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

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION**
A. Hegde informed the group that the Chancellor’s Office (CO) feedback on CSUB’s University Plan is forthcoming.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
M. Rees moved to approve the June 10, 2020 Minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
D. Wilson moved to approve. R. Gearhart seconded. The agenda approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. **Provost Update – V. Harper**
      i. The Instructional Plan portion of the University Plan was sent to the CO. He is proud of CSUB’s proposal. His conversations with the other campus Provosts revealed that eighteen campus plans have been received. Of those, five have been approved. There are two levels of review. The first round of review goes through legal, etc. The second level goes to the Vice-Chancellor’s Office. CSUB will probably get a revise (request for more information) and resubmit before our plan goes to the second level. Campuses with a high number of face-to-face, referred to as S2, are getting their proposals returned. The Housing portion and the Athletics portion of the University Plan were also submitted. V. Harper noted his gratitude toward M. Lukens for completing the University Plan. CSUB will receive a response from the CO’s in a couple weeks. This week, the Provost is meeting
with the faculty union to discuss the document. M. Martinez mentioned that the CFA is dissatisfied with the training compensation for converting their classes to alternate delivery. V. Harper replied that his office is negotiating with the CO about the Professional Development stipends, up to $1200. There is $400 for Teaching Online Proficiency Series (TOPS) training. V. Harper respects faculty’s concern. B. Hartsell is rewriting the proposal. D. Boschini asked about the Academic Affairs re-organization. V. Harper met with the AASCU consultants and the Department Chair Leadership Council (DCLC). The consultant’s survey was discarded. They will build a new one. The sub-committee will meet to discuss the instruments and dimensions within the six sections. There will be a series of focus groups. That information will inform the new survey. The Provost’s involvement is not needed during that process. Yet, he is contemplating how the steering committee will be organized and deployed in the fall. They will work for approximately six months on a final report. It will be broadly shared and distributed. Then, there will be a period of consultation. V. Harper requested that the recommendations be vetted by the Senate. Next, the timeline for implementation of the recommendation will be developed. J. Tarjan said that the consultant’s survey had different layers and different topics. Perhaps some issues were missing because the chairs weren’t initially consulted. There is a pre-focus meeting this afternoon. The focus group meets tomorrow. It includes department chairs. They will discuss the structure, policy, and units of Academic Affairs going forward. V. Harper expressed his appreciation that the chairs have run with the survey. It’s a sign of a healthy functioning group.

ii. The second campus conversation on racial diversity will be held tomorrow. The first campus conversation resulted in summer stipends to Ethnic Studies faculty members for them to develop an Ethnic Studies Department proposal. The state Senate passed AB 1460. It’s a structural change to the university. V. Harper respects the entire process whereby all faculty will be consulted and discuss the proposal for an Ethnic Studies department. Administrators have stepped out of the process. He has not allocated resources to the department itself. The proposal will be solely faculty driven and must go through the Senate. A. Hegde said the environment is different than when the proposal for an Ethnic Studies department proposal was first presented, years ago. He looks forward to the Senate receiving the proposal, having a discussion, and then providing input.
b. Searches Update – V. Harper informed the group that the new Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education, Dr. James L. Rodriguez, starts next week.

c. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – B. Street said that there was a $600 million cut to the original draft proposal of the CSU. That may change, depending on federal funds allocated in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. For CSUB, there are transparency issues we need to think about: #1 stipulate how particular funds to CSUB from the CARES Act be spent. Half was to be spent on students. That has basically all been spent. There is $6.8 million remaining for COVID-19 response. There is another $900 thousand given to CSUB as a Hispanic institution. There is money for housing and fees. #2 What is CSUB’s Reserve account and how will it be spent? At the state level, the distribution is being worked out. He suggested that T. Davis attend the Summer Senate to begin the conversation now about the $6 million - $8 million CSUB is getting rather than wait until August. D. Boschini inquired about the CARES funding portion for alternate delivery instructional expenses. Nursing made purchases specifically as a result of alternate delivery. The expenses were denied because the wrong code was used. The analysts did not share the code with the chairs. V. Harper said that the CARES funding is a separate pot. Accounting pushes that money out to support students, faculty, and staff through their normal process. The department analyst can change the code.


