ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, September 1, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   - Open Forum – September 2, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. Zoom videoconference
   - Budget Forum - October 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon Zoom videoconference

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   August 25, 2020 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart)
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Provost Update
   c. Searches
   d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   e. Academic Testing

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time
   b. Faculty Rep on Alumni Board
   c. Sustainable Financial Task Force - reference August 5 minutes
   d. Post-Tenure Review Requirements
   e. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout)
   f. Unapproved Software
   g. Tabled AY 19-20 resolutions

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING SEPTEMBER 3, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
Announcements
President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
Consent Agenda
Reports
New Business
Old Business
Open Forum

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION**
   - Senate Calendars (handouts)
     - Executive Committee
     - Senate
     - Standing Committee
   - President Zelezny – Report to Senate August 27 between 10:00 – 10:30. The EC is in favor of her presence during the entire Senate meeting. People who are uncomfortable about sharing ideas in front of the President can email their Senator.
   - Budget Forum - October 19, Zoom 11:00 – Noon
   - Ethnic Studies discussion includes English and other departments because of the impact on programs and degrees.
   - Standing Committee composition – Clarification needed whether the position of librarian can count as faculty member where standing committee composition is comprised of a majority of faculty members. M. Rees requested a change in the description of FAC in Bylaws to be consistent with the Handbook. Substantive changes to the Bylaws and Handbook need to go before the Senate. M. Danforth suggests putting [Librarians] in brackets to include librarians as faculty. D. Boschini recommended to list the numbers of the composition of committee membership when making changes to the Handbook and Bylaws. A. Hegde will reach out to S. Bozarth, Chair of Librarians, for her recommendation of a librarian position in AS&SS.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   C. Lam moved to approve the August 5, 2020 Minutes. M. Martinez seconded. Approved.
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
M. Rees moved to approved the Agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. **AS Log (handout)**
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart) He acknowledged the following items:
         Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement
         Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) He acknowledged item
         Referral 12 Graduate Student Grievance – Reporting Chain
      iii. FAC (M. Rees) She acknowledged the following item:
         Referral 8 Honorary Doctorate – Handbook change
      iv. BPC (B. Street) Nothing carried over from 2019-2020.
   b. **Provost Update**
      - 9/2/20 Open Forum 1:00-2:30 p.m. V. Harper will review the slides that he presented at the General Faculty Meeting.
      - AA Pandemic Budget Task Force - V. Harper will write the charge of the committee. Basically, it is to look at the budget data and make a set of recommendations by the end of the semester on operational adjustments that would increase the probability of achieving the monetary targets of the next three years. The membership is as follows:
         - Co-Chair Administrator Bruce Hartsell has been appointed by V. Harper.
         - Co-Chair (1) tenured faculty member. The AS Office will send out a call for interest that includes that a candidate submit a paragraph or two on why they are interested and suited for the position.
         - Academic Senate Chair
         - ASI President or designee
         - (2) members from Senate Executive Committee: The chairs of FAC and BPC
         - Department chairs:
           (2) SS&E
           (2) NSME
           (1) A&H
           (1) BPA
         - (2) School Deans
         - CFA President
• Academic Affairs Budget Analyst
• (1) or more staff members appointed by the Provost

M. Rees inquired whether work-study students are essential, and who is deciding or means of deciding that they are essential workers. V. Harper responded that the Campus Preparedness Council is working on a definition of Essential Workers. In the meantime, he has directed deans to provide a list and their rationale for classifying the individual as essential. The Campus Police Department maintains the database of the approved individuals to enter the campus. J. Miller said that a Covid-19 survey/mobile application will be used by students and faculty for clearance to enter campus. The user keeps it displayed in case they are asked to show proof of the survey’s completed checklist. They have to be cleared in advance to be on campus. The Campus Preparedness Council is still working on their communication piece.

c. Searches – The Elections Committee Chair will issue the calls soon:
   i. AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
   ii. Dean Antelope Valley

