they conform to the relevant Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Requirements, which should be included in the syllabus.

3. Courses that are cross-listed as both graduate and undergraduate are not eligible for certification for general education.

4. If a course is included in a theme, or is required to reinforce a foundational skill, it must also be approved for that purpose.

Themes

Normally there will be no more than 3 to 4 themes. Generation and approval of themes will follow a timeline established by GECCo. The thematic content of themes will be determined according to the following criteria: the need to meet student demand; the need to maintain coherence by limiting the total number of courses in GE; the quality of proposed themes; and their ability to
support GE learning outcomes. Theme approval will be informed by comparisons among proposed themes and by balancing themes so they reflect the diverse disciplines of the campus.

Each theme will have a coordinator who will assure breadth and consistent thematic coherence. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, will interview candidates, and will appoint the coordinators. Theme coordinators should be compensated and will be appointed by GECCo. Theme coordinators should attend GECCo meetings and provide reports to GECCo regarding their activities.

Because themes are interdisciplinary, they must demonstrate sufficient cross-disciplinary support for successful implementation. Once a theme has been established the proposal and/or elimination of individual courses within a theme must be advertised (e.g., through memos of intent) and appointed by GECCo.

**Foundational Skills**
Each foundational skill will have a coordinator who will assure consistent introduction and reinforcement of skills. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, will interview candidates, and will appoint the coordinators. Foundational skills coordinators should be compensated and will be appointed by GECCo. Foundational skills coordinators should attend GECCo meetings and provide reports to GECCo regarding their activities.

**Assessment**
Ongoing assessment of the GE program shall be conducted in accordance with campus and system policy. Faculty teaching in the program shall support assessment activities. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, will interview candidates, and will appoint the coordinators. The normal term of service will be three years. The GE Assessment Coordinator will be reviewed in a manner similar to a department chair.
Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

The General Education program will be governed by the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo), chaired by a Faculty Director. GECCo will have responsibility for administering the GE program approved by the Senate, and is seen as being inextricably connected to the Senate. Changes to the structure of the program will require ratification by the Senate. The GE Faculty Director will provide monthly reports to the Academic Senate.

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

1. Work in coordination with the designated administrator.
2. GE program review and GE program assessment.
3. Training and Support of GE faculty.
4. Faculty Interest Group (FIG) coordination.
5. Review and revise program learning outcomes.
6. Review and revise GE areas, foundational skills, theme and course requirements and student learning outcomes.
7. Course appeals.
8. General Education Modifications (GEMS) (substitutions and waivers).
9. Recommend changes to the structure of the program.
10. Report to Academic Senate, including requests for any changes to GE structure.
11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors.
12. Course review.
14. Theme oversight.
15. Obtaining broad input from those involved in teaching in the GE Program and from the campus community.

Departments and school curriculum committees will initially approve course submissions prior to submission for GECCo. The General Education Curriculum Committee will have final course approval authority. Due to the volume of work relating to the GE program, we suggest that proper compensation be given to committee members.

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

There shall be eight voting members of GECCo with staggered two-year terms: 2 elected representatives from each school (A&H, BPA, NSME, SS&E) and a non-voting GE Faculty Director. The committee will also include a non-voting representative of the office of Academic Programs and a non-voting student representative. All members, except the GE Faculty Director, may designate an alternate to attend in their place. If the GE Faculty Director is absent, he or she shall designate a voting member of GECCo to chair the meeting. The designated chair may cast a vote to create or break a tie and is counted in determination of a quorum.

Selection of the GE Faculty Director
The GE Faculty Director will be a tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost upon recommendation of GECCo and endorsement by the Academic Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. The committee will put out a call to the campus faculty and will interview candidates prior to making a recommendation to the Provost. The normal term of service will be three years. The GE Faculty Director will be reviewed in a manner similar to a department chair.

Responsibilities of the GE Faculty Director (to be supported by the appropriate academic administrator)

1. Chair GECCo.
2. Ensure that recommendations from GECCo regarding program funding and GE resource management are implemented.
3. Support GE program review and GE program assessment.
4. Coordinate training and support of GE faculty.
5. Facilitate Faculty Interest Groups (FIGs).
6. Facilitate Skills Reinforcement Groups (SRGs).
7. Oversee the operation of faculty learning communities.
8. Work collaboratively with the administration and department and program chairs and faculty to schedule GE courses to meet students’ needs.
10. Seek outside supplemental program funding via grants.
11. Represent GECCo on bodies dealing with issues related to GE (e.g., student success, scheduling, and accreditation).
12. Report developments related to GE to GECCo (e.g., grant activity, student success, scheduling, faculty development).
13. Ensure the GE Compendium is up-to-date and contains applicable GE policies and procedures.
14. Coordinate communication and cooperation with our community college partners and other outside groups.

