1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes**

3. **Announcements and Information**
   - 20.37 Awardee
   - Appointments approved

4. **Approval of Agenda**

5. **ASCSU Report**

6. **Provost Report**

7. **Committee and Report Requests**
   (Minutes from [AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC](#) are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)
   a. Executive Committee (B. Hartsell)
   b. Academic Affairs Committee (M. Slaughter)
   c. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (C. MacQuarrie)
   d. Budget & Planning Committee (A. Hegde)
   e. Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush)
   f. Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez)
   g. ASI Report (M. Gomez)

8. **Resolutions** – (Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)
   a. Consent Agenda
   b. Old Business
      i. RES 171801 CSUB Position Statement on Open Search for President and Call for Campus Community Engagement
   c. New Business
      i. RES 171804 Position Statement on the Deferral of Implementation of Executive Orders 1100 (revised) and 1110 (First Reading)
      ii. RES 171805 Dissolution of Environmental Committee (First Reading)
      iii. RES 171806 University Program Review Committee Charge (First Reading) *
      iv. RES 171807 Amendment of Classroom Observation Policy (First Reading) *
      v. RES 171808 University Review Committee Membership Nomination Exemption (First Reading) *
      vi. RES 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative (First Reading)
vii. RES 171810 Addition of Chief Financial Officer as Ex-Officio Member on Budget and Planning Committee (First Reading) *

9. **Open Forum Items (Time Certain 11:15 a.m.)**

10. **Adjournment**

* Changes to be made to University Handbook
1. Call to Order - meeting called to order by D. Boschini

2. Approval of Minutes – J. Kegley moved to approve minutes. B. Hartsell seconded. Approved.

3. Announcements and Information
   Update on EO 1100 and EO 1110 General Education Breadth Requirements – P. Newberry.
   EO 1100 changes some aspects of General Education (GE). CSUB shouldn’t have a problem with implementation because the junior year diversity requirement (JYDR) does not add extra units to the 48-unit maximum.
   EO 1110 – removes remediation for both English and Math on all CSU campuses and requires that by fall 2018, all students entering will go into college-ready Math and college-ready English. The primary concern is that although the changes are well intentioned and evidence based, the Executive Order was rolled out without sufficient faculty input.

   University Advancement – V. Martin – (handout) Mr. Martin provided an overview of the organization of University Advancement (UA). He explained that while dollars raised are important, they are not ends in themselves but are a reflection of community and alumni engagement with the university. He explained how several vacant positons have been filled and the office is gearing up for more activities.

4. Approval of Agenda – B. Hartsell moved to defer Committee Reports until after Resolutions, and to review resolutions in changed order 171803, 171802, and then 171801. M. Rush noted that the Time Certain for Open Forum should be 11:15. A. Jacobsen seconded. All approved the modified agenda.
5. **ASCSU Report** - J. Tarjan distributed a report to Senate via email last week. It can be found on website. EO 1100 and EO 1110 discussion was detailed in that report.

6. **Provost Report** – The request for nominations for the Wang Awards are going to be coming out, shortly. The Provost said CSUB can nominate in all categories.

7. **Committee and Reports (deferred)**
   (Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)
   a. Executive Committee (B. Hartsell)
   b. Academic Affairs Committee (M. Slaughter)
   c. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (C. MacQuarrie)
   d. Budget & Planning Committee (A. Hegde)
   e. Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush)
   f. Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez)
   g. ASI Report (M. Gomez)

8. **Resolutions** – (Certain Time 10:45 a.m.)
   a. RES 171802 CSUB AV Name Change (First Reading) – BPC Chair A. Hegde stated that historically the branch campus has been known as CSUB Antelope Valley Center (CSUB AVC), but because it is housed on the Antelope Valley College (AVC) property, having the same abbreviation for two entities is confusing. Antelope Valley Dean Randy Schultz made a proposal to Provost Zorn to rename to “California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley.” The Provost approved, and now Senate can make it official. A. Hegde moved to waive first reading since a name change doesn’t use additional resources and there isn’t any financial impact. The motion carried. D. Boschini made friendly amendment to use the language in Dean Schultz’s request as the “resolved” statement in the resolution: that the senate recommend to the president that “CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley Center” be renamed “California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley” and that alternate versions would be “CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley” and “CSUB AV”. The motion was seconded and approved.

