1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   July 08, 2020 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. Provost Update
   b. Searches Update
   c. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   d. Handbook Error Log –
      i. 306.2.2 Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty (handout)
   e. COVID-19 related issues
      i. Cameras in Class (handout)
   f. Updates on University Week/ Faculty Day Planning
      i. General Faculty Survey
   g. Electronic RTP (handout) – RES 202103 Electronic RTP
   h. Fall Office Hours
   i. Academic Testing
   j. Space Utilization Committee Update

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. UPRC Annual Report (handout)
   b. American Institutions – Government
   c. Educator Prep Programs
   d. GI designated courses
   e. Potential Layoffs (handout)
   f. Winter Session Extension (handout)
   g. CSUB Campus Police Advisory Council (handout)
7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING AUGUST 27, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   
   Announcements
   
   Consent Agenda
   
   Standing Committee 2020-2021
   
   New Business
   
   **RES 202101 Extension of Temporary Suspension of the Online/Hybrid Instructor Certification Requirement**
   
   RES 202102 Academic Standing Spring 2020
   
   RES 202103 Electronic RTP – AY 2020-2021
   
   **RES 202104 GWAR Testing – AY 2020-2021**
   
   Old Business
   
   Open Forum Items
   
8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
SUMMER SENATE
Minutes
Wednesday, July 8, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.
Video Conference


Absent: J. Millar
Visitor: T. Davis

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by A. Hegde.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
CARES ACT and HEERF – A. Hegde prefaced T. Davis’ presentation by informing the group that he and B. Street meet regularly with T. Davis. A. Hegde appreciates the interaction. T. Davis said that the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund (HEERF) falls under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. He walked the group through a shared document, CSUB Source and Use of Funds. There were two notifications [installments]. Notification #1 was $13,588,942. 50% is required to go Students Aid. The other 50% to the Institution to be used at their discretion. Notification #2 was $956,617 for minority-serving institution. The total funding is $14,545,559. The money needs to be spent this next year. L. Lorigo, Director of Budget is overseeing the distribution. The criteria for use of funds are
1. Student Assistance,
2. Costs associated with significant changes in the delivery of instruction due to the coronavirus, and
3. Retain current employees to the “maximum extent practical”.

Notification #1 Student Assistance
The first thing CSUB did was award emergency aid grants to students this spring. That money has been spent. We can still award additional aid to students using discretionary funds. CSUB is tentatively targeting to award $270,000 to Fall 2020 first-time freshman students in form of a technology grant. Given our environment, we require students to have certain computer and Internet access. There are a percentage of students who don’t have a computer and have a financial need. The amounts for computers and Internet hot-spots to be determined. Once ITS and Budget submit the costs they will be
added to that spend. The institution can replenish itself for refunds for elected fees such as parking, dining, and housing.

Costs associated with significant changes to the delivery of instruction due to the coronavirus
CSUB is allowed to recover extraordinary operating costs. Record your COVID-19 cost in the operating fund BK001 and in your department. Use the class code to indicate COVID-19 prior to June 30. We can account this way, knowing we had savings from lack of travel and other spending that did not occur. As we move into new fiscal year, continue to record COVIDs costs in your operating budget BK001 lest there are truly extraordinary COVID 19 expenses. In that case, submit those for the Provost’s approval. It then goes to BAS for T. Davis’ approval. It would be applied to the newly established BKCR3. CSUB is allowed to use funds for unfunded emergency pay for essential workers. Pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) essential workers come to campus and the union requires essential workers get emergency pay. Related to that, the remaining balance is directed to the Transfer to virtual education: improve facilities and faculty training. For example, the summer training will be absorbed by the CARES HEERF, and not the Provost’s office. $5million to be investment in tech, and the remaining going out to the identified costs. CSUB has plans to improve technology so faculty can be in classroom using state of the art equipment which enables faculty and students to be productive.

Retain current employees to the “maximum extent practical”
Core services support campus safety, dining services, and parking. (CSUB has half the normal population of housing students.) No commission revenue to CSUB means that there’s nothing to support those services. Similarly, there is a small portion of the University Police Department who are students whose compensation is paid by parking fees. Since there is no revenue to support that, the employees can be retained using this federal funding. T. Davis took questions from the Summer Senators.

