SUMMER SENATE
Minutes
Tuesday, May 27, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Video Conference

Absent: J. Millar
Visitor: D. Jackson

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   The Summer Senators will be compensated, beginning with this meeting.

   A. Hegde attended the Provost Council meeting for the first time. D. Cantrell provided an update on enrollments. There are 8,520 continuing students who could register Fall 2020. Of those, there are 1,200 who haven’t registered. If they don’t register, it’s problematic because people will use data from the prior year. Last year was a record. 16,000 applied, and of those who enrolled, the forecast was 3,000 freshman. This year the number is 2,600. A. Hegde requested department level enrollment from K. Krishnan. Dean Novak reported that Extended University and Global Outreach (EEGO) has 2,800 students enrolled for the summer courses. It’s an increase of 500 enrollments. EEGO increased the number of courses it offers in Summer Session to 156. J. Tarjan said that since CSUB was over target last year, we are forecasted to where we were two years ago. V. Harper said the will be looking at the data that caused a pop in enrollment last year. Relative to the five-year trend, we will be off the trend in Fall 2020. Yet, we will still be over target and overenrolled. We are doubling up efforts on returning students. A. Hegde asked whether classes with low enrollment be cancelled. V. Harper will look at the data and converse with the Deans. R. Gearhart noted that the 20% decline in Bakersfield College (BC) enrollment will impact CSUB numbers, long term. V. Harper stated that CSUB is funded differently than BC. We’re funded to the Chancellor’s Office (CO) target. We are 1,000 FTS above that number, which translates to 2,000 students. If we drop 1,000 students, we would still be over target. J. Tarjan asked if the money could be taken away. V. Harper replied that the over enrollment
fund can be used to support the overall operations of the university. No reason to panic about CSUB enrollment.

Academic Standings for Processing Spring 2020 (handout) – D. Jackson submitted a written response to the Summer Senate's (SS) questions. She attended this meeting to answer questions. M. Danforth said the crux of the concern is the suspension of student disqualification without intervention to address what got them into the situation. With the exception of freshman and first year transfer students who may be challenged coming to campus, when they are sophomores, juniors and seniors, there are long-standing academic issues that caused them to be disqualified. Consider offering virtual workshops for students and make sure they are in contact with resources. D. Jackson will talk to the two academic probation advisors (who are also staff advisors) at the Academic Advising and Resource Center (AARC) about developing workshops on how students change their status to good standing. They also conduct student success workshops to be eligible for academic jeopardy and they also advise students who need to make satisfactory academic progress to stay eligible for student aid. The two advisors share a case load of 1000 students. The students need a lot more intervention and it would be desirable to have more advisors. In May, the AARC launched an online probation workshop that students can take at their convenience. They have been working on putting the student success workshops online. The thought is that students who are facing academic disqualification Spring 2020 may have faced challenges beyond study skills, time management, or lack of understanding of the resources. It may be that the students who had to take class off campus due to the COVID-19 pandemic didn’t have the technology, or experienced family issues that interfered with their academic success. D. Jackson sees this as a unique situation, thus calling for a temporary suspension of student disqualification. She expressed her appreciation in the SS’s interest in getting more for the disqualified students, to help them get back to campus. R. Gearhart noted that juniors and seniors who become disqualified have taken many semesters to reach a low GPA. Students who are readmitted are advised to repeat their classes. What number of students who have retaken courses then graduate? D. Jackson said it’s difficult to get an accurate number because when an academically disqualified student returns, their standing changes. She will share what data she has over email. M. Danforth asked about the difference in the proposal to 1) automatically reinstate the students for fall, and 2) to suspend the spring disqualification as to continue in their current status in fall. What are the long-term effects of taking one of the two approaches? D. Jackson responded that only status that they have right now that would result in their academic disqualification is if they currently academically reinstated, or if they are on academic probation. They’re not different proposals.
Automatically reinstated refers the way their status changes in order to register for classes. If they are academically disqualified, that standing has to be changed to academic reinstatement or they will not be able to register for class. There is another, trickier option. We could put standing as academic probation, rather than academic reinstatement. It would blur the lines between those who earned the academic probation and those who disqualified but allowed to continue with their studies. For tracking purposes, it’s better not to blur those lines. The difference is that if a student is academically reinstated, then that opens the door to be able to re-enroll. If a student is on academic probation, in terms of their academic record, it looks like the they were able to meet the GPA expectations to stay on academic probation. It’s a question of what does that standing mean? The better strategy is to use the reinstatement standing because it signals that they were disqualified and they have been given permission to continue after they were disqualified. A. Hedge thanked D. Jackson for her time and thoughtful response. The Summer Senate will work on a resolution. M. Danforth said we need to provide some support services to help those students who had trouble transitioning to alternate delivery so they are on good footing to get back on track in the fall. A. Hegde is in support of the memo from D. Jackson to V. Harper that requests consideration of a temporary alteration of the academic disqualification process such that any student who would normally be disqualified at the end of Spring 2020 be automatically granted the status of academic reinstatement. The resolution could include the recommendation that students get workshops to support their academic progress. R. Gearhart is not in support of a temporary suspension because there is no data on whether it’s effective or not. M. Martinez said while we’d have more information in November to make a solid decision, given the options and urgency, err on the side of the students. B. Street is concerned that we don’t know about these students. As much as we’re worried about some not as deserving, there are students who could get lost. As long as there is a mechanism to support students, he is in favor of the suspension. J. Tarjan said not a matter of supporting the students or not. It’s about preventing the students from getting to a place where they can’t recover. Many must go to EEGO, take fewer units, go to college, and/or replace some courses to raise their GPA. Make policy about prevention accompanied by more intense support such as tutoring to help them be successful in the long run. A. Hegde called for a vote to recommend a temporary suspension of the academic disqualification. The majority voted in favor. A. Hegde will draft a statement for the Summer Senate to review today. He will send the final version to V. Harper and D. Jackson.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   C. Lam moved to approve the May 19, 2020 Minutes. M. Rees seconded. Approved.
C. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   C. Lam moved to approve the agenda. D. Wilson seconded. Approved.

D. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. Provost Update – see Searches
   b. Searches
      i. AVP FA – V. Harper met with the search committee. The committee will convene in the fall. Candidates will likely visit the campus late fall.
      ii. Dean SS&E – V. Harper will make an offer in the next couple days. He thanked B. Street and B. Santiago-Evans for bringing quality candidates to campus. He checked the references. An announcement may be sent late next week. The immediate onboarding process has been discussed with B. Hartsell.
      iii. Associate Dean SS&E – Tanya Boone-Holladay will be returning to this position which is our practice after completing her term as Interim Dean.
      iv. Dean of Library – The search will start in Fall semester.
      v. Dean AV – The search will start in Spring 2021. The Interim Dean D. Facile.
      vi. AVP AP – The search committee will be formed in fall with candidate visits expected in Spring 2021. D. Jackson has a twelve-month appointment as the Interim AVP and Dean of AP.
      vii. Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies – D. Jackson appointed L. Vega as the Interim Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. If D. Jackson applies for the AVP AP and gets it, a search for the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies will follow.
      viii. Faculty Fellows – V. Harper said that D. Jackson approached him with the idea of adding Faculty Fellow(s) with specific roles and specific assignments that allow for advancement(s). V. Harper supports professional development leadership opportunities for faculty. Certain assignments were created throughout the year. The funding comes from the salary savings derived from a grant. V. Harper congratulated B. Street/Kinesiology, and J. Sun/Public Administration for taking the steps to earn the Faculty Fellow award. D. Boschini said she heard concerns about pay and the scope of the position upon the announcement of the recipients. The original announcement didn’t contain a detailed description, the number of positions, and the funding. V. Harper accepted the suggestion and seeks to be transparent. The call was generic. He was approached by D. Jackson about the Faculty Fellow idea and then through creative funding via a grant, she saw that it allowed for an additional position. From the WSCUC side, there are expectations of faculty representatives and assignments which provided a way to approve it.
Harper expanded the description with a tighter focus in preparation for WSCUC’s return to campus. A. Hegde agreed that the Leadership Academy is a great thing to have. Faculty Fellow is great opportunity and be aware of the optics of the course release while there’s the possibility of layoffs.

c. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – B. Street will commence weekly meetings with T. Davis. There have been particularly important hires in Student Affairs, Faculty Affairs, and in Business Administrative Services. They will be analyzing hiring and looking into position control as the first step to address budget concerns. The state has cut the CSU budget by 7.25%. There will be cuts. A. Hegde requested to be part of the weekly meeting to exercise shared governance in the discussion on how money is being spent. B. Street said that things are moving quickly and we want to be intelligent with strategic planning and long term forecasting in mind.


e. COVID-19 related issues – A. Hegde referred to the Provost Council meeting where V. Harper shared that the CO asked every campus for their Fall 2020 plan for instruction, athletics, and students housing and services. The deadline is June 5, 2020. The VP for those areas will respond, and then the University Plan will be disseminated to the Senate for input. A. Hegde said that due to the importance and urgency, the SS will need to review the plan next week so it can get to the President in a timely manner. M. Rees thinks the SS should get together to discuss the plan rather than communicate through emails. She made a list of issues to share with the Provost: widespread faculty requests for onsite academic testing is meeting resistance, Faculty is concerned about cheating, consider a reduction in parking fees for students who are coming to campus for just one face-to-face course, and consideration of the impact of scheduling back-to-back courses whereby students have to be on campus and then they have to be off campus for the next class with only a 15 minute window to leave and get online. Parking combined with class types scheduling may be a contributing factor in the decrease of enrollment. D. Boschini is in favor of videoconferencing with advance review of the policy and procedures document from the CO. The document makes it very clear that the number of exemptions to alternate delivery will be very limited. There are no blanket exemptions for certain majors. For example, she has to write an extensive description of every course to justify why Nursing has to be face-to-face. She is also very concerned about academic integrity. J. Tarjan said that 1) faculty is in charge of standards. Faculty has asked for an academic testing center before this crisis. 2) the presidents oversee the NCAA and we need a minimum of sports to remain Division 1. Perhaps the NCAA can reduce the required number. V. Harper said the CO
document is 100 pages including attachments addressing Athletics, Housing, and Instruction. D. Jackson will be the editor. The Instruction section to go to the CO is 30-40 pages. V. Harper should be able to share the document on Tuesday, June 2. After the Summer Senate’s review, it goes to the President’s Office for her final review and submittal to the CO.

f. Updates on University Week/ Faculty Day Planning – There will be Zoom meetings and webinars. B. Hartsell and R. Weller are working on a virtual orientation for new faculty. Sub-committees could be formed this summer to work on ideas for Faculty Day, what it’ll look like, and the date.

g. Fall QM suspension – M. Danforth and R. Gearhart are working on a resolution.

