

ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2022

10:00 A.M. – 11:25 A.M.

LOCATION: BDC 134- CONFERENCE ROOM AND VIDEO CONFERENCE

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/89221483688?pwd=QllyS25SemtaTTlyemJwaVZzeFB5UT09&from=addon>

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair; virtual), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, and V. Harper

1. CALL TO ORDER

- a. (A. Hegde) called meeting to order 10:07 a.m.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

a. Announcements:

- i. Faust Gorham – Associate VP and CIO (**Time Certain: 10:20 a.m.**) (F. Gorham) adjusted time: 10:32 a.m.

1. TechSmith Knowmia (A. Hegde) Please provide updates regarding TechSmith Knowmia.

- a. (F. Gorham) CSUB has been using TechSmith Knowmia for the recording and distribution of content such as lecture videos. Official contract ends October 31, 2023 and product will be retired by TechSmith. The team has evaluated five different products. Two major aspects to consider: usability of the product and ability of Knowmia content to be converted to the new product.

- b. (A. Hegde) Request a report that can be sent to EC for a referral to AS&SS.

- i. (F. Gorham) The team will ensure the requested information, such as level of support and TechSmith recommendation is included in the report.

- c. (M. Rees) Regarding expired Zoom recordings housed in Knowmia. Will cleaning out of these records be required? (F. Gorham) No, that will not be required.

2. Advising Access:

- a. (A. Hegde) Emailed Jennifer McCune regarding athletic advisor access to remove advising holds. She will conduct an audit.

- b. (A. Hegde) Do advisors have access to Canvas? (F. Gorham) No, not unless assigned by an individual in Peoplesoft. (J. Tarjan) Suggests that someone contact the chief advisor for Athletics. A. Hedge confirmed he would do so.
 - c. (E. Correa) Requests clarification regarding who has automatic access in Canvas. (F. Gorham) The individuals with administrative access are: Alex Slabey (FTLC), Don David, and himself.
 - 3. Addendum: Phone Costs (M. Danforth)
 - a. (M. Danforth) There is a significant communication breakdown regarding the new VOIP system and higher PBX charges.
 - b. (V. Harper) Has been in conversations with Thom Davis regarding how much of his budget can be transferred to schools to offset the cost. It is an item for Provost Council.
 - c. (F. Gorham) The PBX system is dying and the voicemail server needs to be replaced. PBX charges will go up as transition to VOIP occurs.
 - d. (A. Hegde) Confirms that the consensus is that faculty do want and need phones and voicemail. (V. Harper) Understands and agrees.
 - e. (F. Gorham) Working to bring on ZOOM phone feature to work directly with ZOOM client. (M. Danforth) Important to consider and evaluate internet traffic capacity for various areas/buildings on campus.
 - 4. Question and Answer:
 - a. (J. Tarjan) Requests a full single sign on system where one would only be required to sign on once per machine.
 - i. (F. Gorham) Yes, moving towards a unified single sign on program, however, it would be by browser, not machine.
 - b. (E. Correa) Will changes be coming for the schools in terms of the website and webpages?
 - i. (F. Gorham) There is a web governance committee which consists of a person from each school. Schools will continue to go through these updates.
 - c. (F. Gorham) One more significant MyCSUB change to be announced soon campus-wide.
- b. Announcements:

- i. (A. Hegde) CSU Cozen O'Conner Assessment on-campus visit scheduled for Wednesday, September 27 to September 29. Invitation to come from Claudia Catota.
- c. Information: Faculty Open Forum debrief (A. Hegde)
 - i. Provost shared data from the Campus Climate Survey (Great Colleges to Work For). Do not have access to the raw data or comments. Will be a school level meeting this year regarding finances. Regarding diversity, equity and inclusion: while information from the survey is helpful, it is perhaps not the best way to evaluate the diversity climate.
 - ii. Early faculty felt left out of communication. Women and minority faculty feel their careers are adversely impacted if they speak up. Communication is a big problem; among department chairs as well. Latinx faculty at the lowest score for sense of belonging. Low confidence in senior leadership
 - iii. Scored higher than benchmark for perceived and publicized recognition of shared governance
 - iv. Request for more recognition of scholarship.
 - v. Provost's action items:
 1. Early Faculty Open forum for faculty in probation years 1-3 to take place Thursday, September 29.
 2. E. Correa to lead group to look at experiences and develop strategies for Latinx inclusion. DEI fellows program overseen by T. Salisbury.
 3. Division Conduct Policy Officer to be announced under D. Boschini's office.
 4. Provost to meet with Asian faculty and staff.
 5. Faculty sabbatical symposium to recognize scholarship.
 - vi. Open Forum discussion:
 1. (E. Correa) Dr. Harper did not get around to discussing the mission and pride.
 2. (M. Rees) Only 20% of faculty participated. Important to put results in context and not generalize across the university.
 3. (A. Hegde) Would like to propose that faculty conduct their own survey to have clearer feedback and access to comments.
 4. (V. Harper) Multiple measures and instruments to be used to continue evaluation of the organization. Invaluable feedback received from this survey.
 5. Contrast Ratio of Slides on the PowerPoint
 - a. (J. Millar) Difficult to view the charts on the PowerPoint slides in the presentation.