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – see 5.b. Provost Update, AA Pandemic Advisory Task Force

e. Academic Testing – V. Harper said the directive from the CO stated that the CSU use an online platform for testing. CSUB’s Instructional Plan, 51 face-to-face courses and 57 other instructional activities run in special spaces, was approved by CO. Those courses in regular lecturer rooms are not OK. V. Harper met with Deans and they will meet with Chairs to move some of the spaces to conform to the directive. It’s just a slight modification to our Instructional Plan. The CO will be updated upon completion of the relocation of some class space.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

   a. Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science– reference minutes March 10, 2020 – referred to AAC, BPC

   b. FHAC Nomination feedback from Senate – Reference March 5, 2020 minutes. Define what is meritorious. Some senior faculty pressured junior faculty to support them. Senior faculty may be aware who did or did not sign their support. Referred to FAC

   c. MS Accounting – Reference April 7, 2020 minutes. The proposal is missing documents. It was sent back to the proposer last semester. It will be referred to AAC, BPC upon receipt of the complete set of documents.
d. Office Hours Policy – reference April 21 minutes. Clarify language in Handbook 303.1.3. Clarify how to do office hours via Zoom. Referred to FAC

e. IRPA Issues – reference April 28 minutes. The CO gave feedback in the WSCUC Report. The issues are access and permissions to the data, define what data is needed for the Budget, define that data that faculty need, and define how the data is to be parsed for department chairs’ use. Referred to BPC

f. Summer Senate Decisions to Senate – Refer to Item 7., below.

g. Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time – reference April 30, 2020 minutes. M. Martinez said there is a need to establish a timeline at least a month in advance to notify the department chair so they can find someone to teach a class. Assigned time does not absolve faculty of their responsibilities if notification is less than three weeks. The clarification of policy comes from Provost Office. B. Street recalled discussion of attaching department chair’s signature to when the release time begins. M. Rees suggested that the Senate invite dean(s) to discuss the fairness of Assigned Time across schools. M. Rees will discuss the issues with M. Martinez before it’s referred. A. Hegde will attempt to follow-up with the people on the implementation of RES 161714.

h. New Call for Assigned Time - It will be sent upon receipt of the Fall 2020 FT Faculty list.

i. CFA President or designee ex-officio on FAC – Reference May 12, 2020 EC minutes. The CFA President’s knowledge of existing contracts, knowledge of emerging issues at the campus and systemwide levels are useful to the FAC’s work. Decide whether the membership is a voting or non-officio position. Referred to FAC

j. Search Committee – See 5.c.

k. Workload – Community Service – reference May 7, 2020 Senate minutes. A. Hegde will talk with J. Woods.

l. CSUB Patent Policy Draft (handout) GRaSP submitted a draft for Senate consideration. Referred to FAC.

m. Elections and Appointments - There are 27 positions to be filled this fall. GECCo went to A&H to make a call but didn’t notify the AS Elections Committee Chair. A call will go out for GECCo representatives from A&H, NSME, and SS&E.

n. Recommendation for reappointment of HSIRB Alternate I. Sumaya – C. Commuri, Chair of IRB, sent a letter of recommendation to the EC. I. Sumaya holds three positions on the board. The Handbook says that the secretary is not a member of the IRB. M. Martinez said that J. Kraybill is interested in serving. She can qualify her interest while the process is verified. B. Street has not seen a call for interest from the IRB. He put his name forth every year. J. Millar asked if we
need to pay attention to the bigger group. Is I. Sumaya the alternate to the scientific concerns position or non-scientific concerns position? D. Boschini said that for many years, the IRB has functioned smoothly and their recommendations have been readily approved. It’s heavy work. Yet, it may be time for the EC to look at the process. A. Hegde will ask C. Commuri to 1) clarify on how IRB works and 2) how are the three positions that I. Sumaya fills different. The position needs to filled by December 2020.