J. Tarjan commented on the differences in students’ use of technology. We may have juniors and seniors who have severe financial and learning constraints. They leave a noisy home or work environment to use their phones from a parking lot for schoolwork. They use their smart phones – not by choice, to take screenshots of exams, etc. T. Davis recalls a recent survey that showed that 15% of the student body indicated they didn’t have the technology they needed. The Provost and Academic Affairs are working to establish criteria, like a computer or laptop, to be successful. We have to develop a strategy to support them. D. Boschini thanked T. Davis for the survey on expected costs. However, the Nursing department hasn’t been asked what the extraordinary costs are going to be this year. $60,000 - $80,000 is the best-case scenario. She knows that Nursing’s O&E budget will be spent before the first day of classes. Nursing will likely
absorb all the savings incurred by the entire School of NSME. One size does not fit all. T. Davis acknowledged that Nursing will have extraordinary costs related to COVID-19. CARES will not reimburse for normal costs. Most departments will have the room in their operating budget because people are not traveling and are working from home and increasingly using time-saving technology, etc. When the extraordinary costs are incurred, use class code and indicate that they should be covered under the CARES Act fund when submitting to the Provost’s office. There are significant federal requirements under this circumstance and with the Department of Education. We will be audited. We have to make decisions with vague and changing directions, knowing we’re going to get audited three years from now. M. Martinez asked if it was possible to 1) allocate some of the funding for minority-serving institution to the Multicultural Alliance and Gender Equity Center (MAGEC). It’s not just the Hispanic students using the Dream Center at MAGEC. Others seek help with housing, legal, DACA, etc. 2) work out an agreement whereby certain county libraries be used as testing centers and/or hotspots. It could help those Hispanic students living in Arvin and Lamont, for example, and help fund these libraries. It could also provide jobs for graduate students to proctor tests, etc. T. Davis agreed, and will talk to the CIO about providing hotspots and develop an environment to support their studies. Regarding the Dream Center, the CARES Act was clear that no funds were to go to students who were not Title 4 (Financial Aid) eligible. That excludes all the Dreamers and international students. CSUB did award funds from its reserves to provide scholarships toward Dreamers and our international students. There may be another funding mechanism for the Dream Center. He will talk with Chief Diversity Officer, C. Catota about looking into that possibility. M. Danforth reiterate the need for upper level student support. She conducted a survey of her computer science students. It resulted in 11/27 stating that they have Internet access issues. If computer science students are having issues, then other students are having issues. Faculty have extraordinary costs, too. The first level equipment purchases in spring went so quickly. Now that faculty won’t be returning to campus, they need to purchase more things to teach their classes from home in the fall - such as scanners, better microphones, etc. She strongly advocates funds go toward faculty and upper level students. T. Davis said that CARES is one-time money and one-time spend. The idea is to get students the computers to be successful and then find other funding for other things like the recurring cost of Internet service. C. Lam asked if there was enough inventory of computers and funding for hot spots to cover the fall semester. T. Davis replied that CSU is moving away from purchasing Chromebooks and hot spots to providing grant money so students can acquire their own tools. We will still go with providing some hot spots. D. Wilson asked, what are normal expenses? Example, masks in skills lab aren’t normally needed. Who makes determination of what is
T. Davis said that the department determines. Class code COVID 19 requires documentation. Expect some questions from Accounting, so we have the right documentation to be ready for when we get audited. A. Hegde thanked T. Davis for his time and detailed explanation. Direct further questions to A. Hegde and B. Street. They are meeting with T. Davis regularly.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   C. Lam moved to approve June 24, 2020 Minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   C. Lam requested to add “New rule on international students” under CONTINUED ITEMS, COVID-19 related issues.
   V. Harper requested “Required open camera” to be added to Provost Update.
   J. Tarjan requested that GI designated courses be added to NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   M. Rees requested that Honorary Doctorate be added to NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   R. Gearhart moved to approve the agenda as amended. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. Provost Update – V. Harper
      Budget – The Provost Council will be receiving criteria and protocol on items that will be reimbursed. He will set aside approximately $80,000 to backstop any departments for expenses related to the coronavirus. If ultimately, they aren’t reimbursed, the Provost’s Office will absorb it. He’ll make the money available by removing the COVID code to move the expense to Provost Office, to serve as buffer so the departments don’t take the hit. He’ll absorb the uncertainty.
      Stipend for professional development – At this time, there is a hand-shake agreement on the amount. He wants to distribute it to those who joined the group without knowing what the stipend was going to be. The Provost office will be reimbursed for that, through the CARES Act.
      AA Consultant survey – He thanked M. Danforth and J. Tarjan for their help in developing a good survey for the consultants. It should be going out to faculty today. The responses will be collected over the next few days. There will be a summary sent to the consultants. We’re on the path to get CSUB’s reporting done.
      Administrator reviews - The President will send out communication on the results of Administrator reviews in the next few days.
   b. Searches Update
      Nothing to report.
c. **Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation** - see ANNOUNCEMENTS – CARES ACT - HEERF

d. **Handbook Error Log** –
   i. 304.7.3 Temporary Faculty with Six or More Years of Service – the issue of continuous appointment. The topic will be taken up in the fall.
   ii. 306.2.2 Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty – it appears that the handbook is missing a word. M. Danforth said that it could be that the section number (in accordance to) could be missing. A. Hegde will look at it. If it’s a minor change, it can be addressed during the next meeting.

