ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Extra

Agenda
Tuesday, September 29, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Invitation to General Education 2025 Convening (handout)
   • Budget Forum - October 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon Zoom videoconference

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   September 22, 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 - PBATF
   e. GE Structure Taskforce

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. University Policy Advisory Council (handout)
   b. Wang Award – FHAC
   c. Post-Tenure Review Requirements
   d. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout)
   e. APM Proposal – GECCo (handout)
   f. Unapproved Software
   g. Expanded Winter Session (handout)
   h. Course Repetition (handout)
i. Elections and Appointments
   i. School Elections Committees
   ii. Committee proliferation
j. Handbook 306.2.2.e (handout)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 1, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   - Consent Agenda
   - Reports
   - New Business
   - Old Business
   - Open Forum and Wellness Check?

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
Dear CSU Family,

Please join us for the largest and most inspiring virtual gathering in the history of the CSU: this year’s Graduation Initiative 2025 Convening, set for Friday, October 23, 2020, 10:00 to 11:15 a.m. (PST) via livestream.

While the past six months have presented daunting challenges, the CSU’s commitment to our students has never been stronger. For the first time ever, we are inviting the entire CSU family to join in celebrating our remarkable and unwavering progress toward meeting our Graduation Initiative 2025 goals. Whether you are a faculty member, an accountant, a custodian, an administrator, a student advisor, or any one of our 53,000 faculty and staff, you play a crucial role in advancing student success and equity – now and always.

The convening will feature students, faculty and staff sharing inspirational stories of how their daily efforts are transforming students’ lives. It is our hope that these uplifting stories will serve as essential reminders of the life-changing work that happens every day across the CSU. We will also share the latest data and measure our progress toward eliminating equity gaps and helping more students secure the proven, lifelong benefits of a CSU degree.

Please register using the link below, and visit the Graduation Initiative 2025 Convening website for more information about the event.

We look forward to sharing this moment with you.

Sincerely,

Loren J. Blanchard
Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs
### 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 Addendum 8/25/20</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>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>Carry-over</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>Carry-over</td>
<td>AAC BPC Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required.</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>Carry-over</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>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/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>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change</td>
<td>Carry-over</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. RES 202106 Office Hours Policy During Mandated Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 05 CFA President or Designee on FAC-Bylaws Change</td>
<td>Second Reading 10/1/20</td>
<td>FAC 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 RES 202107 CFA President or Designee on FAC – Bylaws Change</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. RES 202105 Fall Classroom Observations During Mandatory Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 08 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.</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</td>
<td>Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs' need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Police Advisory Council

Adopted TBD

Intent
The intent of the University Police Advisory Council (UPAC) is to support the university police with recommendations and advice for planning regarding safety concerns and related police activity on the campus.

Purpose
The purpose of the UPAC is to create a “best in class” university police environment by assisting the university police by providing advice on utilizing community policing strategies on issues that impact the safety and quality of life of our diverse group of students, faculty, staff, and visitors.

Objectives
The objectives of the UPAC are to:

1. Promote the cause of safety throughout the university
2. Increase the awareness of safety conditions and programs among the university community
3. Create a sense of comfort and security while at the university
4. Identify areas of involvement for university police officers in the life of the university in ways that will create an environment that is the “most conducive to the intellectual, cultural, and personal development of its students, faculty, staff and visitors”

Membership
The membership of the UPAC shall consist of the following, or their respective designee:

1. Chief of Police and Director of Public Safety, facilitator
2. Chief Diversity Officer
3. Academic Senate Chair
4. Academic Senate representative, appointed by Academic Senate Executive Committee
5. Associated Students Inc. President
6. Associated Students Inc. Vice President for Campus Life
7. Associated Students Inc. Vice President University Affairs
8. Student representative, appointed by Associated Students Inc.
9. Staff representative 1, appointed by staff
10. Staff representative 2, appointed by staff
11. University Police Officer, appointed by University Police Department
12. Community Member, appointed by University President

Meetings
The meetings of the UPAC shall be at least twice per semester, with additional meetings scheduled as requested by the UPAC Facilitator.
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.
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.
Thursday September 3, 2020

Dear Dr. Hegde,

During its meeting on August 28, 2020, GECCo **APPROVED** the attached proposal to modify the Academic Planning Manual. We respectfully submit it for consideration by the CSUB Academic Senate.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Andreas Gebauer, Ph.D., Faculty Director
General Education Program
June 24, 2020

To: Vernon Harper, Provost

From: Mark Novak, Dean, Extended Education and Global Outreach

Re: Expansion of CSUB Winter Session: A Proposal to the CSUB Academic Senate

Background:

Current CSUB Winter Session dates, based on the calendar, can lead to a short instructional period. Though classes maintain a 45-hour class schedule, some years (e.g. 2021) the session is very condensed.