6. (E. Correa) Important to address these issues of trust, accountability, and sense of belonging. Good step in the right direction for the creation of allyship and diversity for all.
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain: 10:05 a.m.)
 - a. Approval of Agenda moved to 10:30 a.m.
 - b. Addendums:
 - i. (M. Danforth) Request to add phone costs to discussion with F. Gorham.
 - ii. (E. Correa) Request to remove AS&SS from referral 2022-2023 02 Academic Integrity Campaign – Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility item. Will not be going to AS&SS per previous discussing in EC.
 - iii. (J. Tarjan) Request to remove item 5.f “AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan.” It is already being addressed by AAC.
 - iv. (M. Rees) Request “GEECO Deadline” to be prioritized.
 - v. K. Van Grinsven noted amendments to agenda.
 - c. A. Hegde requests motion to approve amended agenda; E. Correa approves and C. Lam seconds. Approved.
 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - a. August 23, 2022 (tabled)
 - b. August 30, 2022 (tabled)
 - i. K. Van Grinsven revised 8/30/2022 minutes with updates E. Correa sent to Executive Committee. Will email the EC the revised minutes.
 5. CONTINUED ITEMS (deferred)
 - a. AS Log (**handout**) (deferred)
 - i. AAC (J. Tarjan)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. BPC (C. Lam)
 - iv. FAC (M. Rees)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper) (deferred)
 - c. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation (deferred)
 - d. AB 927 (**handout**)
 - i. (A. Hegde) Forwarded the email from the ASCSU chair regarding AB 927. Suggests the organization of a taskforce to generate proactive strategies for a coordinated CSUB response.
 - ii. (J. Millar) Agrees with the suggestion of a taskforce which would allow for an avenue to collect feedback. (M. Danforth) Agrees a mechanism for the collection of formalized feedback is necessary.
 1. (J. Tarjan) Suggests a small group (1-2 individuals, perhaps ASCSU representatives) to draft a brief statement and the

generation of a letter from the Executive Committee.
Concerned with the amount of time a taskforce would need.
(M. Martinez) Agrees.

2. (A. Hegde) Disagrees with this suggestion as it would not allow for equal and inclusive engagement from the campus.
 - iii. (E. Correa) Suggests a combination approach; have J. Millar and M. Martinez generate a statement as well as work on the organization of a taskforce simultaneously.
 - iv. (A. Hegde) Out of time. Will keep AB 297 on the agenda. Continue the discussion of the formation of a taskforce in future meetings.
- e. AB 928 (**handout**)
- f. ~~AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns~~—J. Tarjan
- i. Removed from the agenda per J. Tarjan.
 - g. Office hours flexibility (deferred)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain: 10:45 a.m.)

- a. Addendum to Agenda: GECCo deadline discussion
 - i. (J. Tarjan) At DCLC A. Gebauer, the GE Director, said the October 1 deadline was proposed by Academic Operations, but GECCo would continue to review courses as they come in.
 - ii. (M. Rees) There were some concerns in Arts and Humanities regarding these early deadlines, but this was before the DCLC meeting took place.
 - iii. (A. Hegde) J. Paschal confirmed Academic Operations is willing to have flexible deadlines.
- b. GVAR- Exam and/or Course - AAC (**handout**)
 - i. (A. Hegde) Memo was sent out from the Chancellor's Office regarding GVAR testing and CSU consideration of ending high stakes testing as a means of meeting GVAR requirements. Also mentions the development of GVAR courses in each program to fulfill GVAR requirements. GVAR exams are suspended until Fall 2023.
 - ii. (C. Lam) What can be done by the Executive Committee body?
 1. (A. Hegde) Can draft a resolution in opposition of dropping the GVAR exam option. (C. Lam) Agrees. There are high unit programs where this additional course requirement would extend graduation. (M. Danforth) Agrees. Not all majors can accommodate the unit and faculty load that additional courses would require.
 2. (J. Tarjan) Understands referral will be coming to AAC. (A. Hegde) Yes, the charge would be for AAC to generate a statement identifying CSUB's stance on the GVAR Exam and/or course requirement.
- c. RTP Calendar- BPC and FAC (**handout**) (deferred)