o. UPRC Recommendations (handout: Annual Report) The WSCUC report directed the campus to review the program review process. The WSCUC committee, headed by D. Jackson, met this summer. M. Danforth said that AAC already has Referral 2019-2020 16 Program Review Process. A. Hegde recommended to modify and supplement the referral. There is urgency because WSCUC visits the campus in Spring 2022. We have this AY to implement the change. D. Boschini said that it’s not clear to Academic Programs what they can and cannot request. For example, resources tied to the outcome of a program. It can get stuck because people higher up don’t want to sign-off on the review and then the MOUAP doesn’t get signed. It might help to define the purpose of Program Review. The MOUAP needs to be clarified. The Handbook says that the MOUAP is written by the Dean and Provost Office. That is not the way it works at all. People in program review need a clear set of goal posts. A. Hegde said concerns are 1) only one was MOUAP completed last year and yet many were submitted for review 2) streamline the program review template to one page 3) failure to complete the self-study in a timely manner affecting student learning outcomes 4) assessment training workshops needed 5) compensation for the assessment coordinator. D. Boschini suggested that the referral stay in AAC. V. Harper agreed. A. Hegde said the issues will be added into the existing AAC referral.

p. Faculty Rep on Alumni Board (deferred)

q. Fall Classroom Observations – A. Hegde said that while observations have been suspended due to switching to alternate delivery, there are some who want them. M. Martinez suggested that because everyone is new to the virtual situation, consider the assessment come from the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC). If faculty wants to improve, they can have the FTLC come in and make suggestions. They could have the option of including the FTLC’s evaluation in the RTP. Provide faculty with a positive versus punitive process to classroom observations. Referred to FAC. M. Rees asked that the five referrals to FAC be prioritized.

R. Gearhart moved to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes. C. Lam seconded. The meeting was extended by 15 minutes.
B. Street sees urgency to providing observations because there is the risk that they won’t occur at all. M. Danforth said that if observations are optional due to the pandemic, it must be clear at all levels of review and that faculty would not be penalized for choosing not to include them. A. Hegde suggested that a letter from the Provost’s office informing all levels that SOClS and classroom observations are optional. Further, guidelines for review are needed to address that many faculty members are unable to do human subject research. C. Lam added that the decision needs to be made before second year of RTP files on whether to have mandatory observation and the option to include in RTP. This is a priority referral for FAC.

r. First Year Seminar (FYS) Instructors Review - A. Gebauer communicated to A. Hegde that FYS are taught by staff and that it presents issues with reviewing their instruction. 1) No reviews are being done because the staff members aren’t associated with any unit 2) While the GE Faculty Director does the hiring, he does not function as the chair of any unit. He suggested 1) the Senate develop a review process for FYS instructors 2) The Senate stipulate that staff cannot be hired as part-time (PT) faculty 3) How faculty can be motivated to teach FYS. M. Danforth said that staff hired as PT faculty are given an appointment to teach. There is already language in the Handbook about the review process for PT instructors. It needs to be a process clarification, not a referral. The subject will carry to next meeting. A. Hegde will include A. Gebauer’s communication in the agenda packet.

s. SAT elimination – reference August 5 minutes. Be aware that many CSUs are not recording SAT. Rather, they use an alternative index that seems to be working.

t. Sustainable Financial Task Force - reference August 5 minutes. Some of the concerns are being addressed in the AA Pandemic Budget Advisory Task Force.

u. Digital divide - reference August 5 minutes – Slow internet speed is issue due to poor infrastructure.

v. Post-Tenure Review Requirements - It’s not clear what to include. Departments dictate. Clarity needed on that. Not urgent. Not a referral yet. Carry to next meeting.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING  AUGUST 27, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   **Announcements**
   
   President Zelezny (Time Certain) 10:05-10:30
   Orientation – Power point emailed to the Senators on behalf of A. Hegde

   **Consent Agenda**
   
   Standing Committee membership approval (handout)
RES 202102 Academic Standing Spring 2020 (handout)
RES 202103 Submission of Electronic RTP for AY 2020-2021