e. **COVID-19 related issues**
   i. [New rule on international students](#) – V. Harper said that we welcome and want international students as part of the rich community we have. He was among the Provosts and Chancellor’s Office (CO) on a conference call yesterday, and he’s meeting later today with the Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO), M. Novak. Guidance from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) stipulated how the rule will be implemented according to how an institution defines itself. We have to certify to the ICE division, Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP), whether CSU will be 100% distance learning, or a hybrid institute. We are a hybrid institution. The law indicates that our international students could not take a full course load online. We received an exception for that in Spring 2020, as did many higher education institutions. SEVP modified temporary exemptions for nonimmigrant students taking online courses during Fall 2020 semester. All higher education institutions had their waiver revoked. CSUB will have to redo visa applications for approximately 150 students here, and then we have to seek recertification for our hybrid operating model. We’re working to make sure it’s a pathway for our international students to be supported by this institution. We do not have a full plan, yet. M. Martinez and M. Rees expressed concern to push the process to accommodate international students planning to take Fall 2020 courses. B. Street asked about a timeline for policy for system and if there is anything the campus could do to mitigate the decision. V. Harper said the policy distributed from ICE is being worked through by the CO’s legal team. It’s clear from the Provosts meeting that we’re taking a system-wide approach. Students’ applications will have to be reviewed. It affects those who are here, and those who are abroad. Most of our students are abroad. We have three weeks to make a statement that students are not taking online classes and redo their institutional application. We are doing the best we can to have the process completed before Fall semester begins. CSUB has begun reaching out to students abroad. A. Hegde said it’s not
the first time this happened. He was a graduate student after the 9/11 international terrorist attacks in the U.S. The rules changed whereby one had to be a full-time student. When a student finished their coursework, their dissertation was only one to three units. The university automatically reenrolled the students to be in compliance with the regulation. A. Hegde chose to pay $40,000 for another academic year rather than go back to Canada. F1 students who could not pay fees were deported. Any kind of communication to the international students to let them know we are working on it and that they are not alone would be helpful. J. Tarjan said that certain faculty members with H1-B visas are approaching their maximum number of years without securing a green card. V. Harper replied that expedited processing has been released or reinstated for faculty and their applications were sent before the deadline. Faculty have been taken care of.

ii. Required open cameras – B. Hartsell sent syllabi language about masks last week. He is preparing language to be sent to faculty that states that they can require that students to open their cameras during instruction. The caveats are: it needs to be on the syllabus, and the campus needs to address issues like poor connectivity, and CSUB needs to update the FAQ regarding recordings. A. Hegde asked about enforcement of face masks in the classroom. V. Harper suggested to use the language that he, B. Hartsell and legal counsel A. M. put together for the syllabi. R. Gearhart asked for the rationale behind putting the responsibility of granting exceptions to wearing masks on the Director of Equity, Inclusion and Compliance. He suggested that the Student Health Center or other active health related units be involved to ascertain medical situation. V. Harper responded that M. Brown is the Title V person and will consult with others, and he trusts his process. M. Martinez said that requiring students to be online and use cameras is a good start. He suggested to follow what Princeton University did. They have a safety and health policy that returning students have to sign an agreement that they’ll wear a mask. It’s a new student code of conduct. The expectations are spelled out. Adopting such would give faculty leeway to enforce, and make faculty and staff more secure about their safety. V. Harper continues to look at other campuses’ benchmarks. The statement we have was vetted by the CSU legal counsel. M. Rees said that the Performing Arts disciplines are conducting safety studies to determine on their own what can and cannot be done outdoors without masks. Bands, which applied as a face-to-face course, could not meet if masks are required. She asked for an exception for wind instruments. V. Harper will talk to Counsel and M. Williamson. A reasonable standard will be applied.
Updates on University Week/ Faculty Day Planning – the last couple years past chair, D. Boschini, sent a survey and then addressed faculty’s most pressing issues during the General Faculty Meeting. A. Hegde said we’ll still do a survey. Since the theme for University Week is social justice, the survey may include that. He and M. Danforth are on the University Week Planning Committee. He asked for assistance in planning. He will ask R. Weller if FTLC is responsible for the faculty development day. M. Danforth suggested social justice workshops that can address inclusivity, etc. A. Hegde suggested focus on the specific social justice areas that receiving funds. (reference Virtual CSUB: Your weekly update dated June 25, 2020.)

- Support faculty in the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department proposal ($10,000)
- Mathematics tutoring and peer support for African-American students ($10,000)
- Stipends to faculty mentors for African-American students ($15,000)
- Virtual Center for Social Justice ($4,000)

J. Tarjan is involved in the Summer Institute. Sustainability and Social Justice are combined. Is it part of GE or full placement? He recommends that Social Justice be a stand-alone theme. A. Hegde said it’s a good discussion to have on Faculty Day.

g. Electronic RTP – A. Hegde met with F. Gorham about the feasibility using available technology and checked the number of faculty under review with B. Harstell. He shared the document Electronic RTP – AY 2020-2021. Fall 2020 Faculty under Review: (19) 2nd year; (60) 3rd – 6th year; (16) Post Tenure. Faculty would create a Box folder with sharing rights to designated staff. Designated staff would copy the Box folder and handle sharing rights with each level of review. Possible options to convert paper material to electronic copies: (1) single page scanner for each faculty member, (2) multi-page scanner for each faculty member, or (3) drop off papers on campus to have sent to a scanning service company. M. Danforth asked if the proposed scanning service company would accept mailed packages. There needs to be some contactless method for faculty to submit papers to be scanned. A. Hegde will ask F. Gorham. In the long-run, we have to explore whether campus will go all electronic for RTP and for SOCIs. M. Rees asked if someone is coming to campus for face-to-face classes can they use the campus equipment to scan? Those going for tenure, there could be five years of material or the most recent year. A. Hegde replied that in that case, use of campus equipment may be an option. We have to come up with a solution. M. Danforth said that second year faculty deadline is approaching. V. Harper is discussing an extension of the deadline with B. Hartsell, and he expects some flexibility. A. Hegde asked the group 1) if Box is okay for electronic processing of RTP. The biggest concern is Box security. 2) If the deadline was delayed, will Interfolio work? There is a training issue if we adopt new software.
M. Danforth said that it might be more reasonable for the Dean’s office to manage the process; more staff to distribute the workload. The deans could give short extensions of the deadline. M. Rees asked if the staff Box copies are destroyed after review. V. Harper said that F. Gorham feels that Box is a suitable platform and we want to prevent people from coming to campus. The question is how to communicate the protocol to campus. He recommends to have CFA and the Senate move that it’s appropriate. A. Hegde said that a process has to be created, and then have M. Rees, D. Gove and B. Hartsell look at it. Because of urgency, the Summer Senate (SS) may have to get more involved in details such as scanning SOCIs, Box security, and the process. For example, the physical folder has a log sheet. F. Gorham said that a Box parent folder can be created, and there could be a sign-in by only those who have access to it. The sub-folder is only for view and print. Others can’t upload anything into that sub-folder or edit. There would be a limited time that one had access to the folder. F. Gorham’s team would work on the process. Senate gives guidance. He asked if the SS was comfortable to use Box, campus, or using the scanning service company. A. Hedge will share feedback with B. Hartsell and then draft a resolution by the next meeting. He asked V. Harper to work on extending the deadlines. That would give faculty enough time to upload their materials. This is only for AY 2020-2021. A referral will go out to FAC in the fall to discuss long term policy regarding Electronic RTP.