- d. Campus Modality Philosophy – Handbook Appendix (deferred)
- e. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)
 - i. Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee
(handout)
 - ii. Police Advisory Council **(handout)**
 - iii. HIPs taskforce [RES212212] 5th resolve
 - iv. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity)
 - v. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
 - vi. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1 **(handout)**
 - vii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 – Workload
 - viii. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
 - ix. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion) – EC
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
 - x. Committee proliferation
- f. Carry-over from 2021-2022 Annual Report (Possible New Referrals) (deferred)
 - i. Honorary Doctorate – Handbook Change
 - ii. DEI Faculty Fellows Exploratory Group Report
 - iii. Accessibility of Instructional Materials
 - iv. The Personal Action File (PAF) and the Working Performance Action file (WPAF) – Handbook Change
 - v. Digitizing the Performance Review Process
 - vi. Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change
 - vii. Modifications to Search and Screening Procedures
 - viii. Amended: 2022-2023 02 Academic Integrity Campaign – Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility – AAC, AS&SS, BPC, and FAC **(handout)** AS&SS removed from item on agenda line per E. Correa.
 - ix. RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority – *(Table, pending more information)*
- g. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees – EC [AB 928] (deferred)
 - i. They should not duplicate degrees offered by CSUs in the same geographic area.
 - ii. They should be held to the same accreditation standards as universities to have their students eligible for financial aid in upper-division coursework.
- h. Course Drop Policy – AAC (deferred)
- i. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force formation (deferred)
- j. General Faculty Meeting, Spring Follow-up (deferred)

- i. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS
 - ii. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action (**handout**) – FAC
 - iii. URC workload as campus grows - FAC
- k. Dean Professional Development – FAC (deferred)
 - i. Responsiveness
 - ii. Understanding/following the Handbook
 - iii. Understanding/following the CBA
 - iv. Supporting (not undercutting) chairs
- l. Summer Session GE courses – AAC (deferred)
- m. Exam Modality for Flex Classes – AAC, AS&SS (deferred)
- n. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee – FAC (deferred)
- o. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC, FAC (deferred)
- p. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (**handout**) (deferred)
- q. Investment Divestiture – BPC (deferred)
- r. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) – BPC (deferred)
- s. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (deferred)
- t. Assigned Time application revision and timing (*Hold- pending further information*) – FAC (deferred)
- u. Distinguished Professor Award – (**handout**) FAC (deferred)
- v. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (*Hold- pending further information*) (deferred)
- w. Alma Mater (*Hold- pending further investigation*) (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING (deferred)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD

ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2022

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES CONFERENCE ROOM AND ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
<https://csub.zoom.us/j/89008353888?pwd=V2NoeVBQeURTZzBycUI5V2ltZU5sUT09&from=addon>

- a. Call to Order
- b. Approval of Minutes
 - i. September 8, 2022 (*tabled at 9/22*)
 - ii. September 22, 2022 (*tentative*)
- c. Announcements and Information
 - i. President Zelezny's Report (**Time Certain: 10:10 a.m.**).

- ii. Dwayne Cantrell- AVP Enrollment Management (**Time Certain: 10:25 a.m.**).
 - iii. Elections and Appointments- M. Danforth.
 - d. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)
 - e. Reports
 - i. Provost's Report
 - ii. ASCSU Report
 - iii. Committee Reports: (*Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC to be posted on the Academic Senate Webpage*)
 - 1. ASI Report- C. Vollmer
 - 2. Executive Committee- M. Danforth
 - 3. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)- J. Tarjan (*attached*)
 - 4. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS)- E. Correa (*attached*)
 - 5. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)- C. Lam (*attached*)
 - 6. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – M. Rees (*attached*)
 - 7. Staff Report- S. Miller
 - f. Resolutions (**Time Certain: 10:45 a.m.**)
 - i. Consent Agenda
 - ii. New Business
 - iii. Old Business
 - g. Open Forum (**Time Certain: 11:15 a.m.**)
 - h. Adjournment
8. ADJOURNMENT
 - a. A. Hegde thanks EC for attending this extra meeting. Meeting adjourned 11:35 a.m.
 - b. (V. Harper) Dr. Gus Garcia has passed away. Will be very missed.

ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AGENDA- EXTRA MEETING

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2022

10:00 A.M. – 11:25 A.M.

LOCATION: BDC 134- CONFERENCE ROOM AND VIDEO CONFERENCE

<https://csub.zoom.us/j/89221483688?pwd=QllyS25SemtaTTlyemJwaVZzeFB5UT09&from=addon>

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
 - a. Announcements:
 - i. Faust Gorham – Associate VP and CIO (**Time Certain: 10:20 a.m.**)
 1. Techsmith Knowmia
 2. Canvas Access
 - b. Information
 - i. Faculty Open Forum debrief
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain: 10:05 a.m.)
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - a. August 23, 2022 (previously tabled)
 - b. August 30, 2022 (previously tabled)
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log (**handout**)
 - i. AAC (J. Tarjan)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. BPC (C. Lam)
 - iv. FAC (M. Rees)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - c. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
 - d. AB 927 (**handout**)
 - e. AB 928 (**handout**)
 - f. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan
 - g. Office hours flexibility
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain: 10:45 a.m.)
 - a. GWAR- Exam and/or Course - AAC (**handout**)
 - b. RTP Calendar- BPC and FAC (**handout**)
 - c. Campus Modality Philosophy – Handbook Appendix
 - d. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth

- i. Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee
(handout)
- ii. Police Advisory Council **(handout)**
- iii. HIPs taskforce [RES212212] 5th resolve
- iv. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity)
- v. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
- vi. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1 **(handout)**
- vii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 – Workload
- viii. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
- ix. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion) – EC
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
- x. Committee proliferation
- e. Carry-over from 2021-2022 Annual Report (Possible New Referrals)
 - i. Honorary Doctorate – Handbook Change
 - ii. DEI Faculty Fellows Exploratory Group Report
 - iii. Accessibility of Instructional Materials
 - iv. The Personal Action File (PAF) and the Working Performance Action file (WPAF) – Handbook Change
 - v. Digitizing the Performance Review Process
 - vi. Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change
 - vii. Modifications to Search and Screening Procedures
 - viii. 2022-2023 02 Academic Integrity Campaign – Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility – AAC, AS&SS, BPC, FAC **(handout)**
 - ix. RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority – *(Table, pending more information)*
- f. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees – EC [AB 928]
 - i. They should not duplicate degrees offered by CSUs in the same geographic area.
 - ii. They should be held to the same accreditation standards as universities to have their students eligible for financial aid in upper-division coursework.
- g. Course Drop Policy - AAC
- h. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force formation
- i. General Faculty Meeting, Spring Follow-up
 - i. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS
 - ii. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action **(handout)** – FAC
 - iii. URC workload as campus grows - FAC
- j. Dean Professional Development – FAC

- i. Responsiveness
- ii. Understanding/following the Handbook
- iii. Understanding/following the CBA
- iv. Supporting (not undercutting) chairs
- k. Summer Session GE courses - AAC
- l. Exam Modality for Flex Classes – AAC, AS&SS
- m. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee - FAC
- n. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC, FAC
- o. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding
(handout)
- p. Investment Divestiture - BPC
- q. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) - BPC
- r. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC
- s. Assigned Time application revision and timing (*Hold- pending further information*) – FAC
- t. Distinguished Professor Award – **(handout)** FAC
- u. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (*Hold- pending further information*)
- v. Alma Mater (*Hold- pending further investigation*)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING**

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD

ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2022

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES CONFERENCE ROOM AND ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
<https://csub.zoom.us/j/89008353888?pwd=V2NoeVBQeURTZzBycUI5V2ltZU5sUT09&from=addon>

- a. Call to Order
- b. Approval of Minutes
 - i. September 8, 2022 (*tabled at 9/22*)
 - ii. September 22, 2022 (*tentative*)
- c. Announcements and Information
 - i. President Zelezny's Report (**Time Certain: 10:10 a.m.**).
 - ii. Dwayne Cantrell- AVP Enrollment Management (**Time Certain: 10:25 a.m.**).
 - iii. Elections and Appointments- M. Danforth.
- d. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)
- e. Reports
 - i. Provost's Report
 - ii. ASCSU Report

- iii. Committee Reports: (*Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC to be posted on the Academic Senate Webpage*)
 - 1. ASI Report- C. Vollmer
 - 2. Executive Committee- M. Danforth
 - 3. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)- J. Tarjan (*attached*)
 - 4. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS)- E. Correa (*attached*)
 - 5. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)- C. Lam (*attached*)
 - 6. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – M. Rees (*attached*)
 - 7. Staff Report- S. Miller
- f. Resolutions (**Time Certain: 10:45 a.m.**)
 - i. Consent Agenda
 - ii. New Business
 - iii. Old Business
- g. Open Forum (**Time Certain: 11:15 a.m.**)
- h. Adjournment

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Aaron Hegde
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:40 PM
To: Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: FW: Campus Senates' Feedback by October 24, 2022 on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Cal-GETC Proposal

Colleagues,

Let's discuss this at the next EC.

Aaron

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: BDC 20
Bakersfield, CA 93311

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Beth Steffel <BSteffel@csusb.edu>
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 at 12:26 PM
To: Senate Chair listserv <campussen@lists.calstate.edu>
Subject: Campus Senates' Feedback by October 24, 2022 on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Cal-GETC Proposal

Campus Senate Chairs,

Hopefully, you've had a chance to review [AS-3565-22/APEP "Feedback on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates \(ICAS\) Cal-GETC Proposal" \[calstate.edu\]](#) that was distributed to you last week.

In order to meet the requirements of [AB 928 \(Berman\) Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021: Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee \(2021-2022\) \[leginfo.legislature.ca.gov\]](#), the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) has proposed the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) a "singular lower division general education pathway" for consideration by the three segment senates (University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges). Specifically, AB 928 requires that:

“(1) On or before May 31, 2023, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges shall establish a singular lower division general education pathway that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission to both the California State University and University of California. If the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges is unable to come to agreement on or before May 31, 2023, the respective administrative bodies of those segments shall establish a singular lower division general education pathway that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission to the California State University and the University of California by December 31, 2023.

(2) Commencing with the fall term of the 2025–26 academic year, the singular lower division general education pathway established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be the only lower division general education pathway used to determine academic eligibility and sufficient academic preparation for transfer admission to the California State University and the University of California.

(3) The singular lower division general education pathway established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not lengthen the time-to-degree and shall not include more units than is required under the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum on July 31, 2021.”