   b. RES 171803 Integrated Teacher Education Program (First Reading) BPC Chair A. Hegde reported that the resolution came because the Teacher Education Program combined programs so within four years a student can earn a Bachelor of Science in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies and a credential in Special Education.
After discussion, there was a consensus that Senate action was not required. M. Rush moved that Senate acknowledge the notification from ITEP. The motion was seconded and approved.

c. RES 171801 Presidential Searches (First Reading) J. Tarjan and A. Hegde originated the resolution and then the Executive Committee (EC) approved recommending to the Senate as a reflection of faculty opposition to the idea of closed presidential searches. After extensive discussion, A. Hegde agreed to modify the resolution to include a recommendation for an official open campus visit.

9. **Open Forum Items** *(Time Certain 11:15 a.m.)*

None.

10. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 11:31.
## Academic Affairs Committee: Mary Slaughter/Chair, meets 10:00am in BDC 134

**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>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 161719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Referral #24 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS RES 161720</td>
<td></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>AAC, BPC Review Proposal’s three new one-unit classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 161719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Referral #24 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS RES 161720</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>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 161719</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 161719</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>AAC, BPC Review Proposal’s three new one-unit classes</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Review Proposal’s three new one-unit classes</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>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 on Senate Agenda 10/12/17</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 on Senate Agenda 10/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 004 - CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley Center Name Change</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>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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 008 – Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative to Promote Tenure Density</td>
<td>BPC RES 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative to Promote Tenure Density (First Reading) on Senate Agenda 10/12/17</td>
<td>BPC RES 171809 Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative to Promote Tenure Density (First Reading) on Senate Agenda 10/12/17</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></td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS, BPC, FAC RES 161719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Recusal from Discussion and Voting on RTP Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Referral 2016-2017 #22 sent to committee. The FAC committees reported to EC 05/02/17. RES 171808 University Review Committee Membership Nomination Exemption (First Reading) on Senate Agenda October 12, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>Position of Ombudsman (2016-2017 11)</td>
<td>Returned 2/16/17 to Committee by Senate</td>
<td>FAC On Senate Agenda 2/02/17 RES 161711 Tabled by Committee 5/04/17 until next year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 006 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 (First Reading) scheduled for Senate October 12, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/17</td>
<td>Referral 2017-2018 007 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 (First Reading) on Senate Agenda 10/12/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate express its conviction that an open search process for campus presidents is the most appropriate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate strongly urge the California State University Board of Trustees (BOT) to conduct an open search to fill the presidential vacancy at California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Chair of the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP), Mr. John Nilon, and the members of the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) be invited to meet with the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate request the faculty representatives to the ACTCSP share the concerns and issues contained in this resolution with the members of the TCSP.

RATIONALE: It is the judgment of the Senate the reason for closed searches cited most often—the desire to have a robust candidate pool—does not outweigh the following problems associated with a closed search process.

- The handicap faced by the successful candidate of being viewed as being a representative of the BOT rather than the legitimate campus leader.
- The inability of candidates to get a broad introduction to CSUB.
- Feedback on the candidates coming from a very small subgroup of campus and community constituents. This is especially worrisome given our desire to mount our first capital campaign to coincide with our upcoming 50th anniversary (in 2020).
- Unequal approach to presidential searches relative to other important positions on campus.
- A closed process is inconsistent with university values of transparency and full participation in decision-making.

Furthermore, this resolution is consistent with previous CSUB Academic Senate resolutions (see attachments).