M. Rees moved to extend the meeting by 10 minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved.

h. Statement to the campus community from the Summer Senate – The suggestions have been incorporated into the third version. B. Street supports it and feels it’s a starting point. He is looking for structural and policy changes to be defined later. A. Hegde said that the statement needs to be made and then be discussed further during Faculty Day with a focus on solutions. As the budget details are defined, it will help guide what we are able to do as a group. A. Hegde will send the statement to Jennifer Self Public Affairs.

i. Fall Office Hours (deferred)

j. Academic Testing (deferred)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. UPRC Annual Report (deferred)
   b. American Institutions – Government (deferred)
   c. Educator Prep Programs (deferred)
d. GI designated courses (deferred)
e. Honorary Doctorate – referral to AAC. This is the second time in two years that faculty was not involved. The Honorary Doctorate Committee was not consulted. D. Boschini said that the awardee’s name was mentioned during a one-on-one with the President, but the EC was not consulted. V. Harper talked about the awardee’s name with the President and it had to go to the CO but he doesn’t have further information on the process. D. Boschini said the awardee is a good choice, especially for the impact on our Antelope Valley campus. She suggested the discussion be about the process. A. Hegde said that the nominations can come forward by the Trustees directly to the President. He will list FHDC as a topic for discussion when he meets with the President in August.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING AUGUST 27, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - Consent Agenda
   - Standing Committee 2020-2021
   - New Business
   - RES 202101 Extension of Temporary Suspension of the Online/Hybrid Instructor Certification Requirement
   - RES 202102 Academic Standing Spring 2020
   - RES 202103 Electronic RTP – AY 2020-2021
   - RES 202104 GWAR Testing – AY 2020-2021
   - Old Business
   - Open Forum Items

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   - A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.
Hi David:

I am in the middle doing the review for one of our temporary faculty that is in Group 1. I was trying to find the policy on how many SOCI's he is required to submit with his file. As I was reading I came across a sentence that might have an error. It is below. I think there is a word missing between “with” and “during” …I am having a hard time understanding what that sentence means. Thanks so much for your help!

306.2.2 Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty
e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCI's 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)

Isabel C. Sumaya, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Psychology
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, Ca 93311
Ph: 661-654-2381  FAX: 661-654-6955
isumaya@csub.edu
rerc@csub.edu

Animal Colony Director
Research Ethics Review Coordinator (RERC), HSIRB & IACUC
MARC U*STAR Program Director
Proposed Syllabus Language regarding Cameras in Synchronous Classes

Because nonverbal feedback is helpful in human interactions, I expect students in this class to keep their cameras on during synchronous portions of online instruction. With this in mind, please plan where you will be during class time so you can participate in a setting that is free from visual distractions. If you believe you have a legitimate reason not to have your camera turned on, please consult with me well in advance of the class period, and I will make a determination.
RESOLVED: That faculty under review for the academic year 2020-21 be allowed to submit electronic RTP files, and that all levels of review shall accept this file format and be it further resolved,

That the campus use Box as the repository for such electronic RTP files following the procedures outlined in the attached documents.

RATIONALE: The University Handbook currently allows for the approval of electronic RTP files as stated in Section 305.4.2.10 The RTP File listed below, with the relevant section underlined:

Each faculty member subject to performance review shall prepare a file containing a representative sample of materials from the period under review. The file should be prepared with attention to the demands on reviewers. For example, the file, excluding SOCI’s should be no longer than could be held in one three-inch binder. If electronic files are approved, the documents in the electronic file should be capable of being held in one three-inch binder if they were printed. SOCI’s may be contained in a separate file.

As the campus will be on alternative delivery, and presence on campus is restricted, it is necessary to allow for electronic RTP file submission in order to limit the need for individuals to be present on campus. Requiring hard copies of RTP files also places an undue burden on maintaining a safe environment as dictated by the State of California and the Kern County Department of Public Health. This resolution is only for the 2020-21 academic year.