ICAS, in June of 2022, made a recommendation for a “singular lower division general education pathway” pending approval by the three segments. Of note, the Cal-GETC package does include oral communication but excludes the IGETC requirement of a language other than English. The essence of the proposal, relative to CSU GE is:

- i) a reduction of 5 units (mandated by AB 928),
- ii) loss of 3 of the 9 units of area C (Humanities and Arts),
- iii) loss of 3 of the 3 units of Area E (lifelong learning),
- iv) the 1-unit science laboratory (Area B3) is required (instead of 0/1 unit),
- v) defining critical thinking to be writing intensive, and
- vi) defining oral communication in a manner that focuses on content (vs. skill development).

[AS-3565-22/APEP “Feedback on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates \(ICAS\) Cal-GETC Proposal” \[calstate.edu\]](#) requests that “each Campus Senate submit feedback to the ASCSU by October 24, 2022, that takes one of the following three positions regarding the ICAS Cal-GETC proposal (June 2022):

- a. Support the ICAS Cal-GETC proposal (June 2022),
- b. Recommend specific changes that satisfy the requirements of AB 928, with rationale
- c. Unable to come to a consensus”

Please submit your campus senate's feedback in the following survey no later than October 24, 2022. The campus senate feedback will be shared with the ASCSU to inform the decision on Cal-GETC.

Please don't click on the survey link until you are ready to submit your campus senate's position https://csusb.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3gYnBCeitSDmuqO [csusb.az1.qualtrics.com]

Beth A Steffel
Chair, Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)
Immediate Past Chair, California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) Faculty Senate
bsteffel@csusb.edu



Sylvia A. Alva, Ph.D.
Executive Vice Chancellor
CSU Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802

www.calstate.edu

June 7, 2022

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Senate of the CSU Executive Committee
FROM: Sylvia A. Alva, Ph.D. *Sylvia A. Alva*
Executive Vice Chancellor
SUBJECT: Assembly Bill 927 – Community College Baccalaureate Programs

As you know, the passage of Assembly Bill 927 in 2021 gives the community colleges the authorization to offer bachelor’s degrees that are not “already offered by the California State University or the University of California.” This spring was the first submission cycle since the bill’s passage, and we received 10 bachelor’s degree proposals.

We value the thoughtful collaboration with Academic Senate and academic leadership groups in reviewing these proposals. Through this consultation, the CSU and UC found no objections to seven proposals; however, as stated in the attached letter to California Community Colleges Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Interim Chancellor Koester has communicated our opposition to the following three proposals on the basis of duplication:

| Proposed Baccalaureate Degree | Community College |
|--|------------------------|
| BS in Biomanufacturing | Moorpark College |
| BS in Ecosystem Restoration and Applied Fire | Feather River College |
| BS in Cyber Defense and Analysis | San Diego City College |

Given that the next submission cycle will open in August 2022, we will continue to reinforce the CSU’s and UC’s interpretation that we must consider degree duplication from a statewide approach and not a regional approach. We have encouraged campus presidents to explore opportunities for memoranda of understanding or pathway programs with these community colleges to help meet the educational needs of students as well as workforce demand in these disciplinary areas. We appreciate the continued involvement and expertise of our faculty and Academic Senate leaders.

SAA/ae

- | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| CSU Campuses | Fresno | Monterey Bay | San Francisco |
| Bakersfield | Fullerton | Northridge | San José |
| Channel Islands | Humboldt | Pomona | San Luis Obispo |
| Chico | Long Beach | Sacramento | San Marcos |
| Dominguez Hills | Los Angeles | San Bernardino | Sonoma |
| East Bay | Maritime Academy | San Diego | Stanislaus |



THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

May 31, 2022

CHANNEL ISLANDS

CHICO

Eloy Ortiz Oakley
Chancellor
California Community Colleges
1102 Q Street, 6th Floor
Sacramento, California 95811

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

EAST BAY

FRESNO

Dear Chancellor Oakley:

FULLERTON

The chaptering of Section 78042 of the California Education Code will enable California's three public higher education segments to collaborate in new and promising ways to create and expand additional equitable opportunities for students of all backgrounds to access postsecondary education in California. With the conclusion of the initial review cycle for the California Community Colleges (CCC) Bachelor's Degree Program (BDP) proposals submitted before the January 15, 2022, deadline – and following engagement and discussion among staff from the University of California (UC) Office of the President, CCC Chancellor's Office and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) – I write on behalf of the California State University (CSU) to convey our appraisal of these proposals as required in Section 78042.