Distribution List:
CSU Board of Trustees
Chair, ASCSU
Campus Senate Chairs
President, CSSA
President, CSUB ASI
President and Executive Director, CSUB Alumni Association
CSUB President’s Advisory Council
President CSU Staff Forum
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) urge the CSU Board of Trustees to continue to have finalists for campus presidencies meet with campus constituencies in on-campus visits as a part of the selection process except in those rare cases when there is consensus among the members of the campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President that the campus would be better served by forgoing campus visits by one or more finalists, and be it further,

RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to Chancellor Reed, the CSU Board of Trustees, the Council of Senate Chairs and the Academic Senate of the California State University.

Rationale: The Board of Trustees has changed the policy on the selection of presidents. Historically, finalists in presidential searches have visited the campus for which they were candidates and have held targeted meetings with administrators, faculty and staff and also held open forums for the campus community.

The loss of campus visits by finalists provided for in the proposed policy changes would greatly diminish the role of the campus community in the presidential selection process by eliminating the ability of candidates to meet all members of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, staff, students and community members, who enhance candidates’ understanding of the issues and challenges they might face in the role.

Campus presidents are presented with a wide variety of difficult challenges, and clearly the California State University should take advantage of any opportunity to allow new presidents to build support in their respective communities. Arriving on campus without having the support and legitimacy provided by such a process would put the chosen candidate at a significant disadvantage in building a successful transition.

APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE ON OCTOBER 6, 2011
SENT TO CHANCELLOR REED, CSU BOARD OF TRUSTEES, COUNCIL OF SENATE CHARIS AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU ON OCTOBER 7, 2011
Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents

Responsibility for Appointment of Presidents

The Board of Trustees of the California State University, in partnership with the Chancellor, is responsible for the recruitment, selection and appointment of CSU campus presidents. There is a deep commitment throughout the process to the principles of consultation with campus and community representatives and diversity. The ultimate decision and responsibility for the transition of executive leadership rests with the Board. The Chancellor designates staff to support the process.

The Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President

The Chair of the Board appoints a Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) for any campus with an impending vacancy. The TCSP is composed of the Chair of the Board, four Trustees, and the Chancellor. The Chair designates a Trustee as chair of the TCSP.

The TCSP determines the attributes desired for a successful candidate, approves the final campus and job descriptions, and any advertising copy, and reviews and interviews candidates. Although the TCSP is the ultimate body to make the final decisions, including the advancement of candidates to the full Board, the process is to be conducted in a manner that includes the campus representatives. The Chancellor may indicate his or her ranking of final candidates before the Board. The Board Chair and the Chancellor may use executive search firms to assist on specific tasks related to the selection process. The Chancellor is responsible for background and reference checks of the final candidates advanced to the Board.

The Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President

The Chair of the Board also appoints an advisory group to the TCSP, known as the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP). The ACTCSP is composed of the Chair of the Academic Senate on the campus, two faculty representatives selected by the campus faculty, one member of the campus support staff selected by the staff, one student selected by the duly constituted representatives of the campus student body, one member of the campus Advisory Board selected by that board, one alumnus/alumna of the campus selected by the campus Alumni Association, and one Vice President or academic Dean from the campus, and the President of another CSU campus selected by the Chancellor. Each of the campus representatives shall be determined according to procedures established by the campus. If the campus has a standing policy on campus representation to the ACTCSP that does not call for open election by each constituency, that policy shall be reviewed at the start of a new presidential search, and ratified or amended. The Chair of the Board or the Chancellor may appoint up to two additional members from constituent groups to the ACTCSP to strengthen its capacity to cope with the complex requirements of a specific search, including diversity of the campus, the service area or the state.

The ACTCSP provides advice and consultation regarding the position and campus descriptions and any advertisement of the position. Members of the ACTCSP may also suggest potential candidates with the leadership qualities, administrative ability, academic qualities and other talents appropriate to the position. The ACTCSP reviews and comments
on all candidate applications, participates in candidate interviews and the deliberations that lead to the selection of the final candidate(s). The consultative procedures are to be conducted in a manner designed to generate confidence in the selection process and garner local support for the eventual appointee.

