ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, October 6, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Budget Forum - October 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon Zoom videoconference
   • Faculty Trustee nominations

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   September 29, 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 - PBTF
   e. GE Structure Taskforce
   f. 50th Anniversary

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Post-Tenure Review Requirements
   b. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout)
   c. APM Proposal – GECCo (handout)
   d. Unapproved Software
   e. Expanded Winter Session (handout)
   f. Course Repetition (handout)
   g. Elections and Appointments
      i. School Elections Committees
ii. Committee proliferation
   h. 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**
1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Invitation to GI 2025 Convening – V. Harper said that it’s a virtual convention, October 23, 2020 10:00 to 11:15, and open to everyone. Consider registering for the event. A. Hegde attended last year. One of the more interesting speakers was Governor Newson. Awards were given. J. Tarjan received the Faculty Innovation and Leadership Award.
   • Budget Forum - October 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon via Zoom videoconference. A. Hegde and B. Street have been meeting regularly with T. Davis.
   • The Executive Committee (EC) meeting ANNOUNCEMENTS will include a WELLNESS CHECK. It’s an opportunity to share the how the virtual environment affects the members. The Senate meetings will also include a WELLNESS CHECK as part of the OPEN FORUM.
   • K-12 schools may be going back to face-to-face instruction at the end of October. That’s good news for those who are burned-out by teaching children at home.
   • Faculty members have reached out about certain concerns. It’s important for Chairs and Senators to reach out to faculty, instead of waiting for them to come to you. New faculty especially need the contact. A. Hegde offered to attend any department meetings as a way to connect faculty with the Senate and other aspects of faculty information and morale.
   • Expected babies in Computer Science have arrived in good health. More on the way.
   • Economics won the fantasy football game last night for the first time.
   • V. Harper shared with M. Burroughs and the EC that when the announcement came that remote delivery of instruction would continue through Spring 2021, he was sad. He misses the energy of having people around.
• C. Lam shared that the Department of Education grant had a surplus. He and J. Chen Louis submitted a supplemental application. They just received notification that they will get $100,000 to hire student assistant peer mentors. A. Hegde said congratulations, that’s great!

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
M. Rees called for correction to state that the topic V. Harper came to FAC to discuss was RES 192015, Faculty Workload. M. Rees moved to approve the September 22, 2020 Minutes as edited. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
C. Lam moved to approve the Agenda. D. Boschini seconded. Approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart) Referral 2019-2020 #18 Interdisciplinary Bachelor Degree in Science in Public Health Proposal - Performing as curriculum committee, the proposal was approved. The individual will present to the Provost’s office and when Provost Office sends OK to the Senate, then it will go to BPC to look at the costs, etc., and back to AAC as part of the Senate approval process.
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) Referral 2019-2020 #12 Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain – Committee member, L. Vega, took the issues back to the Graduate Council to revise the policy because there is no Appeals Board. There is no due process for students.
      iii. FAC (M. Rees) Referral # 2020-2021 #06 Patent Policy - AVP Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP), I. Ebong has been invited to discuss the topic. Provost Harper visited the committee to discuss 192015 Faculty Workload. A. Hegde referenced the President’s position regarding resolutions that she leaves unsigned because certain actions are being taken by the Provost. While the Handbook states that resolutions end with the President’s signature, there is no need to change the Handbook now. V. Harper believes the treatment of Senate resolutions doesn’t necessitate a Handbook Change. His discussion of how AA implements RES 192015 was robust and working as intended. CSUB’s Chief Counsel, A. Maiorano, was reassigned to San Marcos. We are in the process of getting a new Legal Counsel. A. Hegde said that the
President’s tabling of resolutions is fine, as there has been a precedent and it’s in her purview to do it.

iv. BPC (B. Street) Referral 2020-2021 #01 Masters of Science in Computer Science – the Chair put questions to the person who submitted the proposal and has received a response and will present that to BPC and AAC. Referral 2020-2021 03 Institutional Research in Response to the WSCUC Report – The committee had initial discussion and is working through how to access the data. B. Street began reaching out to individuals to facilitate larger conversation on how to parse the information for Chairs and Faculty to address their budget concerns. He will be presenting at the DCLC in October. It will be an opportunity to gather information as well.

b. Provost Update – V. Harper

i. Instructional Plan and registration for the Spring - The systemwide Provosts meeting revealed that the expectation is to maintain or reduce S2 courses to minimize the number of individuals on campus. A new form and guidance forthcoming from the CO. Academic Programs will use the same workflow of prior cycle. Show how the courses are being built. Build as hybrid. The President will play an important role in the overall approval of courses.

ii. FAQ on Ethnic Studies – We are waiting for guidance from the CO.

