SUMMER SENATE
Minutes
Tuesday, June 2, 2020
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Video Conference

Absent: J. Millar

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   A. Hegde suggested that this extra Summer Senate meeting focus on NEW DISCUSSION items, University Report and the CSU Report due to the deadline to the Chancellor’s Office on the first and the importance of sharing the information on the second.

   Social Justice Statement from faculty members - A. Hegde encouraged collaboration on a statement to be issued on behalf of the Summer Senate members. The draft will be sent to the CSUB CFA President, D. Gove. The campus Social Justice Chair of the CFA is T. Salisbury. ASI will be sending a statement. The President sent a message to the community on behalf of the Cabinet. C. Lam is already advocating for social justice. He was selected to write on behalf of all Hong Kong support groups in the U.S. on the protest in the U.S. His experience is that because the political spectrum is wide, there are a very few things that can be written that don’t provoke an argument. M. Martinez said that the Political Science department will be sending out a statement. The department is looking at producing a documentary on the history of institutionalized racism in the U.S. from the detention of Japanese Americans in the 1940s, Jim Crow laws, and the civil rights movement. It will take some additional funding.

   A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Rees moved to table the May 27, 2020 Minutes until next meeting. Majority approved.

   B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   C. Lam moved to focus on NEW DISCUSSION Items, University Report, and CSU Report. R. Gearhart seconded. Agenda approved as amended.
C. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. Provost Update (tabled)
   b. Searches - Update
      i. Dean SS&E – An offer has been made. The background check is underway.
   c. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation (tabled)
   d. Handbook Error Log (tabled)
   e. COVID-19 related issues (tabled)
   f. Updates on University Week/ Faculty Day Planning (tabled)
   g. Fall QM suspension (handout) (tabled)
   h. Electronic RTP (handout) (tabled)
   i. GWAR testing (tabled)

D. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. University Report - (handout) V. Harper forwarded a draft. The document was prepared from input by the Deans, specifying exceptions to alternate delivery mode as they apply to Athletics, Housing, and Instruction. The Chancellor’s Office (CO) will approve, disapprove, or have follow-up questions. CSUB desires to have as many students on campus as safely possible. Perhaps 1000 students are eligible to come on campus. There would be a number of students in the low hundreds on any given day, according to the plan. The Deans and department chairs will deploy the plan in a safe fashion. PPE would be available to faculty. The campus anticipates a response from the CO in mid-June. D. Wilson’s understanding is that the campus puts forward their best argument for what the departments need from a pedagogical standpoint, and then the CO decides whether to allow for it. M. Danforth’s department decided to offer an equipment box instead of S2. It would be a project kit for the engineering students. They already pay a course materials fee. They would pick-up the materials similar to the way a drive through food distribution works. She does not see that idea in the report. V. Harper suggested she check with Dean Madden. M. Rees inquired who vets the document? Other campuses are choosing a range of numbers. What is likely to be accepted? V. Harper is in discussion with Deans about a set a number that would minimize the exposure to health risks. However, some courses are intrinsically face-to-face. He did deny some courses. There are two campuses that have no S2 classes. He feels that CSUB should try to have some face-to-face. At this point, 96% will be in virtual delivery mode. V. Harper said to refer questions from the Runner and other publications about Instruction to him. Refer questions about Athletics and Housing to the President’s office. A. Hegde acknowledged the time constraint to process and then
provide input no later than Thursday. Send inquires and comments to V. Harper. B. Street is concerned about SRS and graduate students who need to conduct research on human subjects. V. Harper said there are instructional activities in separate table (internship and clinical) that do not apply to SRS and graduate students. Human subjects are not part of Instructional activities. CSUB is waiting for guidance from the Chief Research Officer because research is not courses and is not internship. The M. Rees asked about the time between face-to-face classes to allow for cleaning. V. Harper said the plan is to have people clean between those classes.

b. CSU Report – Academic Transformation (handout) V. Harper said that last year the university reached out to a consulting company to identify how CSUB could improve service to students given a forecast for significant growth. The consultants created a draft. Due to COVID-19 issues, the project was on hold. The President wants to move forward. The strategic plan makes clear that Academic Affairs take a strong look at itself and then put in a structure that’s most effective. V. Harper has reached out to the new DCLC, and he scheduled a meeting with the Standing Committee Chairs to review document this week. There are no hard-wired outcomes to the report. The certainty is that there will be collaborative, open and inclusive conversations. Sub-groups will be formed to address specific areas. There will be some interesting things to come in terms of graduate studies, our relationship with colleges and schools and their structure. The follow-up groups will consult and discuss the report into next semester. J. Tarjan noted that the Provost Office has a large span of control and the report didn’t seem to address that. He liked the idea of colleges and a decentralized budget. He was surprised to see the consultants propose a college for honors, and yet did not propose one for General Education (GE), which was supposed to be centrally funded and in control before being vetoed by the Associate Deans. It seems unparalleled. There are some things that were not addressed. It does not seem to be a balanced report. R. Gearhart questioned how closely the consultants looked at the economic data. He stated that the CA Dept of Labor data is completely different than the City of Bakersfield’s data. They didn’t focus on local statistics. The only growth in the county is blue-collar growth, not white-collar growth. There are 10% fewer people employed in financial and insurance activities in January compared to ten years ago. The only white-collar growth is in education and health care. The State of California may be facing a skilled labor shortage, but that doesn’t mean that Kern County has a skilled labor shortage and one can extrapolate that to academic growth. The consultants need to drill down a little more. A. Hegde appreciates that the report is a starting point for discussion. He also found the proposal for an honors college interesting when some
of the honors classes contain only four students. The report doesn’t specify if the projected 13,000 – 18,000 refers to FTES or headcount. M. Danforth said the document referred to an attachment containing comparison data with other CSUs, which is missing. A. Hegde asked for clarity on the system difference between college and school? V. Harper said that Colleges have a bit more cachet. Colleges can hold a school that can be led by associate dean, dean, or director. There is a budgetary structure as well as cachet. There are several models in the CSU and nationally. The Provost’s goal is to revise the budgetary process and how allocation goes to the schools. If we move to colleges with schools nested within them, there will be a need for funds. J. Tarjan said colleges allow more naming opportunities. V. Harper said the President is still actively involved in the Capital Campaign. He requested that the Senators bring questions to the meeting. We want to get our money’s worth from the consultants. The cost was approximately $35,000. A final document will be formed mid-June and then CSUB will pause to allow faculty to digest and then a steering committee will be formed in Fall. The report is a menu, not a map. The steering committee will develop the areas and then bring recommendation for changes. It could be a two-year process. A. Hegde saw that the report was sent to the department chairs. If one is not able to make the DCLC meeting, send input to A. Hegde.

c. Universitywide Committee Appointments (handout) (tabled)
d. Exceptional Service Award (Article 20.37) (tabled)
e. UPRC Annual Report (handout) (tabled)
f. Academic Testing (tabled)

E. 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 Fall QM Suspension
   RES 202102 Academic Standing Spring 2020
   Old Business
   Open Forum Items

F. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

G. ADJOURNMENT
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.