Half of the CSU campuses (10 of 20 campuses that responded to a recent survey) offer a longer Winter Session. In these cases, Winter Session begins after grades for the fall term are due and ends before classes begin in January. This provides approximately four weeks of instruction time (less some days off for Christmas and New Years).

Instructors can use this time in various ways according to their course requirements. Some may choose to have meetings online prior to Christmas and then meet either face-to-face or online in January. Some may choose to assign readings or other self-study activities prior to meeting either face-to-face or online in January. These and other arrangements provide more time for students to assimilate and work on course content.

Benefits:

This expanded Winter Session:

- Provides a longer period of instruction and learning. This is especially beneficial for General Education courses.
- Provides instructors with more pedagogical options.
- Opens Winter Session to a wider variety of course offerings (e.g., courses with large amounts of reading).
- Provides students with a greater variety of courses that advance them toward graduation.

.../2
Proposal:

That CSUB institute a Winter Session program that begins after grades are due for the fall term and ends before classes begin in January. The specific dates will vary each year depending on the calendar, but will accommodate instructor and student scheduling with respect to the fall and spring terms. Winter Session in this format will begin in the 2021-2022 academic year.

June 24, 2020

Mark Novak, Dean
Extended Education and Global Outreach
Date: September 8, 2020

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Debra Jackson / Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Academic Programs

CC: Vernon Harper / Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Re: Course Repetition Petition for Exception

Current course registration practices at CSUB prevents students from repeating a course with a grade of C- or lower more than two times even when the student has not exceeded the maximum number of repeat units. Therefore, if a student wishes to repeat a course beyond the third attempt, they must submit a petition for exception to the Academic Petitions Committee. However, this practice is not based in any existing policy, neither from the CSU or from the CSUB catalog.

The Office of Academic Programs asks the Academic Senate to consider whether a policy regarding the repetition of an individual course beyond the third attempt is needed. If no such policy is developed, the Office of Academic Operations and Support will work to modify the course registration process so that students are no longer prevented from repeating a course with a grade of C- or lower more than two times when they have not exceeded the maximum number of repeat units.

Background

Executive Order 1037 establishes the CSU policies on repetition of courses, and CSUB policies stated in the course catalog are consistent with this Executive Order. It states that students are limited to 16 semester units of course repeat with forgiveness plus an additional 12 semester units of course repeat without forgiveness, and it states that students requesting additional repeat units must submit a petition for exception to the Academic Petitions Committee.
EO 1037 limits how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness (twice), but it does not limit how many times a student can repeat a course without forgiveness. Although EO 1037 does allow for individual campuses to develop more restrictive course repeat policies than required, there are no policies stated in CSUB’s course catalog regarding a limit on the number of times a student can repeat an individual course without forgiveness.

For reference, please see the below table reporting the number of submitted and approved petitions for repetition of a course beyond a third attempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th># petitions for course repeat beyond 3rd attempt submitted</th>
<th># petitions for course repeat beyond 3rd attempt approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Aaron,

Can’t the schools just make their own accounts on VotingPlace? They’ll have much smaller populations of voting faculty, so they would probably qualify for the lower pricing tiers. Or perhaps we need to allow other electronic voting means during the pandemic as an interim measure.

With regards to GECCo, my personal frustration is the constantly shifting goal-posts with respects to what a course needs to do in order to be approved. There also doesn’t seem to be sufficient consultation when the student learning outcomes, requirements, etc. are revised. The former is more personal, but the later speaks to a governance / structural issue. And of course, any changes to the GE structure itself needs to clearly be labeled as going through appropriate consultation and that is has Senate oversight.