**Confidentiality and Professionalism**

To ensure that the search process respects the professional needs of candidates and is conducted with integrity, strict confidentiality must be maintained by members of the TCSP and the ACTCSP, the Chancellor and staff. Only the Chair of the TCSP or the Chancellor will act as spokesperson for the committees during the presidential search process. After providing a notice of violation and an opportunity for a meeting, the Chair may dismiss a member of the TCSP or the ACTCSP if confidentiality is determined by the Chair to have been violated, or if the behavior of a member is determined by the Chair to have been unethical, unprofessional, disruptive to the conduct of business, or if a member is determined by the Chair to have ignored or failed to follow these rules and procedures.

**The Presidential Selection Process**

The TCSP meets initially, together with the ACTCSP, to discuss the needs of the campus, and the desired attributes of the new President. The committees also receive information from the campus and the community on these subjects. After these initial sessions, advertising copy is developed, candidates are invited to submit applications, and a broad pool is developed. The Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP confer and evaluate whether any additional internal CSU candidate(s) is/are a good fit for the position to be added to the pool and considered for the position. The TCSP and the ACTCSP then meet again, review all candidates and decide whether to interview internal candidates, internal and external candidates, or external candidates. After consultation with the TCSP and the ACTCSP, the Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP determine whether to schedule campus visits, which are optional, or to schedule campus visits on a modified basis, depending on the circumstances of the search.

**Deviations from These Procedures**

The Board of Trustees will normally confine itself to the names presented by the TCSP. In rare instances and for compelling reasons, the Board reserves the right if, in its judgment, circumstances warrant to depart from the recommended candidate(s) or from the procedures outlined in this policy.

Adopted September 20-21, 2011
CSU Board of Trustees
Resolved: That the California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate calls for open and transparent search processes for the four CSU presidential searches in 2015-16, in which finalists’ names are publicly announced and official campus visits for them are scheduled; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the Chairs of the 2015-16 Trustees Committees for the Selection of the President (TCSPs), the Academic Senate CSU and campus senate chairs.

Rationale

In 2015-16, the California State University will conduct searches for new presidents at four campuses, Sonoma State University, San Jose State University, CSU Channel Islands and CSU Chico. CSU presidential searches are governed by the Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents. The Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (TCSP) recommends final candidates to the Board. The campus Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) participates in the search process, including interviews and deliberations that lead to the selection of a final candidate(s). On the one hand, the policy expresses a welcome “deep commitment” to consultation with campus and community representatives. On the other hand, rather than mandating an open search process, the policy provides that the Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP together decide whether to schedule campus visits for presidential finalists.

The California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate strongly urges that campus TCSPs conduct open and transparent search processes. Forgoing announcing finalists’ names publicly and scheduling official campus visits for them would mean less transparent search processes and less confidence in the outcomes on the part of the university community and the public. The thoughts of CSU Sacramento’s new president are instructive in this regard. In his Fall 2015 Address, President Robert S. Nelsen frankly expressed his dislike for the search process for new presidents. He spoke to the absence of an on-campus interview and who actually selects the president. In his words, “I hate that I didn’t get the opportunity to meet all of you during the search and that I am only meeting you now. And I don’t like it that you are only meeting me now and that the huge majority of you had no say in whom [sic] your next president would be.”

(http://csus.edu/sacstatenews/Articles/2015/08/documents/FallAddress2015_AsPrepared.pdf)
Meaningful consultation means open campus visits where all members of the university community have the opportunity to meet finalists and ask them questions in a public forum. Such visits give the university and public insight into finalists’ knowledge of the campus and their ability to unify and lead students, faculty, staff and administrators. They also give finalists insight into the university community they aspire to lead.

Approved by the Academic Senate on October 8, 2015

Sent to the President as information on October 9, 2015
RESOLVED: That the CSU Bakersfield Academic Senate not participate in the implementation of Executive Orders 1100 (revised) and 1110 until such time as the Academic Senate of the CSU endorse the proposed changes to the curriculum and academic standards.