iii. K. Krishnan retirement notification was distributed today. He is a friend and was a good leader. The details on the replacement for that function to follow.

iv. CSU Long Beach got close to the 2% positive Covid-19 trigger and they acted proactively to go to remote delivery of instruction. CSUB is stable, and our S2 classes will run this semester.

v. RES 192015 Faculty Workload and President’s role in course approval – J. Millar expressed concern whereby the resolution was tabled by the President because she said it wasn’t in her purview and belonged in Academic Affairs, yet she is involved in S2 course approval going into the Instructional Plan. The Provost responded that he is working on faculty workload to find common ground. The difference is that the Office of Chancellor said the Office of the President on each campus will play a larger role in the S2 courses running in Spring 2021. The structure is working. As long as any particular Provost is willing to sit with faculty and work through different perspectives, shared governance is intact.
vi. New Chancellor, Dr. Castro – D. Boschini asked V. Harper if he had any thoughts on what we can expect. V. Harper said those who know him have spoken of him very highly. It’s a watershed moment for higher education. He is the first Mexican-American to hold the position in the largest higher education system, 490,000 students, in the country. He was President of CSU Fresno for seven years. President Zelezny has a personal connection, as she was the Provost there, during his term. Things she learned from him are being taught to V. Harper. It’s a positive for the Central Valley, and for CSUB in particular because of these connections.

vii. Internship Courses that don’t fit into the S2 mold - V. Harper said the selection of S2 courses for the last cycle of the Instructional Plan was approved by the CO without edits. It is a testament to the very good job the deans and chairs performed. The expectation for internship assignments, offers, and when students get them is not on a regular cycle. The CO and Department of Public Health give guidance and we had to seek approval for courses and follow their guidance for internships. Two internships have been approved for this cycle. Let’s try to capture everything we possible can for our Instructional Plan approval.

viii. Course-related activities - M. Danforth requested guidance for Chairs, through the Deans, on course-related activities that don’t map neatly into PeopleSoft timeslot(s). For example, for the Engineering senior project, teams go in and reserve a time slot to come to the Fab Lab, but it’s not a set time every week. We need to make sure that the space is reserved, it’s sanitized and has the proper set-up. That can’t be coded in PeopleSoft. It’s still related to the course. We will need some guidance how to set that up for Spring 2021. V. Harper will discuss the issue with the Director of Academic Programs. He thanked M. Danforth for identifying the need.

ix. Sanitization – M. Rees inquired whether someone follows up on the cleaning schedule that was distributed. V. Harper said that the cleaning schedule is public for every class and that it should be posted outside. He will follow-up with F. Gorham.

x. Testing Center – V. Harper said that we are taking a hard look at it and we have sent a proposal to the Department of Public Health. B. Street requested that the proposal be for a long-term solution. V. Harper recent thrust is about finals this semester and he’s balancing that with long-term objectives.
Wellness – V. Harper is getting ideas to help faculty wellness and is still gathering input. The main feedback is not to create Zoom meetings for checking in on peoples’ wellness. J. Millar volunteered to compile tips on how to reach out to faculty members. E. Poole-Callahan in Campus Programs has been doing fun things on the Kahoot program. Perhaps there are things suitable for faculty fun that can be put in Kahoot. The Wellness page on the campus website has ideas. Perhaps we could have virtual breakout rooms for cooking, jewelry, yoga, financial literacy and other wellness topics. M. Martinez objects to meetings that go until the very end and immediately into another without a break. Schedule virtual meetings for 45 minutes instead of an hour. V. Harper created a meeting with E. Callahan, J. Millar, and himself to discuss ways to promote wellness in our current environment. M. Danforth said Zoom is not set-up for socialization because it doesn’t lend itself for people to talk simultaneously. The program Discord operates in real-time protocol. It’s easier for people to have a back and forth conversation. Some of the Zoom burn-out may come from the way it’s set-up to be used for business. Further, it’s important for people to be honest and give themselves permission to have moments of insecurity and know that it’s OK to be imperfect. D. Boschini said after six months of virtual instruction, there are resources about best practices in how to lead. This would be helpful to department chairs and deans to facilitate the transition into leadership and personal development.