Melissa

Hi, Melissa.

Thanks for looking in to these issues. You are absolutely correct that it has fallen on Beth to co-ordinate and at times run school elections. This is the reason I had suggested in the summer that you have a meeting with each SEC chair and discuss their charge and responsibilities. We can step if there are any disputes that need an impartial arbitrator. The handbook is not very detailed about the process within each school. Perhaps you can ask each SEC chair to have by-laws and get them approved from the school faculty. Finally, we had stayed away from allowing SECs use Voting Place to run their elections, since it would fall on Beth to do it, as the only authorized administrator. The three of us can certainly discuss if we should make an exception during virtual delivery.

We do need to revisit GECCo structure. Before we send it out to committee, I wanted to get some more background about the central issues that need fixing. Is it just a reporting mechanism that needs to change, or are there more deeper issues/concerns. I am aware of those issues raised by some chairs in DCLC. I want to know if they are still of concern or if they have been fixed. Vernon had apparently passed along the message to Lori requesting her to address them. I was thinking of putting it as an item on the next DCLC meeting, getting some feedback, and then sending it to committee. We can certainly discuss it further at EC.

Beth, would you please amend the item on the agenda to say “FYS Instructors and GECCo
Hi Aaron,

Beth noticed at the end of the week that three of the four School Elections Committees had not run the elections for replacing termed-out members. I’ve also been having a lot of questions on the elections process, so I had a conversation with Beth and I’ve been reading up on that part of the Handbook this weekend. After all of that, I’m seeing a couple of issues, both procedural and Handbook related.

The first issue is the delineation of the duties to each SEC. The Handbook elections section reads to me like a distributed system managed and overseen by the Senate, with each SEC taking a stronger role within their school for school-based calls and elections, then reporting up to Senate regularly of nominations and outcomes. But it seems to be running in a more centralized mode, with the Senate office doing almost everything. As the campus grows, a centralized model is not going to scale. My computer science background is constantly thinking about scaling, so this leaps out at me. This is probably more procedural than Handbook-related, but something that needs to be ironed out before we get more issues as the campus grows.

More immediately related to the SEC, the SEC chair and/or the dean’s office staff should have been making sure that all the seats on each SEC are replaced as terms expire, particularly since those seats will always be school seats and will never turn into at-large seats. I think the Handbook is pretty clear here “The composition and structure of the SEC is decided by the faculty of the School”, which I would think also means each school has to run the SEC elections since they determine the composition. But given that three out of the four haven’t done that yet, perhaps we need to revise
that Handbook line to also make it clear that each school is responsible for electing people to their SEC, following the election rules in the Handbook, and for informing the Senate office of the outcomes.

Maybe I’m overthinking things and the SEC issue is as simple as they don’t know how to run an electronic vote now that we’re working remotely and we just need to provide some training on VotingPlace to the deans’ ASCs. But I suspect there’s also some procedural and Handbook issues at play.

Second, this deep dive into elections sparked a neuron that the Senate has discussed in the past, before the pandemic, concerns about committee proliferation from a faculty workload perspective. It was set aside for very valid reasons, but now that we’ll be in remote operation for a while, Exec Committee may want to circle back to this issue again. Committee proliferation is a workload issue from several perspectives.

Third, it also sparked a neuron that we were going to have broader discussions about GECCo structure and governance this Fall, but it wasn’t on the Exec Committee agenda, other than the part about FYS instructors. But there were concerns in Spring about Senate oversight of GECCo and other GECCo-related concerns. I can’t recall how CARS operated before GECCo, other than that it delegated responsibility for Area B GE courses to the NSME Curriculum Committee. Charles was on CARS though, so he can provide more insight there.

Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth
Vice Chair, CSUB Academic Senate
Professor, Department Chair
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
California State University, Bakersfield
Office: Sci III 319
Phone: (661) 654-3180
Website: https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/
I suspect the marked section was inadvertently added, rather than having something missing. If you take out the bold, underlined section, it's coherent.

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with **during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first** established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)
Aaron and Beth,

306.2.2.e is supposed to say this -- or something darned near like it.

   e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring quarter semester PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle.


Thanks,
Bruce