h. Electronic RTP – There is an interest in changing the language in the Handbook policy to encourage an electronic RTP process. Faculty want to prepare their files over the summer. Provisionary faculty files are due in September. Some of them want guidance. Perhaps student assistants could be hired to scan SOCIs. M. Danforth said that notices have already gone out to faculty. It’s urgent to inform faculty on how to prepare their files, especially second year probationary faculty. A. Hegde said the deadlines are internal and flexible, and not bound by contract. M. Martinez confirmed that. C. Lam said that submittal via USB drive is not the way to do it because of the security risk. He recommends submitting to Cloud based platform. IT needs to provide software. A. Hegde said that B. Hartsell found that other CSUs use Interfolio. C. Lam said that we need to be clear so faculty doesn’t submit a thumb drive. M. Danforth said USB is a big malware vector. D. Boschini said there is not enough time to get an official RTP change this summer. The best we could do is give guidance on what currently exists regarding electronic files. There isn’t time for the full Senate to consider changing RTP language before due date(s). There’s differing opinions and we don’t want to do anything permanent. A. Hegde said that approval to submit RTP electronically could come from their department. J. Tarjan agreed that the SS should not make electronic RTP a requirement. He does support the recommendation of electronic RTP for a variety of reasons such as health reasons. The purpose of the SS is to take emergency action. The SS has the authority to approve interim policy that can ratified or turned down by the full Senate at their first meeting and then approved by the President. R. Gearhart said having just completed his file, faculty will be spending significant time on campus if done manually. B. Street agreed with the logistics of having electronic submission going forward. The big work is how faculty electronic documents are shared and the chain review in the process. M. Danforth said that ITS and/or TLC will have to hold workshops on how to do it. M. Martinez informed the SS that someone is his department developed in-house solution so good that it
needs a patent or trademark before deploying it to campus. If someone is interested, talk to D. Facile. A. Hegde asked for a course of action, excluding implementation. The full Senate can have discussion on how to implement the change the policy, if needed. C. Lam supports a non-physical (USB) electronic transmission such as cloud based platform accessed online. Only authorized people have access to the files. J. Tarjan disagrees with cloud based and that faculty could drop off files at the Dean’s Office. M. Danforth said that USB drive is a gig malware vector. The Deans PAF go to Dean’s office and people are directed to look through the paper file to sign-off. If we encourage electronic RTP submission, we need to facilitate the unit committees to do their work electronically. Some faculty are in high-risk groups and do not want to touch anything. We need an electronic analogue or some agreement with Provost’s Office that this year we’re going to trust the WPAF and not compare it to the PAF. D. Wilson is in favor of electronic transmission. D. Boschini shared that junior faculty feel tremendous pressure when they hear something is “preferred”. She suggested that A. Hegde, B. Hartsell, and M. Rees draft a document, have D. Gove (CFA President) look at it, and then have the SS perform final review before approving it. A. Hegde said for faculty coming up for review, they could consult with their department to send their RTP files electronically. We don’t have to worry about URC until the Spring. A. Hegde will draft language and then send it to the Summer Senate.

i. GWAR testing – Discussion regarding the policy for Fall 2020 will be taken up at the next meeting.

E. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Universitywide Committee Appointments (handout) deferred
   b. Grading Basis for Spring 2020 (handout) Credit/no credit. This memo asks whether students can switch their grade to Credit/No Credit after faculty turned in grades. M. Rees stated that there is a faculty workload issue to changing Credit/No credit to grade. Faculty may have to review materials after they submitted grades. R. Gearhart noted that an extension was granted, and the students were informed of the consequences. M. Martinez suggested use faculty discretion. It’s temporary. He feels there should be flexibility for Spring 2020 and not Fall 2020. J. Tarjan feels it should go before the DCLC. V. Harper said it is urgent in the sense that grades are submitted June 1. Students have been advised that it’s not in their best interest to choose C/NC. He will support faculty’s interest. There isn’t time for Department Chair Leadership Council’s review. Discussion ensued. We don’t know how many students we’re talking about. The opportunity for students to grade shop is not fair. If an instructor has a pre-law student who got an A, it’s in the student’s best interest.
to give them a grade. Students who did very well and want to go to graduate school may ruin their chance of being accepted in the C/NC situation. Trust the instructor’s judgement and give them the opportunity to approve or deny the change. The intent of the memo from D. Jackson was to inform students if they chose C/NC they have to take the class again and the consequences. They can go back to grade scale. It’s one way. There is concern for the students who got a C- and below who didn’t realize they were automatically getting NC when a D grade would be sufficient to pass the class. Perhaps they are the target group of students than the ones in passing grades and then went to C/NC. Perhaps the concern is for those who want to have NC changed to a grade to improve their GPA. A. Hegde put forth a vote in support of the memo that gives students who have chosen C/NC the opportunity to petition for grade if they have a compelling reason to do it, with the caveat that the instructor has the right to grant the change. Majority voted in favor. A. Hegde will send a memo response to D. Jackson and copy V. Harper, and then he will send a message to the campus faculty. D. Jackson’s office will communicate to the students.

c. Exceptional Service Award (Article 20.37) Deferred.
d. UPRC Annual Report (handout) Deferred.

F. **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 Academic Standing Spring 2020
   - Old Business
   - Open Forum Items

G. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   - R. Gearhart moved to extend the meeting 15 minutes. Seconded. Majority agreed.

H. **ADJOURNMENT**
   - A. Hegde thanked the SS members for extending the meeting 30 minutes. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.