Distribution List: Provost, AVP Faculty Affairs, Deans, Department Chairs

Attachments: Electronic RTP Policy
**Process for Electronic RTP via Box for all under review during AY 2020-21**

1. Faculty under review creates a Box folder with all required elements since their file was last reviewed (listed in the same order and headings as physical RTP files)- outline of master index to be provided by Provost Office
2. Faculty shares folder with Dean’s Office– one person identified in each office
3. Academic personnel in Dean's Office make a copy of Box folder, to prevent any further changes being made to the RTP file
4. Dean’s Office shares folder, with appropriate rights, with members of the various levels of committees.
5. Electronic signatures are acceptable.
6. Faculty under review are responsible for including scanned copies of SOClIs and other materials, not already in electronic format, for their file.
7. Faculty should consult with their respective Dean’s Office regarding the number of years of SOClIs to be included in their electronic files.
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: May 22, 2020

TO: Dr. Aaron Hegde / Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: The University Program Review Committee
Dr. Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley (Chair); Dr. Danielle Solano; Dr. Dan Zhou; Dr. Doreen Anderson-Facile; Dr. Karlo Lopez; Dr. Angel Vazquez-Ramos; Dr. Hager El Hadidi; Dr. Debra Jackson (ex-officio)

CC: Dr. Vernon Harper / Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Annual Report of the University Program Review Committee, AY 2019-2020

This memorandum summarizes the activities of the University Program Review Committee for the academic year 2019-2020. In addition to the activities listed below, the UPRC assisted significantly with the WSCUC accreditation visit by preparing a poster and meeting with the WSCUC evaluation team.

Program Reviews Completed

- B.S. in Computer Science – completed 09/10/2019
- B.A. in Psychology & M.S. in Counseling Psychology – completed 04/07/2020
- B.S. in Economics – completed 04/27/2020
- B.A. in Music – completed 05/19/2020

Program Reviews That Could Not Be Completed – Moved Forward to 2020-2021

- B.S. and M.S. in Biology – This self-study was submitted on 02/05/2020 and the external review, which was originally scheduled for 05/08/2020 was postponed due to COVID-19.
- B.A. Human Biological Sciences – This self-study was submitted on 02/05/2020 and the external review, which was originally scheduled for 05/08/2020 was postponed due to COVID-19.
- M.S. in Health Care Administration (HCA) – This self-study was due on 09/15/2018. An extension to 11/08/2019 was approved.
• B.A. and M.A. in Spanish – This self-study was due on 09/15/2018, with an extension to 01/15/2020. Personnel matters have prevented the self-study from being completed.
• B.S. in Environmental Resource Management – This self-study was due on 09/15/2019. An extension to 02/15/2020 was approved.
• B.A. in Communications – This self-study was originally due in 2015 and has received numerous extensions with the latest due date of 03/15/2020.
• B.S. in Mathematics – This self-study was due on 09/15/2019, with an extension to 03/02/2020.
• B.S. in Physics – This self-study was due on 09/15/2018. The program received an extension to 03/02/2020.
• B.A. in Political Science – This self-study was due on 09/15/2018. An extension to 10/01/2020 was approved.
• B.A. and M.A. in Anthropology – This self-study was originally due on 09/15/2018. An extension to 09/15/2020 was approved.
• B.A. in Religious Studies – This self-study was due on 09/15/2019. An extension to 09/15/2020 was approved.

Program Reviews Scheduled for AY 2020-2021

• B.A. in Liberal Studies – Program notified on 09/03/2019; progress report received 01/31/2020.
• B.S. in Chemistry – Program notified on 09/03/2019; progress report received 02/04/2020.
• B.S. in Biochemistry – Program notified on 09/03/2019; progress report received 02/04/2020.
• B.A. in Sociology – Program notified on 09/03/2019; progress report received 02/13/2020.
• General Education – Program notified on 09/03/2019; progress report received 03/02/2020.

Mid-Cycle Reports Scheduled for 2019-20

• Honors Program – Report received 03/16/2020.
• B.A. in Criminal Justice – Report due on 10/15/2019 (not received).
• B.A. and M.A. in English – Report due on 03/01/2020 (not received).

Workshop

• The UPRC held a program review workshop on October 25, 2019. Members of the UPRC presented on sections of the Program Review Template.
• In addition to UPRC members, representatives from the School of Arts and Humanities, the School of Business and Public Administration, Sociology, Mathematics, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Liberal Studies were present.
• An online evaluation of the workshop was distributed to participants. Responses indicate that that participants found the workshop useful.

MOUAPs Completed

• Kinesiology – signed on 12/16/2019
Issues of Concern

- The UPRC continues to stress the importance of completing MOUAPs in a timely fashion. Only one MOUAP was completed in the Academic Year 2019-20.
- The Program Review Template and MOUAP Template need to be reviewed by the Academic Senate and reaffirmed if appropriate.
- As noted by the WSCUC visiting team, the failure of programs to complete their self-studies in a timely fashion needs to be addressed by the Academic Senate and the Administration. This needs to be a high priority in order to fulfill the expectations of our accrediting body, not to mention our responsibility to our stakeholders.
- Student learning outcomes assessment is a crucial component of a program Self-Study. The UPRC recommends that assessment workshops and trainings be regularly offered to faculty, and that assessment coordinators provide extra support to those programs scheduled for review.

Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley  
CSU Outstanding Professor of Philosophy  
Director, Helen Hawk Honors Program  
CSU, Bakersfield  
9001 Stockdale Highway  
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022  
661-654-2249  
jkegley@csub.edu

“Freedom has always been an expensive thing.”- Martin Luther King
Dear Colleagues,

At the end of last week, CSU management sent a formal request to meet with CFA as the CSU anticipates implementing the layoff procedure on all 23 campuses. The CSU says that layoffs are necessary due to an anticipated $299 million reduction in state funding for the CSU for the 2020-21 budget year if federal stimulus monies do not materialize.

CFA believes discussion of layoffs is premature, given there is still time to advocate for federal stimulus funding in the HEROES Act that would backfill the $299 million budget reduction, and that student enrollment for Fall term isn’t final.

We do not have any details, but we know that under the terms of our extended Collective Bargaining Agreement, layoffs can only happen at the departmental level. In other words, the CSU’s outreach last week does not constitute official layoff notice. We want members to know that we will continue to do everything we can to fight for faculty jobs, and we will hold the CSU accountable to the terms of the CBA.

We will demand that the CSU open its books and explain why faculty jobs are on the chopping block. Even with the reduction in funding from the state, the state Legislature negotiated a final budget deal that restored a $199 million increase to base funding for the CSU to help soften COVID-19-related budget cuts. Early enrollment numbers for fall at most campuses are steady or increases from last year, so there are no enrollment numbers from which we can conclude that there will be fewer classes or less work this fall. We plan to find out how the CSU intends to spend its reserves that continued to grow even in the last recession.

A 2013 state audit concluded that the CSU made at least $682 million in 2009-10 from the layoffs and furloughs of staff and from student fee increases. This money was added to CSU accounts that are held outside of the State Treasury. A June 2019 state audit revealed a CSU budget surplus of $4 billion, of which $1.5 billion are ongoing, discretionary funds that can be used for CSU operational costs. These funds were accumulated from years of employee salary savings and tuition increases. The recently passed state budget for 2020-21 includes a message from state Legislators that highly encourages the CSU to use reserves to backfill any anticipated shortfalls.

Finally, the CSU received millions in federal stimulus funds to mitigate losses due to COVID-19 in the past few months, and we expect the CSU to join CFA to fight for more from the federal government in the days to come.

It is irresponsible of the CSU to consider layoffs of our workforce.

Over the past decade or so, the CSU has prepared for disaster cases such as the one we are facing today. Whether it is a net increase of $199 million or net decrease of $299 million (trigger cuts if Congress does not pass the HEROES Act), we must ensure that the quality of the education we provide is not compromised. We have to remain active and vigilant during
these trying times. CFA will continue our advocacy at the state level, to ensure that the commitments made to our students are kept, and to work with the CSU Chancellor’s Office to ensure sound fiscal decisions.

As you can imagine, CFA’s leaders want to avoid job loss, and that is why we fought so hard to obtain the recent agreement that allows for mitigation efforts during the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting economic fallout. We obtained new terms including voluntary reductions in time base, maintenance of lecturer entitlements if work is not available in the upcoming academic year, waiver of the normal deadline to enter the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), and other provisions. We believe that these efforts can help get us through the next year of the pandemic and economic downturn.

With the recent surge in COVID-19 infections and hospitalizations and poor job numbers, we know that the fallout continues to grow. There are additional political decisions that exacerbate everything that we are going through in our professional and personal lives.

CFA leaders and staff will meet with the Chancellor’s Labor Relations representatives soon, and we will be very clear with management that the CSU will not sit on billions in reserves, nor continue hiring in the management and university police ranks while cutting from the faculty providing instruction and resources directly to students.

On every campus, we have leadership and staff who will fight for you and represent you. In the coming days we will also let you know what action you can take to ensure our jobs and our students’ quality education. Our faculty rose to the occasion to address this pandemic, and together we can push back on these draconian reactions to the ongoing economic situation. If you have questions or comments, reach out to the leadership for northern California campuses here and southern California campuses here.

In Solidarity,

Charles Toombs, CFA President
Kevin Wehr, CFA Vice President
Diane Blair, CFA Secretary
Susan Green, CFA Treasurer
Leslie Bryan, CFA Associate Vice President, Lecturers, South
Meghan O’Donnell, CFA Associate Vice President, Lecturers, North
Darel Engen, CFA Associate Vice President, South
Margarita Berta-Ávila, CFA Associate Vice President, North
Sharon Elise, CFA Associate Vice President, Racial & Social Justice, South
Chris Cox, CFA Associate Vice President, Racial & Social Justice, North
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.
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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
California State University, Bakersfield

Campus Police Advisory Council

Mission
Actively seek the advice and input of a diverse group of campus community members regarding issues that impact the safety and quality of life of the students, faculty, staff and visitors to the CSU, Bakersfield.

Membership
- Academic Representative (Chair of Academic Senate or designee)
- ASI appointments (ASI President or designee and 2 Student Leaders from Student Leadership Council)
- Campus staff member (Chair Staff Forum)
- Community Member (selected by President)
- Police Officer (appointed by the Chief of Police)
- Student Affairs (VP Student Affairs or designee)
- University Police Chief
- CSUB Chief Diversity Officer
- CSUB President or her designee
- Chair-VP BAS

Duties
- Promote the cause of safety throughout the university
- Increase awareness of safety conditions and programs among all members of the campus community
- Provide input to create or allow for a sense of comfort and security while on the CSUB campus
- Assist in describing the means for involving campus 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”
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Trust between law enforcement agencies and the people they protect and serve is essential in a democracy. It is key to the stability of our communities, the integrity of our criminal justice system, and the safe and effective delivery of policing services.