RATIONALE: It is the history of higher education in the United States that faculty determine the curriculum and academic standards related to the awarding of degrees. It is also the tradition of the CSU that changes to general education curriculum are only made after recommendation by the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee and endorsement by the Academic Senate of the CSU and that changes to pre-baccalaureate coursework and assessment are made only after recommendation by the English or Mathematics Councils of the CSU and endorsement by the Academics Senate of the CSU.

Distribution List:
President Horace Mitchell
CSU Board of Trustees
Chair, ASCSU
Campus Senate Chairs
Chair, Mathematics Council of the CSU
Chair, English Council of the CSU
Chair, Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) object to the severely time-constrained and flawed shared governance process and consultation surrounding Executive Order 1100 (revised) and Executive Order (EO) 1110 and insist that the practice of joint decision-making mandated in HEERA be respected and adhered to; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge Chancellor White to immediately put EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110 into abeyance and defer their implementation date to, at earliest, Fall 2019; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that, before any future implementation, the Chancellor’s Office engage in data-driven and genuine consultation with faculty, with the goals of refining both EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110 and then implementing them on a mutually agreed upon timeline; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor’s Office work with the campuses to develop an analysis of the costs of wholesale modification of the General Education (GE) and academic preparation portions of the curriculum and share that analysis widely; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the requested analysis specifically focus on resource allocation mechanisms on the campuses and the potential deleterious effects on student success and programs, such as ethnic and cultural diversity studies, resulting from implementation of EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU requests that the Chancellor’s Office ensure that the multiple measures approach called for by EO 1110 assess foundational quantitative reasoning proficiency (as outlined in the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report, page 17, Recommendation IIC); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge Chancellor White to reinstate the recently lifted moratorium on changes in Ethnic Studies programs and departments1 until at least

---

1 Excerpt from letter from Chancellor White to CSU Community (https://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ethnicstudiesreport.pdf): “The second set of recommendations (Recommendations 10.1-10.3) focus on maintaining the moratorium that has been in place for the past 2-1/2 years with respect to changes in ethnic studies programs and departments, particularly faculty reductions. I accept the task force recommendations to maintain the moratorium during AY 2016-17 for review, discussion and response to the report, and lift the moratorium effective July 2017. I also expect that any campus decisions regarding the status and administrative design of ethnic studies departments and programs will take the report’s contents into consideration. But the ethnic studies report should not constrain the regular academic planning process of each campus, rather it should be one factor that informs the planning.”
Fall 2019 to ensure that Ethnic Studies programs, departments, and faculty are integral to the fair and regular academic planning process of each campus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor’s Office collaborate with the ASCSU in developing a plan for monitoring the efficacy of the changes in General Education and academic preparation curricula, and that the details of this plan be communicated to campus stakeholders early enough to be considered in campus curriculum planning; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU campus articulation officers, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association (CSSA), CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA), California Community College Chancellor, California Community College Academic Senate, CSU Ethnic Studies Council and Chairs, CSU Math Council, CSU English Council, and CSU World Language Council.

RATIONALE: CSU faculty and campus constituents have expressed serious concerns about the adequacy of the consultation, the content, and the timeline of revised Executive Order 1100 and newly released Executive Order 1110. The two require vast curricular changes, which bring into question the need for the hasty release of these Executive Orders during the summer break, a time when only a handful of ASCSU faculty representatives were available. The insistence by the Chancellor’s Office that the CSU needed to move forward at such a pace suggests that the administration is more attuned to the pressures of outside forces than to the needs of its students and continuing faculty efforts to meet those needs.

When an Executive Order (EO) is issued, time is needed to understand and interpret the changes and engage in clarifying conversations. Campuses also need time to discuss changes and develop appropriate curricular and pedagogic responses. CSU faculty are experts and researchers in their fields who must be relied upon when the system contemplates major changes in curriculum design. We contend that the revision to EO 1100 and the newly released EO 1110 did not arise from the fulsome shared governance process needed to reflect faculty expertise, and therefore the Senate and the faculty it represents are compelled to reject changes in curricula that do not originate through such a fulsome process.