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

1. Prior to submission to GECCo, all course submissions must be approved by a department and an appropriate school committee. If a course carries a school prefix, it must be approved by the corresponding school curriculum committee.
2. The information contained in proposals for GE certification must be applicable to all sections of the course, regardless of instructor. Departments and programs should carefully review all sections to ensure that they conform to the relevant Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Requirements, which should be included in the syllabus.
3. Courses that are cross-listed as both graduate and undergraduate are not eligible for certification for general education.
4. If a course is included in a theme, or is required to reinforce a foundational skill, it must also be approved for that purpose.

Management of Themes

Normally there will be no more than 3 to 4 themes. Generation and approval of themes will follow a timeline established by GECCo. The thematic content of themes will be determined according to the following criteria: the need to meet student demand; the need to maintain coherence by limiting the total number of courses in GE; the quality of proposed themes; and their ability to support GE learning outcomes. Theme approval will be informed by comparisons among proposed themes and by balancing themes so they reflect the diverse disciplines of the campus.

Each theme will have a coordinator who will assure breadth and consistent thematic coherence. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, will interview candidates, then a candidate will be appointed by GECCo, and will interview candidates and will appoint the coordinators. Theme coordinators should be compensated and will be elected by faculty members participating in the theme FIGs appointed by GECCo. Theme coordinators should attend GECCo meetings and provide reports to GECCo regarding their activities.

Because themes are interdisciplinary, they must demonstrate sufficient cross-disciplinary support for successful implementation. Once a theme has been established the proposal and/or elimination of individual courses within a theme must be advertised (e.g., through memos of intent) and appointed approved by GECCo.

Foundational Skills

Each foundational skill will have a coordinator who will assure consistent introduction and reinforcement of skills. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, will interview candidates, and will appoint the coordinators. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, interview them, then a candidate will be appointed by GECCo, and will interview candidates. Foundational skills coordinators should be compensated and will be appointed by GECCo. Foundational skills coordinators should attend GECCo meetings and provide reports to GECCo regarding their activities.

Assessment

Ongoing assessment of the GE program shall be conducted in accordance with campus and system policy. Faculty teaching in the program shall support assessment activities. Given sufficient resources, a GE Assessment Coordinator will be appointed by GECCo. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty, will interview candidates, and will appoint the coordinators. GECCo will put out a call to the campus faculty and will interview candidates. The normal term of service will be three years. The GE Assessment Coordinator will be reviewed in a manner similar to a department chair.

APPENDIX—Proposed Procedures

Existing Curricular Policies
Policy on course syllabi:
http://www.csub.edu/facultyAffairs/files/handbook/UniversityHandbook.pdf pg. 32
School curriculum committee:
A&H    http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/
SSE     http://www.csub.edu/sse/documents/SSE%20Handbook%202012.pdf (pg. 19)
NSM&E   http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml

Approval of New Course:    
http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/

GE Course Proposals:
Proposals for GE course certification will require a completed Course Certification Request Form. It is anticipated that the following information will be included:

1. the course title and number;
2. how often the department is willing to offer the course;
3. the number of units;
4. the PeopleSoft description of the course, including any prerequisites;
5. the established Course Requirements for GE Areas;
6. the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the GE Area, as well as any SLOs specific to the course;
7. the connection of all SLOs (GE area, and course specific) to the activities and/or assignments students will complete to demonstrate they have met the SLOs;
8. a list of default texts and/or materials to be used in the course;
9. any additional course fees or costs;
10. a description of the grading policy;
11. a statement of the criteria used for evaluating students’ work; and
12. an outline of the topics to be covered.

Process for Course Submission and Certification:

1. Course certification proposals will be submitted through the normal pre-established university procedures.

2. Faculty members will initiate the course certification process only after having received approval from the department faculty or other curriculum body with responsibility for curriculum development.

3. Course submissions shall contain the department chair’s signature for confirmation of departmental approval.

4. School Curriculum Committees should review courses and make recommendations to GECCo regarding the appropriateness of GE certification in a timely manner.

5. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Director to ensure that all course certification packets forwarded by the respective school Curriculum Committees are complete. A course shall be reviewed by GECCo within 30 business days.
GECCo may recommend any ONE of the following actions:

a. Certified: GECCo may certify the course. The Faculty Director will forward certified course packets to the office of the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs, the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair.

b. Revise and Re-Submit: GECCo may return the certification packet to the submitting faculty member for revision. In this case, a letter of explanation will be provided to the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair. The submitting faculty member may revise and resubmit the proposal to GECCo indicating that it is a resubmission. Upon review by the Faculty Director, the proposal will be returned to the subcommittee for approval.

c. Denied Certification: Courses that have been denied certification will be returned to the respective school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty, and department chair with an explanation of the reasons they were deemed to be inadequate.

5. The period for certification will be three years. The course may be recertified based upon a review of the course.

Participation Requirements for GE Faculty: FIGs and SRGs

A number of faculty groups will be established to focus on themes (FIGs), the reinforcement of skills (SRGs), and other GE matters. These groups are not expected to be decision-making bodies but serve to facilitate broad consultation, to give guidance to FIG/SRG leaders, to nurture interdisciplinary understanding, and to provide faculty development opportunities. Our long-term goal is to maintain a vital program through ongoing faculty participation. Toward that end, we expect faculty to participate in a minimum of one group each semester they teach within the GE Program and to rotate between groups each semester.
APPENDIX—Philosophy for Designing and Submitting a GE Course

The General Education program at California State University, Bakersfield is designed to enhance the success of students, both at the university and in their life beyond, and to share with students the core values of our university. As such, GE courses are expected to align with the senate-endorsed University Learning Outcomes (ULOs) (Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2010).

The General Education program at CSUB delivers on our promise to student success and our ULOs. Therefore, the GE program at CSUB is not merely a collection of courses representing our rich and diverse academic disciplines, but rather it is an intentional program of study that reflects the central role of the Liberal Arts as defined by the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) vision. This program of study emphasizes a commitment to preparing students with discipline specific knowledge including foundational skills, knowledge integration, reflection, and application; and life-long learning skills.

As a coherent program of study, like major and minor programs, the General Education program requires assessment, oversight, and evaluation. These processes, as carried out by the General Education Curriculum Committee and its various subcommittees, exemplify the tenets of faculty governance. The members of the GEIC share these philosophical statements in the hope that they will help to guide the process by which the GE curriculum and its courses are constructed. In particular, we urge faculty to recognize the following:

- Student success is hindered by the lack of availability of GE courses, especially when students come to expect that particular courses will be offered. Thus faculty are expected to carefully plan their GE contributions and to only offer courses for certification that they can staff and offer on a regular basis.

- Research indicates that a well-integrated and cohesive GE program improves students’ ability to learn and succeed during their college experience and after graduation. Thus faculty members are encouraged to think of the place of their courses in the wider context of the overall GE program.

- The audience for a GE course is potentially very different from that of a course designed for majors. Thus it is appropriate for the discipline to determine the knowledge and skills that they feel are relevant and important for the general student body to have and to deliver these in GE courses with broad appeal.

Course Evaluation Criteria:

The General Education Curriculum Committee and subcommittees are responsible for certifying courses for inclusion in the General Education curriculum based on the following criteria:

1) Student Learning Outcomes. Faculty submitting courses for certification must demonstrate how students will acquire the information and develop the necessary skills to meet the SLOs for the relevant areas through an assessment plan.

2) Course Requirements. Each area of the GE program will have multiple course expectations. Course requirements address logistical issues and course content. Faculty submitting courses for certification must be able to demonstrate how their courses meet these expectations.
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Introduction

The cost of a college degree is an enormous challenge for many students. Not only has tuition increased across the country in response to state disinvestment in higher education, but the additional costs associated with attending college (including books and supplies, transportation, and living expenses that can exceed $19,000 annually) present substantial – and sometimes insurmountable – financial barriers. In fact, not only are students struggling to come up with the resources to cover all of their college costs, but many recent studies have documented widespread food and housing insecurity among students.

For a public university system where tuition is among the lowest in the country, and where nearly two out of every three students do not pay tuition at all, many assume that a CSU degree is affordable. Yet, financially needy students continue to face very real challenges affording all of the costs necessary to earn a college degree. This is reflected in debt burdens that fall more heavily on underrepresented students, and excessive work hours needed to cover low-income students’ net costs (what they must pay out of pocket after all grant aid).