In light of recent events that have exposed rifts in the relationships between local police and the communities they protect and serve, on December 18, 2014, President Barack Obama signed an executive order establishing the Task Force on 21st Century Policing. The President charged the task force with identifying best practices and offering recommendations on how policing practices can promote effective crime reduction while building public trust.

This executive summary provides an overview of the recommendations of the task force, which met seven times in January and February of 2015. These listening sessions, held in Washington, D.C.; Phoenix, Arizona; and Cincinnati, Ohio, brought the 11 members of the task force together with more than 100 individuals from diverse stakeholder groups—law enforcement officers and executives, community members, civic leaders, advocates, researchers, academics, and others—in addition to many others who submitted written testimony to study the problems from all perspectives.

The task force recommendations, each with action items, are organized around six main topic areas or "pillars:" Building Trust and Legitimacy, Policy and Oversight, Technology and Social Media, Community Policing and Crime Reduction, Officer Training and Education, and Officer Safety and Wellness.

The task force also offered two overarching recommendations: the President should support the creation of a National Crime and Justice Task Force to examine all areas of criminal justice and propose reforms; as a corollary to this effort, the task force also recommends that the President support programs that take a comprehensive and inclusive look at community-based initiatives addressing core issues such as poverty, education, and health and safety.

Pillar One: Building Trust and Legitimacy

Building trust and nurturing legitimacy on both sides of the police/citizen divide is the foundational principle underlying the nature of relations between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve. Decades of research and practice support the premise that people are more likely to obey the law when they believe that those who are enforcing it have authority that is perceived as legitimate by those subject to the authority. The public confers legitimacy only on those whom they believe are acting in procedurally just ways. In addition, law enforcement cannot build community trust if it is seen as an occupying force coming in from outside to impose control on the community. Pillar one seeks to provide focused recommendations on building this relationship.

Law enforcement culture should embrace a guardian—rather than a warrior—mindset to build trust and legitimacy both within agencies and with the public. Toward that end, law enforcement agencies should adopt procedural justice as the guiding principle for internal and external policies and practices to guide their interactions with rank and file officers and with the citizens they serve. Law enforcement agencies should also establish a culture of transparency and accountability to build public trust and legitimacy. This is critical to ensuring decision making is understood and in accord with stated policy.
Law enforcement agencies should also proactively promote public trust by initiating positive non-enforcement activities to engage communities that typically have high rates of investigative and enforcement involvement with government agencies. Law enforcement agencies should also track and analyze the level of trust communities have in police just as they measure changes in crime. This can be accomplished through consistent annual community surveys. Finally, law enforcement agencies should strive to create a workforce that encompasses a broad range of diversity including race, gender, language, life experience, and cultural background to improve understanding and effectiveness in dealing with all communities.

**Pillar Two: Policy and Oversight**

Pillar two emphasizes that if police are to carry out their responsibilities according to established policies, those policies must reflect community values. Law enforcement agencies should collaborate with community members, especially in communities and neighborhoods disproportionately affected by crime, to develop policies and strategies for deploying resources that aim to reduce crime by improving relationships, increasing community engagement, and fostering cooperation.

To achieve this end, law enforcement agencies should have clear and comprehensive policies on the use of force (including training on the importance of de-escalation), mass demonstrations (including the appropriate use of equipment, particularly rifles and armored personnel carriers), consent before searches, gender identification, racial profiling, and performance measures—among others such as external and independent investigations and prosecutions of officer-involved shootings and other use of force situations and in-custody deaths. These policies should also include provisions for the collection of demographic data on all parties involved. All policies and aggregate data should be made publicly available to ensure transparency.

To ensure policies are maintained and current, law enforcement agencies are encouraged to periodically review policies and procedures, conduct nonpunitive peer reviews of critical incidents separate from criminal and administrative investigations, and establish civilian oversight mechanisms with their communities.

Finally, to assist law enforcement and the community achieve the elements of pillar two, the U.S. Department of Justice, through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) and Office of Justice Programs (OJP), should provide technical assistance and incentive funding to jurisdictions with small police agencies that take steps toward interagency collaboration, shared services, and regional training. They should also partner with the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST) to expand its National Decertification Index to serve as the National Register of Decertified Officers with the goal of covering all agencies within the United States and its territories.

**Pillar Three: Technology & Social Media**

The use of technology can improve policing practices and build community trust and legitimacy, but its implementation must be built on a defined policy framework with its purposes and goals clearly delineated. Implementing new technologies can give police departments an opportunity to fully engage and educate communities in a dialogue about their expectations for transparency, accountability, and privacy. But technology changes quickly in terms of new hardware, software, and other options. Law enforcement agencies and leaders need to be able
to identify, assess, and evaluate new technology for adoption and do so in ways that improve their effectiveness, efficiency, and evolution without infringing on individual rights.