Changes to basic curriculum policy need thoughtful consideration informed by a nuanced understanding of the rationale and impacts of proposed changes on the quality of education that CSU campuses provide and that our students deserve. In the case of EO 1100 (revised), those impacts include the consequences of acceptance of all online courses, reciprocity of all upper division GE courses, and the implications of allowing all GE courses to be double counted (EO 1100 Section 2.2.6.1).
Further, some of the unintended consequences of a rushed and poorly designed implementation can be illustrated with Ethnic Studies courses which affect students who benefit from exposure to the diverse perspectives that these courses provide. Campuses need time and resources to determine how best to proceed without damaging these courses, the programs that offer them, and the students who benefit from exposure to the diverse perspectives that these courses provide. If these courses are overlaid on GE requirements, switching the overlay may require a new course and/or new learning outcomes and also assumes the needed expertise to teach a cultural competency course. Other content areas also need thoughtful campus attention.

Therefore, implementation of the two Executive Orders must be put into abeyance until at least Fall 2019, and a data-driven, collaborative analysis of the impacts of these Executive Orders must be undertaken in concert with ASCSU and campus senates. Such analysis should focus specifically on cost, resource allocation, and the impact on departments and programs. Moreover, specific attention should be paid to defining foundational proficiency in the use of multiple measures for assessing quantitative reasoning, and to reinstating the moratorium on changes to Ethnic Studies departments and programs. The Chancellor’s Office should partner with ASCSU to develop a plan to monitor the efficacy of changes to General Education and to academic preparation.

Approved – September 14-15, 2017
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

Dissolution of Campus Environmental Committee
RES 171805

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the
Campus Environmental Committee be dissolved.

RATIONALE: The Campus Environmental Committee has seldom met in recent
years, and the functions of the committee are being addressed through
other processes and committees.

Distribution List:
President
Provost & V.P. for Academic Affairs
VP for Business and Administrative Services
School Deans
General Faculty
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the University Handbook be revised whereby deletions have strike-through, and additions are underlined:

202.4 Program Discontinuation

202.4.1 University Program Review (UPRC)

The University Program Review Committee (UPRC) is a faculty committee that is responsible for all CSUB degree and credential programs. UPRC reviews all documents submitted to it from the program, dean, and external reviewer (accreditation findings), in order to assess the extent to which CSUB’s programs adopt reasoned strategies and resource allocation decisions for continuous improvement. Thus, it is expected that program faculty will use UPRC feedback to improve program quality.

The UPRC is regarded as an important committee with respect to program continuity and, in that capacity, UPRC can make recommendations for program improvement and advancement. However, from time to time, the UPRC may determine that it is necessary for the campus to stop offering a particular program either on a temporary or permanent basis. In such a circumstance, UPRC may recommend a program moratorium (temporary) or discontinuation.

The UPRC is also responsible for monitoring the overall program review process, recommending changes in the policy and procedures of that process, and assuring that program review findings are used transparently and with accountability to inform university-wide curricular and budgetary planning processes. Finally, at the end of the academic year the chair of the UPRC shall submit to the Academic Senate a summary of the major findings and recommendations for all programs reviewed.

202.4.2 Program Discontinuation

The decision to discontinue an approved program is an all-university responsibility. Program faculty, the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), a school or staff dean, or the P&VPAA can initiate the process for discontinuation. The discontinuation policy is found in the Academic Planning Manual.
RATIONALE: Currently, there is no charge or description of the UPRC in the University Handbook. This section explains the Charge of the UPRC within the new section 202.4 Program Review.