Among CSU bachelor’s degree recipients in 2015-16 who borrowed, nearly eight out of every ten had annual family incomes no greater than $54,000, and almost two-thirds had annual family incomes less than $27,000 [see Figure 3]. This inequitable burden of college costs on the lowest income students also disproportionally affects underrepresented minority students. Among undergraduates nationally, more than half of Latino students (52%), about three in five Native American students (59%), and almost two-thirds of African-American students (64%) have family incomes under $30,000. At the CSUs, underrepresented graduates of color are disproportionally more likely to have debt than their White peers [see Figure 2].

Thanks to the state Cal Grant program and the CSU’s own grant program, low-income CSU students typically receive enough financial aid to cover tuition charges. Yet there is not enough aid available to CSU students to help cover non-tuition costs, and it is likely these costs that lead low-income students to borrow student loans. While many students work to earn money to help pay for college, either in addition to or instead of borrowing, low-income students’ net costs are such that earning money to cover them would require working an untenable number of hours per week, jeopardizing their academic success. Importantly, recently available data show that lower income Pell Grant recipients graduate from CSU campuses at lower rates than their higher income peers [see Table 2]. These are signals that the state must do more to support its under-resourced students.

This brief, jointly written by the Cal State Student Association (CSSA) and The Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS), explores college affordability challenges faced by financially needy students throughout the CSU system, and highlights how the burden of debt is borne inequitably across different demographic groups.
The Cost of a CSU Degree Is More than Just Tuition

The total cost to attend the CSU stretches far beyond statewide tuition, which is currently $5,742 and composes only about 23 percent of full-time students’ total college costs. Basic needs such as food and housing, as well as campus-based fees, textbooks and supplies, transportation, and other personal expenses, all play a role in facilitating success by enabling students to focus on their studies and efficiently complete a degree. These costs are high for all students, but are sometimes especially high for students who live independently off campus, which the majority of CSU students do.

Overall, the majority of the approximately 90,000 students who earned bachelor’s degrees from the CSU in 2015-16 graduated with student loan debt, but each campus tells its own story. Across the 23 CSU campuses, the share of 2015-16 graduates who borrowed ranged from 40 percent at San Luis Obispo to as high as 91 percent at Bakersfield, with average debt ranging from $11,400 at Bakersfield to $24,300 at Humboldt [see Table 1, below].

To illustrate college costs and affordability across the CSU system, the table below shows the in-state tuition and campus-based fees, total annual cost of attendance, and the proportion of graduates with debt and the average amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campus</th>
<th>In-State Tuition and Fees</th>
<th>Annual Total Cost of Attendance</th>
<th>Average Debt of Graduates with Bachelor’s Degrees</th>
<th>Share of Graduates with Bachelor’s Degrees with Any Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>Not Reported*</td>
<td>Not Reported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
<td>Not Reported*</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$16,400</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
<td>$19,100</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$25,600</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$24,300</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$15,900</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
<td>$16,400</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$22,200</td>
<td>$24,100</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$20,200</td>
<td>$20,900</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$21,200</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$26,200</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$20,100</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$24,600</td>
<td>$20,700</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$26,200</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$25,400</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>$22,700</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$24,700</td>
<td>$20,800</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>Not Reported*</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These data are reported voluntarily to college guide publisher Peterson’s (c) 2017, a Nelnet company, all rights reserved.
Net Price: What Low-Income Students Pay Annually and the Work Hours Required to Earn that Amount

The net price is the total cost of attendance after all grant aid has been applied. For example, if the total cost of college is $20,000 and a student receives $5,000 in grant aid, then the net price would be $15,000. With over 80 percent receiving some type of financial aid, most students are not paying the full sticker price to attend a CSU.

Systemwide, about half of CSU undergraduates receive the Pell Grant, which generally serves students from families with incomes of $40,000 or less. Research shows that need-based financial aid like the Pell Grant increases students’ likelihood of academic success, with one study finding that an increase of $1,000 in grant aid in a low-income student’s first year has been tied to a two to four percentage-point increase in enrollment in the second year.

However, with such large gaps for low-income students between total college costs and available financial aid (the Pell Grant alone has lost substantial value, covering the smallest share of college costs in more than 40 years), many have to work excessive hours to cover their expenses, jeopardizing their likelihood of successfully earning a degree. Data on student debt show how many low-income students need to borrow, and gaps in graduation rates underscore the challenges net prices put on low-income students’ ability to complete on time [see Table 2, below]. Improving need-based aid is imperative for both reducing debt disparities and improving graduation rates for underrepresented students.