HUMBOLDT

LONG BEACH

LOS ANGELES

MARITIME ACADEMY

MONTEREY BAY

NORTHRIDGE

The CSU finds no duplication of existing baccalaureate degree programs within the CSU for the seven proposed CCC baccalaureate programs listed below:

POMONA

SACRAMENTO

SAN BERNARDINO

SAN DIEGO

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSÉ

SAN LUIS OBISPO

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS

| Degree | Community College |
|--|--------------------------|
| BS Respiratory Care | El Camino College |
| BS Respiratory Care | Foothill College |
| BS Respiratory Therapy | LA Valley College |
| BS Respiratory Care | Crafton Hills College |
| BS in Histotechnology | Mt. San Antonio College |
| BS in Automotive Technology Management | De Anza College |
| BS in Research Laboratory Technician | Bakersfield College |

With regard to the three proposed programs listed below, however, the CSU submits its formal, written objection, with supporting evidence. These proposed academic degrees duplicate one or more existing baccalaureate degree programs offered by the CSU and/or UC:

| Degree | Community College |
|--|--------------------------|
| BS in Biomanufacturing | Moorpark College |
| BS in Ecosystem Restoration and Applied Fire | Feather River College |
| BS in Cyber Defense and Analysis | San Diego City College |

The CSU and UC have shared specific supporting evidence of duplication with staff from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

While the CSU has concerns regarding the CCC's BDP proposals – concerns shared by our systemwide academic senate – I want to emphasize that we look forward to continuing to work with California's community college districts to identify innovative, collaborative ways to address identified workforce needs through postsecondary education. We also welcome the opportunity for the three segment offices to collaborate closely on future review cycles for community college baccalaureate degree program proposals and would be happy to answer any questions related to the assessment conveyed above.

Sincerely,



Jolene Koester, Ph.D.
Interim Chancellor
California State University

c: Michael V. Drake, President, University of California
Kristen Soares, President, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

Sylvia A. Alva, Ph.D.

Executive Vice Chancellor

CSU Office of the Chancellor


401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802

www.calstate.edu

March 24, 2022

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Sylvia A. Alva, Ph.D. 
Executive Vice Chancellor

SUBJECT: Upcoming revisions to the CSU Policy on the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GVAR) (formerly Executive Order 665)

Executive Order 665, published in 1987, established requirements for California State University students to demonstrate writing proficiency at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GVAR), an element of that policy, has since been satisfied by CSU undergraduate students most typically via the completion of a designated upper-division course or in-person examination. Although only a few CSU campuses required the in-person exam, due to the pandemic the GVAR was suspended for *all* students through spring 2022. This pause has provided an opportunity to reconsider the place of GVAR in the CSU.

In a February 23, 2021, memo, Academic and Student Affairs committed to a process in fall 2021 to evaluate the future use of the GVAR. A group composed of writing faculty, administrators and a student representative were asked to review the GVAR in light of discussions regarding potential hardships and inequities brought about by high stakes testing and administrative barriers related to the requirement. Among its recommendations, this group highlighted that:

- If GVAR is to be continued as a CSU requirement, then the CSU needs to consider ending high stakes testing as a means of meeting the GVAR, ending the GVAR for graduate degrees, and aligning the assessment of student learning with other WSCUC core competencies.

The teaching and assessment of writing within the CSU system has evolved considerably over the past four decades since the GVAR was established. Most notably, in 2013 the CSU's regional accrediting body, WSCUC, included writing as one of the core competencies for which campuses are required to ensure students have achieved proficiency as part of the institutional review process for

CSU Campuses

Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

Upcoming Revisions to GWAR

March 24, 2022

Page 2

accreditation. This has provided campuses with the necessary impetus and support to require that writing skills be developed and assessed on an ongoing basis for all students. (*Note: the other WSCUC core competencies are oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy and critical thinking.*)

At the same time, the relevance and necessity of the GWAR has come into question. Other than the GWAR, the CSU does not require an additional, systemwide demonstration of competence in any other WSCUC core competency; instead, assessment is managed at the campus level. Moreover, the differential approach to GWAR across the CSU's 23 campuses has raised concerns about its alignment with the CSU's ongoing efforts and significant progress in removing administrative barriers, eliminating high stakes testing and retaining and supporting students of all backgrounds toward timely degree completion.

Based on these considerations, as well as the advisory group's recommendations, the systemwide CSU policy requiring completion of at least one designated 3-unit upper-division writing course to satisfy GWAR has been updated to apply to baccalaureate students *only*, beginning with students with a catalog year of fall 2023 and beyond. Additionally, the use of a stand-alone examination may no longer be used to demonstrate competence in writing under the GWAR; however, writing exams are still allowed under the CSU policy on [Credit for Prior Learning](#). Each campus will continue to have the autonomy to develop an approach to writing instruction and assessment that aligns with their WSCUC-required commitment to continuous improvement throughout a student's educational program on their campus.

If you have questions regarding this policy update, please contact Dr. Alison Wrynn, associate vice chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development, at awrynn@calstate.edu.

SAA/aw

- c: Steve Relyea, Acting Chancellor
Robert Keith Collins, Chair, Academic Senate, California State University
Isaac Alferos, President, California State Student Association
Alison M. Wrynn, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development
Nathan Evans, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief of Staff, Academic and Student Affairs
Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents for Student Affairs
AVPs for Academic Programs and Deans of Undergraduate Studies
Graduate Deans

Katherine Van Grinsven **Attachment: Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee**

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2022 10:13 PM
To: Aaron Hegde
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: EC Agenda Handout question and AS Log Question

Hi Aaron,

RES 212219 created the faculty performance review software exploratory committee (which is a horribly long-named committee, but it is what it is) back in March to determine the electronic RTP/PTR/etc. platform. It has a tenured and probationary faculty member from each school, plus a librarian.