Distribution:
President
Provost
AVP Academic Programs
UPRC Chair
Program Review Task Force Report

Respectfully submitted on May 30, 2017 by the Program Review Task Force: Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair; Steve Bacon, Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education; Mark Evans, Professor of Economics Emeritus; Doris Hall-Mcphetridge, Chair, Department of Criminal Justice; Many Rees, Professor and Chair of Theatre; Danielle Solano, Associate Professor & Chair, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

The Program Review Task Force met throughout the Spring Semester beginning on April 18th. The group met with Dr. Vernon Harper, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Dr. Vandana Kohli, Associate Dean, Undergraduate and Graduate Programs; Dr. David Schechter, Vice Provost, Chair of Annual Report Revision Committee; Dr. Kris Krishnan, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA); and Jenny Zorn, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Based upon these meetings and our own discussions we make the following set of recommendations.

Proposed Recommendations to Senate & Others

- **Task Stream Evaluation:** We recommend that a committee be formed to work with Kris Krishnan to evaluate and reconfigure Task Stream. We recommend school Assessment coordinators and at least one chair from each school be represented on the committee.

- **Annual Report:** We make the following suggestions to the Annual Report Revision Committee: (1) That one field instead of multiple fields be provided for the first four questions and a separate field be provided for the faculty accomplishments. (2) We suggest adding a field for feedback from the Deans. (3) Also there should be a generous character limit for the fields. (4) Finally, we suggest that a preliminary Program Profile [before graduation and final grades posting] be sent early to Chairs.

- **Program Review:**
  a. Assistance should be provided to faculty in completing the Program Review. The UPRC workshop should be continued and there should be workshops for Chairs, especially new chairs, every year, to assist them in a hands on with Annual Reports and the Program Review.
b. We urge that the Deans of the Schools remind the Chairs that Program Review should involve the total program faculty in some meaningful manner.

c. The time for program reviews should be seven-year span and although extensions may be granted to programs, the review cycle should be no longer than 10 years.

d. It is recommended that representatives of the UPRC and representatives from Accredited programs meet to discuss a separate Program Review Template or process that will be facilitate a streamlined yet adequate Program Review process.

e. It is recommended that the Provost, representatives of the UPRC and Deans meet to discussion a revision of the MOUAP that will provide proper closure to the Program Review process.

- The Task Force approves and sends forth the attached “University Program Review Committee Charge” to the Academic Senate for adoption
UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

PURPOSE:
Program review establishes benchmarks and follow-up plans that track progress toward achieving and ensuring alignment of student, programmatic, and university-wide academic goals and objectives. Program review should be centered on the desire to provide a quality university-level program balanced with respect for the needs of society in general and the region in particular, student abilities and interests, and career needs. Most importantly, program review must provide an evidence-based determination of whether students are accomplishing the program’s learning objectives through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development. In this way, the results of program review provide the evidentiary basis for informed, transparent and accountable decisions about program, faculty and student needs, curricular planning, and resource allocation and management. Through this faculty-driven program review process, the university administration, working collaboratively with the faculty at multiple steps in the process, is better prepared to allocate scarce resources and to plan for change. Transparency and accountability is enhanced by tying together the recommendations for program improvement with budgeting, faculty lines and space requirements through a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). The campus systematically integrates the results of program review into planning and budgeting processes.

CHARGE:
The University Program Review Committee (UPRC) is a faculty committee that is responsible for the systematic evaluation of all CSUB degree and credential programs. UPRC reviews all documents submitted to it from the program, dean, and external reviewer (accreditation findings), in order to assess the extent to which CSUB’s programs adopt reasoned strategies and resource allocation decisions for continuous improvement. Thus, it is expected that program faculty will use UPRC feedback to improve program quality.

The UPRC is regarded as an important committee with respect to program continuity and, in that capacity, UPRC can make recommendations for program improvement and advancement. However, from time to time, the UPRC may determine that it is necessary for the campus to stop offering a particular program either on a temporary or permanent basis. In such a circumstance, UPRC may recommend a program moratorium (temporary) or discontinuation.

The UPRC is also responsible for monitoring the overall program review process, recommend changes in the policy and procedures of that process, and assure that program review findings are used transparently and with accountability to inform university-wide curricular and budgetary planning processes. Finally, at the end of the academic year the chair of the UPRC shall submit to the Academic Senate a summary of the major findings and recommendations for all programs reviewed.