New Business  (Time Certain 10:45)
RES 202101 Extension of Temporary Exemption of the Online/Hybrid Certification Requirement
RES 202104 GWAR Testing – AY 2020-2021

Open Forum

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
9. ADJOURNMENT
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:45.
### Academic Affairs Committee: Richard Gearhart/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement</td>
<td>Addendum</td>
<td>AAC Streamline the process upon looking at minimum federal requirements and the current Academic Program Review template. <strong>Addendum:</strong> Review UPRC Annual Report dated May 2020, define the purpose of the program review, clarify what Academic Programs can and cannot request, streamline the program template to one page, make the people and the process consistent with the Handbook, timely completion of self-study to effect student learning outcomes, offer assessment training workshops, and compensation for assessment coordinators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>AAC The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently. Returned to proposers with comments on what needs to be improved. Do the courses have a home and would the Curriculum Committees approve before it comes back to AAC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC BPC Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academic Support and Student Services: Charles Lam /Chair, meets 10:00 via Zoom video conference

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<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>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>AS&amp;SS Policy alignment: University Handbook, and Catalog The committee is waiting for the graduate policy.</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>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>FAC Refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 02 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 04 Office Hours Policy</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Clarify the language in Handbook 303.1.3, How to hold office hours via videoconference, Censure or penalty for missing office hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 05 CFA President or Designee on FAC-Bylaws Change</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>The CFA President’s knowledge of existing contracts, and emerging issues at the campus and system levels. Whether the position is voting or ex-officio member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 07 Fall Classroom Observations</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Decision needs to be made before second year of RTP files on whether to have mandatory observation and the option to include in RTP, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<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>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>AAC BPC</td>
<td>Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 03 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report</td>
<td>BPC Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi, Beth

Could you please place this new agenda item for next exec meeting under “GECCo Charge”? Please include Andreas’ email to provide context.

Thanks,
Aaron

------------------------------------------------

Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, Ph.D.
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
CSUB
9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311
shegde@csub.edu

From: Andreas Gebauer <agebauer@csub.edu>
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 at 10:15 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Subject: GECCo request to review charge

Hi Aaron,

I have been asked by GECCo to have the Academic Senate review a part of its charge that is described in the attached resolution, RES 1314049. The specific issue rests with point "11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors." In this point, the issue is not the course certification/decertification, but the instructor certification/decertification. Since the GE program does not have its own faculty, the scheduling of courses is not done by the GE program but by the departments. The departments decide who to hire and then who to assign to which course. Thus, especially "decertification" is really not enforceable. This also raises issue with the CBA. So, we really do not know what to make out of this part of our charge and ask for clarification by the Academic Senate.

It will probably best to at the very least separate the two issues (Course certification and decertification and faculty certification/decertification), and then address how, if at all, GECCo and the GE Director should be involved in ensuring that faculty teaching GE courses are
meeting a common set of expectations. This was the original intent of point 11, to improve program integrity and cohesion.

As always, I am happy to meet with any committee that addresses this issue to further explain our concerns and provide feedback.

Thanks,

Andreas

Dr. Andreas Gebauer  
Professor of Chemistry  
General Education Faculty Director  
California State University Bakersfield
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends approval of the “GEIC proposals entitled ‘Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield’ and ‘Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield.’

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

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

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

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

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

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

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

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

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

Selection of the GE Faculty Director

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

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

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

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

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

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

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

Management of Themes

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

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

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

APPENDIX—Proposed Procedures
Existing Curricular Policies

School curriculum committee:
A&H [http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/](http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/)
NSM&E [http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml](http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml)

Approval of New Course:
[http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/](http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/)

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

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

Process for Course Submission and Certification

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

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

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

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

GECCo may recommend any ONE of the following actions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Course Evaluation Criteria:

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

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

Transition from GE Implementation Committee to GECCo Governance

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

Staggering of Terms in GECCo

Half of the initial terms of GECCo members should be three years in length to ensure continuity. The terms of the other members of the committee, and all subsequent terms of service, shall be two years.