It did not get fully populated after Spring calls. There are still four open positions, including both positions for SSE. A&H was the only school to fill both their seats in Spring calls. NSME and BPA each still need a probationary faculty member on the committee.

Melissa

From: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2022 9:26 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>; Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: EC Agenda Handout question and AS Log Question

Good Evening, Katie and Melissa.

Yes, the red font does indicate carry over items from last year. Melissa, we give them new referral numbers, don't we? The referrals coming out of the summer senate can keep those referral numbers. The two coming out of last week's EC were numbered on that basis.

Katie, you can probably have a one or two line summary of the referral in the log. This way it takes up less space. For instance - 2022-23 Ref #1 Time Blocks can say "reconsider Time Blocks for classes" or something like that. I will look around in my email to see if there are any handouts for the ones you are missing.

Melissa, do you have any information on the software exploratory committee? Thought I saw on the elections/appointments slide deck that a few have already been elected/nominated?

Aaron

S. Aaron Hegde, PhD

Chair, Academic Senate

Chair and Professor, Economics

Director, ERM Program

California State University, Bakersfield

From: Brian Street
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2022 2:11 PM
To: Aaron Hegde
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RTP timeline review

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Aaron,

I have a concern regarding the calendar and timeline of RTP file review and believe the review of this concern would be best completed in the Senate.

My concern with the calendar and timeline of RTP file review is specifically related to the time given to the President to review.

From RES 192019, and discussions thereof, it is my understanding that the President has made P&VPAA her designee for final RTP file review, and does not review RTP files (with the exception in specific cases). However, RTP review calendars and timelines have not been updated. For example, for 3rd-6th year probationary faculty RTP review timeline, 2 months is given from the point at which the P&VPAA submits his file review letter to when the President offer letter is submitted.

There are 2 areas I hope, and think important, that the Senate should review;

1. Can the time given to the President to review files be utilized by the other levels of review, importantly, for Unit Committee review which can have as little as 2 weeks to review and submit letters.
2. Can the time when letters from the campus, renewing probationary faculty contracts, be given out earlier
 - a. International faculty, requiring their offer letter for Visa renewals, could benefit from the new offer letters being received earlier than the current date, June 15th.

I thank the Executive Committee for their time considering this item.

Dr. Street

Brian D. Street, Ph.D.
Chair and Associate Professor, Department of Kinesiology
Core Faculty, Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
Director, Faculty Leadership Academy
CSU, Bakersfield
EDUC 140
Phone: (661) 654-2551

Attachment: Police Advisory Council

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: Police Advisory Council.
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 2:34:51 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Hi, Katie

Could you please put an agenda item titled "Police Advisory Council" under elections and appointments for the next EC meeting agenda?

Thanks,

Aaron

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: BDC 20
Bakersfield, CA 93311

shegde@csub.edu

Schedule Appointment: <https://app.acuityscheduling.com/schedule.php?owner=20625205>

California State University, Bakersfield



From: Martin Williamson <mwilliamson@csub.edu>

Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 at 2:13 PM

To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>

Subject: Police Advisory Council.

Hi Dr. Hedge,

Just a quick reminder of the vacant faculty rep for the Police Advisory Council to replace Michael Harville. Our first meeting is scheduled for Sept. 23, 2022 at 9am via zoom.

Thanks!

Marty Williamson
Assistant Vice President and Chief of Police

University Police Department and Campus Safety Services
CSU Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
93311
Non Emergency Phone 661-654-2677
Emergency Phone 661-654-2111

Attachments: Evaluation of Academic Administrators- Handbook 311.1

Background:

In August 2021, Beth Bywaters interpreted the language of Handbook 311.1 as the call for faculty on Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) Provost to be early in Fall '21 semester; the first academic year after the Provost's May 2020 hire. Upon mentioning the Fall '21 formation the AARC to Dee Dee Price, she shared her interpretation, having served as coordinator of many AARCs:

The AARC for Provost would be formed in the Spring of his second year after hire. That would be this semester.

Here is some clarifying language which conforms to the timing and practice of the Academic Administrator Review Committee.

311.1 General Guidelines

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three-year intervals. The **first** review **process** should be initiated early in fall semester after their initial hire. **The Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) is formed in the following Spring of the administrator's second year.** The President or the President's designee prepares the schedule of the evaluations.

The President may, if he or she believes it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation.

The supervisor, after consulting with the administrator being evaluated, is responsible for developing the categories to be used for evaluating a director, dean, or academic vice president.

(Revised 12-01-16)

Please consider whether these suggestions go to the EC for discussion and referral.