Pillar three guides the implementation, use, and evaluation of technology and social media by law enforcement agencies. To build a solid foundation for law enforcement agencies in this field, the U.S. Department of Justice, in consultation with the law enforcement field, should establish national standards for the research and development of new technology including auditory, visual, and biometric data, "less than lethal" technology, and the development of segregated radio spectrum such as FirstNet. These standards should also address compatibility, interoperability, and implementation needs both within local law enforcement agencies and across agencies and jurisdictions and should maintain civil and human rights protections. Law enforcement implementation of technology should be designed considering local needs and aligned with these national standards. Finally, law enforcement agencies should adopt model policies and best practices for technology-based community engagement that increases community trust and access.

Pillar Four: Community Policing & Crime Reduction

Pillar four focuses on the importance of community policing as a guiding philosophy for all stakeholders. Community policing emphasizes working with neighborhood residents to co-produce public safety. Law enforcement agencies should, therefore, work with community residents to identify problems and collaborate on implementing solutions that produce meaningful results for the community. Specifically, law enforcement agencies should develop and adopt policies and strategies that reinforce the importance of community engagement in managing public safety. Law enforcement agencies should also engage in multidisciplinary, community team approaches for planning, implementing, and responding to crisis situations with complex causal factors.

Communities should support a culture and practice of policing that reflects the values of protection and promotion of the dignity of all—especially the most vulnerable, such as children and youth most at risk for crime or violence. Law enforcement agencies should avoid using law enforcement tactics that unnecessarily stigmatize youth and marginalize their participation in schools (where law enforcement officers should have limited involvement in discipline) and communities. In addition, communities need to affirm and recognize the voices of youth in community decision making, facilitate youth participation in research and problem solving, and develop and fund youth leadership training and life skills through positive youth/police collaboration and interactions.

Pillar Five: Training & Education

As our nation becomes more pluralistic and the scope of law enforcement's responsibilities expands, the need for expanded and more effective training has become critical. Today's line officers and leaders must be trained and capable to address a wide variety of challenges including international terrorism, evolving technologies, rising immigration, changing laws, new cultural mores, and a growing mental health crisis.

Pillar five focuses on the training and education needs of law enforcement. To ensure the high quality and effectiveness of training and education, law enforcement agencies should engage community members, particularly those with special expertise, in the training process and provide leadership training to all personnel throughout their careers.
To further assist the training and educational needs of law enforcement, the Federal Government should support the development of partnerships with training facilities across the country to promote consistent standards for high quality training and establish training innovation hubs involving universities and police academies. A national postgraduate institute of policing for senior executives should be created with a standardized curriculum preparing participants to lead agencies in the 21st century.

One specific method of increasing the quality of training would be to ensure that Peace Officer and Standards Training (POST) boards include mandatory Crisis Intervention Training (CIT), which equips officers to deal with individuals in crisis or living with mental disabilities, as part of both basic recruit and in-service officer training—as well as instruction in disease of addiction, implicit bias and cultural responsiveness, policing in a democratic society, procedural justice, and effective social interaction and tactical skills.

Law enforcement agencies should also promote wellness and safety at every level of the organization. For instance, every law enforcement officer should be provided with individual tactical first aid kits and training as well as anti-ballistic vests. In addition, law enforcement agencies should adopt policies that require officers to wear seat belts and bullet-proof vests and provide training to raise awareness of the consequences of failure to do so. Internal procedural justice principles should be adopted for all internal policies and interactions. The Federal Government should develop programs to provide financial support for law enforcement officers to continue to pursue educational opportunities. Finally, Congress should develop and enact peer review error management legislation.

Implementation Recommendations

The administration, through policies and practices already in place, can start right now to move forward on the recommendations contained in this report. The President should direct all federal law enforcement agencies to implement the task force recommendations to the extent practicable, and the U.S. Department of Justice should explore public-private partnership opportunities with foundations to advance implementation of the recommendations. Finally, the COPS Office and OJP should take a series of targeted actions to assist the law enforcement field in addressing current and future challenges.

Pillar Six: Officer Wellness & Safety

The wellness and safety of law enforcement officers is critical not only for the officers, their colleagues, and their agencies but also to public safety. Pillar six emphasizes the support and proper implementation of officer wellness and safety as a multi-partner effort.

The U.S. Department of Justice should enhance and further promote its multi-faceted officer safety and wellness initiative. Two specific strategies recommended for the U.S. Department of Justice include (1) encouraging and assisting departments in the implementation of scientifically supported shift lengths by law enforcement and (2) expanding efforts to collect and analyze data not only on officer deaths but also on injuries and "near misses."

Conclusion

The members of the Task Force on 21st Century Policing are convinced that the concrete recommendations contained in this publication will bring long-term improvements to the ways in which law enforcement agencies interact with and bring positive change to their communities.
CSU Campus Police Advisory Councils

Mission
Actively look for the advice and counsel of a diverse group of community members regarding issues that impact the safety and quality of life of the students, faculty, staff and visitors to the CSU.

Membership

Recommended Membership:

- Academic Representative (selected by the Provost)
- Associated Students appointment
- Campus staff member
- Community Member (selected by campus)
- Police Officer (appointed by the Chief)
- Student Life and Leadership
- University Police Chief

Duties

- Promote the cause of safety throughout the university
- Increase awareness of safety conditions and programs among all members of the campus community
- Assist in describing the means for involving campus 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”