50th Anniversary – K. McCarthy has committed to not make any political comments during his appearance as interviewer of keynote speaker, Sir Richard Branson. V. Harper spoke with V. Martin on the process of creating the event.

c. Searches

i. AVP AA and Dean of Academic Programs – BPA and SS&E faculty members are yet to be elected. Thank you to C. Lam for serving as NSME representative. A. Rodriguez represents A&H. V. Harper recommends Bob Frakes to serve as Administrator and Cindy Prado, BPA Advisor, as the Staff representative.

ii. NSME Search – The election of faculty members is pending. V. Harper recommends Dean Rodrigues and A. Sixtos. He will converse with the search consultant later this week. V. Harper will charge that group. M. Danforth and D. Boschini encouraged the addition of NSME staff on the
Search Committee. V. Harper will reach out to NSME chairs and see what they think.

iii. Library Dean – The Search closes at end of October.

iv. Antelope Valley Dean – The faculty representatives to the committee are pending school elections. The committee will meet in Spring 2021.

v. AVP Faculty Affairs – The search committee is formed and will meet in the Spring

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – The AA Pandemic Budget Advisory Task Force (PBTF) meets October 2 for the first time. A. Hegde, M. Rees, and B. Street are on the committee. The EC will be updated regularly on information coming from the PBTF.

e. GE Structure Taskforce – The structure of GE is straightforward, other than the modifications that some departments may need. The Learning Objectives have been sent out by CO and are not permanent. There is a feedback period. CSUB will address unit implementation. M. Danforth shared that the Council of Ethnic Studies is getting contention at the state level. It may look relatively simple here compared to other campuses, but when we dive into the matter, we may find there’s more to it. A. Hegde doesn’t feel we have any issues here because we already have courses in ES and we just have to make sure they meet the Learning Outcomes. He thanked R. Gearhart for overseeing that. The AS Chairs’ list of FAQs forthcoming. V. Harper thanked the EC for their leadership on the formation of the Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force. As a separate issue, he is expecting a departmental proposal coming to the Senate to create an Ethnic Studies department. CSUB is an island in a hurricane.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. University Police Advisory Council – A. Hegde shared the draft structure and recommended that the position of Academic Senate Chair be replaced by a faculty member. A call for interest will go out to faculty to fill (2) positions.

b. Wang Award – The Chancellor’s Office notified the campuses this morning. The draft of the Call from the President’s Office was shared with the group. The timeline for processing was acceptable. Nominations are to be sent to the President by October 16. Upon the permission of the Provost’s Office the candidates’ materials will be sent to the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee (FHAC). They will meet, and then bring a recommendation to the EC. The EC sends a letter to the President specifying approval/no approval of FHAC’s recommendation. The President’s Office works with the candidate(s) to
complete the packet and sends it to the CO. The suggestion was to have the call stress that the Wang Award is for lifetime achievement.

c. Post-Tenure Review Requirements (deferred)
d. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout) (deferred)
e. APM Proposal – GECCo (handout) (deferred)
f. Unapproved Software (deferred)
g. Expanded Winter Session (handout) (deferred)
h. Course Repetition (handout) (deferred)
i. Elections and Appointments (deferred)
   i. School Elections Committees
   ii. Committee proliferation
j. Handbook 306.2.2.e (handout) (deferred)

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
   A. Hegde received a message from B.J. Moore that too many announcements for committee positions require Full Time faculty members. Unless the Handbook says FT we could entertain PT faculty.

9. ADJOURNMENT
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:25.
<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 08/25/20</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>AAC Streamline the process upon looking at minimum federal requirements and the current Academic Program Review template. Addendum: 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>10/15/19</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>08/25/20</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>
</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></td>
<td>FAC 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>Complete</td>
<td>FAC 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>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 05 CFA President or Designee on FAC-Bylaws Change</td>
<td></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>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 07 Fall Classroom Observations</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC 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>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 08 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC 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>
<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>08/25/20</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>
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
Policy on course syllabi: http://www.csub.edu/facultyAffairs/files/handbook/UniversityHandbook.pdf pg. 32

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

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

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

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

Process for Course Submission and Certification

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

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

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

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

GECCo may recommend any ONE of the following actions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Course Evaluation Criteria:

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

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

2) Course Requirements: Each area of the GE program will have multiple course expectations. Course requirements address logistical issues and course content. Faculty submitting courses for certification must be able to demonstrate how their courses meet these expectations.
Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

Transition from GE Implementation Committee to GECCo Governance

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

Staggering of Terms in GECCo

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

[Signature]
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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</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.csusb.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)

---

Hi, Bruce.

In the version I have (dated July 2, 2018) 306.2.2.e says the following:

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with *(something is missing here)* 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)

I assume what is missing is “department policy”, which may just be an editorial change. Will take it up with EC.

Beth, would you please put this on next week’s EC agenda under the Handbook Error log item?

Thanks,

Aaron

---

Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, PhD  
Chair, Academic Senate  
Chair and Professor, Economics  
Director, ERM Program
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 SOClS 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.

But check the handbook. Something got messed up in a revision. Can you fix it? I think it’s purely editorial.

Thanks,
Bruce