Attachments: 2022-2023 02 Academic Integrity Campaign

Dr. Aaron Hegde
Chair CSUB Academic Senate
California State University, Bakersfield
(661)-654-3110
shegade@csub.edu

2022-2023 REFERRAL # 02 Academic Integrity Campaign – Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility

FROM: Aaron Hegde, Academic Senate Chair

TO: John Tarjan, Academic Affairs Committee Chair

Elaine Correa, Academic Support and Student Services Committee Chair

Charles Lam, Budget and Planning Committee Chair

Mandy Rees, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair

DATE: June 1, 2022

cc: Beth Bywaters, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Hegde".

At its meeting on June 1, 2022, the Academic Senate Executive Committee requested that the AAC, AS&SS committee, BPC, and FAC address the issue of Academic Integrity Campaign – Ombudsperson and Committee for Professional Responsibility (CPR). During your discussion, please consider:

- Whether one person serving as Faculty Ombudsperson is enough
- Whether the ASCU/CO Ombudsperson resolution may produce some funding to support Ombudsperson position at CSUB
- Ways the Committee on Professional Responsibility works with the Faculty Ombudsperson
- Structure of CPR annual reports to Senate (see Handbook 308.4)
- How to thank Lecturers and Probationary Faculty for maintaining academic integrity

Please take up this matter with your committee and get back to me with your recommendation. If your recommendation requires Senate action, please prepare a resolution and the rationale for the resolution.

Attachments: Faculty Rights and disciplinary action- FAC
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-3517-21/FA (Rev)
November 4-5, 2021

**FACULTY RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS IN DISCIPLINARY ACTION
PROCEDURES WITHIN THE CSU**

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that CSU Campus Senates address faculty rights to due process in disciplinary action procedures, including but not limited to developing policies regarding the following:

- requirements for notifying faculty when such actions are being considered but before such actions are initiated;
- providing faculty with any written documents, witness statements, or other evidence being considered before such actions are initiated;
- allowing faculty to submit any information or evidence to appropriate CSU administrator(s) before such actions are initiated;
- allowing faculty to meet with appropriate CSU administrator(s) accompanied by California Faculty Association (CFA) and/or faculty representative(s) before such actions are initiated; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Office of the Chancellor, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association (CSSA), CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU campus Offices of Faculty Affairs, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU College Deans, and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA).

***RATIONALE:** The United States Constitution guarantees a fundamental right to due process in the 5th and 14th Amendments. Due process includes fair procedures and the right to meaningfully defend oneself and be meaningfully represented against allegations of wrongdoing. Article 19 in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) does not specify rights of faculty to respond to allegations of wrongdoing before disciplinary actions are initiated, only after disciplinary action(s) are already pending, which allows CSU administrators to begin punishments for faculty without ever speaking to them or receiving any information from them. Article 19 specifically allows for creation of additional steps in the disciplinary action process, including opportunities for informal consultation between faculty and appropriate administrators (19.3). Further, CSU Executive Order (EO) 1096-revised indicates that in cases involving accusations of discrimination, harassment, retaliation, dating/ domestic violence, or stalking, investigation procedures must give equal opportunity to complainants and respondents to meet with administrators*

and to provide information and evidence, and give respondents the right to receive information about allegations of wrongdoing against them (Article III, Section C, Campus Investigation Process, Parts 3 {Intake Interview} and 7 {Investigation Procedure}). The Supreme Court decision in National Labor Relations Board v. J. Weingarten Inc. (1975) provides Weingarten Rights to CSU faculty members, including the right to be accompanied by a CFA or faculty representative(s) to any investigatory interviews with CSU administrators, and the right to receive copies of documents, allegations, and any other evidence that is being considered in investigating a possible disciplinary action.

Approved Unanimously – January 20-21, 2022

Attachment: Policies: reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding



California State University, Bakersfield Division of Academic Affairs

Policy Title: PROVOST Direct Reports Professional Development Funding

Policy Status: DRAFT

Affected Units

Provost's Council, Provost's Direct Reports

Policy Statement

Professional Development is a critical component of CSUB's success. By investing in people, CSUB internally grows its base of talent.

For professional development expenses above \$500, the Provost must provide written authorization to his/her direct reports before any professional development expense is incurred. A professional development expense would be a workshop or training series designed to enhance an individual's skill or competence. Importantly, regular travel for conference meetings etc. are not included within the scope of this policy.

Consultations

Provost's Council

Approved Date

TBD

Effective Date

TBD

Date Submitted to Policy Portal

TBD

Attachment: Distinguished Professor Award

Distinguished Professor

Here is what it refers to (via Anna Jacobsen)

As we look for ways to increase the visibility and support of our scholarship-active faculty, I think that it would be worth examining the creation of the title of "**Distinguished Professor**" on our campus. I am aware of this title being used for "internationally recognized faculty scholars" at CSU MB and LB and there are probably other campuses as well. At some institutions, it seems that these are "funded" positions through donors (often they are named distinguished professorships).

Not sure it is the right thing for our campus, but I think that it would be worth exploring.

This is not from a CSU, but I like the clarity of purpose and eligibility on this

webpage: <http://sphhp.buffalo.edu/home/information-for-faculty-staff/faculty-awards/ub-distinguished-professor.html>