### TABLE 2: Pell Grant Statistics across the CSU, 2015-16 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU CAMPUS</th>
<th>SHARE OF UNDERGRADUATES RECEIVING A PELL GRANT</th>
<th>GRADUATION RATES FOR PELL GRANT RECIPIENTS</th>
<th>GRADUATION RATES FOR NON-PELL GRANT RECIPIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To cover net price, students must come up with thousands of dollars, whether it be through savings, borrowing, or working. While research shows that working more than 15-20 hours per week can be detrimental to student success, in light of unmanageable costs students may have no choice but to reduce their course load to make more time to work.

As demonstrated in the map below, the weekly work hours required to cover net costs for the lowest income students are burdensome at the very least, and for some render full-time attendance impossible, compromising their graduation prospects as a result.

**Net Price Calculations**

These figures are derived using colleges' net price calculators, tools designed to help students understand early estimates of their costs of attending a particular college. We use data derived from net price calculators, rather than the net price data reported by colleges to the U.S. Department of Education. The data reported to the Department combine net prices for students with different living arrangements, making it challenging to compare across colleges with different mixes of student living statuses. For this analysis, we chose to compare costs for students living off-campus (not with parents or relatives), which is the most common living arrangement of CSU students.

Weekly work hours needed range from 20 to 55, with a median of 29
Racial and Income Disparities in Student Debt

Students facing affordability challenges may also choose to borrow student loans to help bridge the gap. While four-year public college graduates in California have the lowest average debt in the nation,\(^v\) digging into the data reveals that the burden is not borne equitably. Underrepresented minority graduates at CSU are more likely to have borrowed loans, and the majority of graduates who borrowed have very low incomes. In 2015-16, 76 percent of African-American bachelor’s degree recipients had borrowed compared to 47 percent of their White peers. And nearly eight out of ten graduates who borrowed were from families with incomes no greater than $54,000 per year [see Figures 2 and 3, below].

**Figure 2: Bachelor’s Degree Recipients Who Graduated in 2015-16 with Debt, By Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 out of 4 African-American bachelor’s degree recipients in 2015-16 graduated with student loan debt.

**Figure 3: Bachelor’s Degree Recipients Who Graduated in 2015-16 with Debt, by Family Income**

- Less than $27k: 65%
- $27,001 - $54k: 13%
- $54,001 - $80k: 8%
- $80,001 - $107k: 8%
- $107,001 - $134k: 5%
- More than $134k: 4%

Nearly 8 out of every 10 bachelor’s degree graduates who borrowed had family incomes no greater than $54,000 per year.
Conclusion

College costs continue to grow for all students, but the burden falls much more heavily on those with the fewest resources. This is illustrated in the shares of low-income and underrepresented students who borrow, and the unacceptable work hours needed to cover low-income students’ total college costs after grant aid is applied.

The Cal Grant is California’s primary need-based college financial aid program, yet despite being one of the most generous state grant programs in the country, every year hundreds of thousands of needy eligible applicants do not receive an award simply because not enough are available. At the CSU, these eligible non-recipients have an average family income of just $22,500. And for those who do receive a grant, the value of the Cal Grant B access award that helps the lowest income students cover non-tuition costs has stagnated and is worth only one quarter of its original value.

Strengthening need-based financial aid to account for total college costs is critical to ensuring more hardworking students can make their studies—rather than work—their focus while in school. Specific ways to accomplish this include, but are not limited to, providing all eligible applicants with a Cal Grant, increasing the value of Pell Grants and Cal Grant B access awards, and targeting institutional grant aid to students with the most financial need. Doing so will not only allow students to enroll in more courses, but increase their likelihood that they successfully complete a degree in a timely manner with as little student loan debt as possible.

The Cal State Student Association (CSSA) is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to serve CSU students by engaging students in public higher education policy making and advocating for student interests at the systemwide, state, and federal levels. For more about CSSA, see www.calstatestudents.org.

The Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS) is an independent, nonprofit research and policy organization dedicated to increasing college access, affordability and success through improvements in student financial aid policies, both nationally and in California. TICAS is home to the Project on Student Debt, which works to increase public understanding of rising debt and the implications for our families, economy, and society. For more about TICAS, see www.ticas.org.

This report may only be reproduced or disseminated, in whole or in part, with proper attribution and within the terms of this Creative Commons license for noncommercial use: creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.
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