MEMBERSHIP:
The UPRC consists of one faculty member elected by each of the schools and two at-large faculty, as well as one faculty from the Academic Senate membership selected by the Executive Committee, and as a non-voting member, the AVPAP (ex officio). To ensure continuity in
UPRC operation the members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Each member is given three WTUs of assigned time for his/her two-year service.

Sources (text extracted from):
Strategic Plan
Academic Planning Manual
Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures (Approved Senate and President 2010)
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the University Handbook be amended whereby deletions have strike-through, and additions are underlined:

305.2.4.7 Classroom Observation

Evaluation of teaching of probationary and temporary faculty members shall include at least one observation of classroom teaching during each academic year.

Evaluation of teaching of temporary faculty members with three-year appointments shall include at least one observation of classroom teaching during the third academic year of the appointment. Evaluation of teaching of temporary faculty members teaching in their second consecutive semester shall include at least one observation of classroom teaching during that academic year. Evaluation of teaching of temporary faculty members teaching across consecutive years shall include at least one observation of classroom teaching during each academic year. Units may require additional observations. Any employee may request that a classroom observation of themselves be performed during any term.

Each department unit shall develop procedures for the observation.

The faculty member shall include the observation report in the RTP file.

RATIONALE: These changes create classroom observation minimum requirements that align with the cycles for periodic evaluation for different faculty units. The proposed changes reduce classroom observation workload for department units.

Distribution:
President
Provost and VPAA
School Deans
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the University Handbook be amended whereby deletions have strike-through, and additions are underlined:

305.8.1 Membership on the URC

The six (6) members of the URC shall be tenured professors, librarians, or counselors. The committee shall select its own chair, who participates in the evaluations and votes on the recommendations. No member of the URC may serve on a unit RTP committee. Faculty members serving as Chair of the Academic Senate/Faculty, President of the CFA, or Director of the Teaching and Learning Center are not eligible to serve on the URC. Department chairs, faculty members who have served on the URC within the last six years, and faculty members who have served two terms on the URC may choose to accept or decline nomination for election to the URC. A faculty member may decline nomination if he/she is the only tenured professor available to serve on the their unit RTP committee. All other tenured professors and librarians and counselors of equivalent rank are obligated to accept nomination for election to the URC.

RATIONALE: Election of the URC precedes the formation of unit RTP, and an exception to serve on the URC needs to be granted to those departments with a sole tenured professor who may be needed to serve on their unit RTP Committee. It is believed that at least one tenured member of the department should serve on the unit committee, whenever possible.

Distribution:
President
Provost and VPAA
School Deans
Continuation of Faculty Hiring Initiative to Promote Tenure Density

RES 171809

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that the President continue supporting the initiative dedicated to annual increases in faculty hiring past the academic year 2020-21.

RATIONALE: Over the decade 2003-2013, CSUB experienced a steady decline in the number of FTE Faculty. The faculty hire expansion initiative dedicating $1 million per year has been effective in reversing this trend. This limited initiative is expected to end after a 5-year period. CSUB’s student faculty ratio (SFR) has consistently been higher than the system-wide SFR over 2003-2013 decade. As a result of the initiative, CSUB’s SFR has improved.

Distribution List:

President
Provost
BAS/CFO
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

Addition of Chief Financial Officer as Ex-Officio Member on Budget and Planning Committee

RES 171810

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that the President approve expanding the membership of the Budget and Planning Committee to include the Business and Administrative Services (BAS) Chief Financial Officer (CFO) as an ex-officio non-voting member; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUB Academic Senate By-laws Section IV.B.3.a. be amended to expand the membership of the Budget and Planning Committee as stated above

RATIONALE: Including the BAS/CFO in BPC will improve BAS understanding of faculty concerns and needs, and BPC’s understanding of campus budgetary resources, processes, and reporting.

Distribution List:
President
Provost
BAS/CFO