e. COVID-19 related issues – V. Harper shared a draft of recommended language to be used on syllabi in Fall, developed by B. Hartsell, in response to the Governor’s new policy regarding face coverings. A. Hegde referred to R. Gearhart’s earlier question about faculty recourse when there is student non-compliance. The point was made in the Campus Preparedness Council that the instructor can ask the student to leave the class for cell phone usage. However, faculty is being told that further discussion needs to occur with the office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) on what can be done when students don’t wear masks. Can students who don’t get medical exceptions and are not willing to comply be asked to leave? V. Harper will discuss that with M. Williamson. The faculty resource is to contact University Policy Department. He needs to confirm that the UPD will come to class to remove the student. R. Gearhart said that the CA Department of Public Health guidelines are vague on what is a medical condition. Who decides what is an acceptable medical condition that allows an exception to wearing masks? D. Wilson responded that in Kern County, people are not wearing masks despite the Governor’s policy. To avoid placing faculty in
the role of enforcer, she recommends saying that masks are recommended and not required. M. Rees said exceptions are more than medical. A student cannot play a trumpet with a face mask. Send something out to faculty and staff soon. The communication needs to be expanded beyond what is in the syllabi. C. Lam asked who does the student submit an exception to. Will the instructor be required to provide accommodations to make a safe environment? V. Harper responded that the request for accommodation would go through OSSR, or perhaps through the Director of Equity, Inclusion and Compliance office. The correct protocol is not in place, yet. A. Hegde talked with M. Williamson. He agreed it’s a student misconduct issue. There could be further disruption amongst students if a student doesn’t wear a mask. M. Martinez repeated what he said last meeting about the limits of freedom of speech. The courts have been clear that one cannot use fighting words or other expressions that put others in current and present danger. Supreme Court case law is clear. If the CSU doesn’t define the policy in response to faculty’s concern, then CSUB is on solid ground to establish one. It’s a health and safety issue. He offered to participate on working on the campus policy. D. Boschini reinforced the need to inform faculty, staff, and students in advance of returning to campus. D. Wilson doesn’t understand CSUB’s reticence to enforce the government’s health and safety policy. She just reported to Jury Duty and they were very strict about everyone having face masks. R. Gearhart said that the City of Bakersfield stated that they are not going to enforce mask-wearing. V. Harper will push the Emergency Preparedness Committee to prepare a campus-wide policy. A. Hegde said the sooner the better, so students know in advance of coming to class. M. Rees inquired whether students who come to campus for a face-to-face class be offered some relaxed parking policy, so students don’t have to spend $6.00 per class. V. Harper said that parking will be different for students. Faculty parking is related to the union contract. The details are still being worked out. Guidance will be communicated before the semester begins, during University Week.

f. Updates on University Week/ Faculty Day Planning – A. Hegde said the morning event includes an update on Academic Affairs from the Provost, and then the faculty are together exclusively. Typically, a survey goes out in advance of the meeting. Then, the top concerns are discussed in a forum format. It will be different this year, since in-person gatherings are highly restricted under the state’s policy to mitigate the spread of the COVID 19 virus. The planning committee met last week. M. Danforth said they spent a lot of time discussing the theme. Social Justice will be the prevailing theme for University Week. The professional development portion could include how to encourage discussion in
the classroom, have a better and more equitable classroom, and kick-off a semester-long seminar series. Social justice is important to our students and the campus as a whole. The itinerary is as follows:

i. Monday and Tuesday: new faculty development via a series of Zoom workshops and webinars

ii. Tuesday: DCLC virtual breakfast

iii. Wednesday will focus on faculty professional development

iv. Thursday is University Day. The keynote speaker will address social justice.

v. Friday is Faculty Day. The plan is to have a panel within the webinar for all faculty, to discuss social justice.

J. Tarjan suggested limiting meetings to 1.5 hours and then have a break, to avoid virtual meeting fatigue. A. Hegde will be working with the Provost about the budget for Faculty Day. He asked everyone to think about what the day could look like.

g. Electronic RTP – the draft resolution to amend the University Handbook is still in discussion. A. Hegde will work with M. Rees on her suggestions, and then get input from the group. RES 192020 RTP Guidelines 2020 made SOCs optional. M. Rees said that students can get confused about the grading scale, and sometimes score the opposite of their intention. The comments people make clearify their opinions and are of the most value to faculty members. It may be disadvantageous to faculty member going up for tenure and the review committee if there are no comments for an entire year. A paper file could be summarized and made available just to the unit committee. If post tenured faculty were to be up for their five-year review and not have any comments, it would be of concern. M. Danforth said that an essential worker can scan and put the files into the faculty member’s PAF. It should be an option, and not required. It’s a lot of work. If one is using BOX, can one designate to whom it’s shared with? For example, the Administrative Support Coordinator (ASC) takes the files to the unit committee for review, and then later to the Dean. It’s important to address who will be given access control. C. Lam suggested that it’s better that the faculty’s file in their BOX account be copied to a separate BOX account for reviewers. A. Hegde said that the Deans’ office could create a BOX folder similar to the physical folder. The software used by some CSUs, Interfolio, cannot be implemented here before Fall. V. Harper said it’s important to have F. Gorham in these conversations about whether BOX is the right tool and who gets access. Faculty will not be allowed to come to campus to use equipment. A. Hegde will set up a meeting with D. Gove, F. Gorham and M. Rees to discuss further.
Everyone agrees an electronic process is needed, and to have the process and permissions clarified before August and September deadlines. The discussion to continue at next meeting.

h. GWAR testing – A. Hegde said that the resolution is in response to the March 12 memo from CO regarding temporarily suspension of the GWAR test through the academic year 2021 to facilitate student progress toward getting their degree. K. Flachmann had a different interpretation. She was confident that CSUB could do GWAR testing via Zoom teleconference. A. Hegde referred to the memo. The memo will be an attachment to the resolution. Summer Senate agreed that GWAR could do Zoom testing. Make it clear that the GWAR classes are still scheduled. A student needs to take the GWAR class or test to graduate. V. Harper said that the CO will be coming out with another memo. He is comfortable what GWAR recommends. A. Hegde called for a vote on the draft RES 202104 GWAR Testing – AY 2020/21. C. Lam moved to approve. R. Gearhart moved to approve. The resolution passed.

i. Statement to the campus community from the Summer Senate - The draft statement on social injustice was distributed for comments. Discussion ensued whether to send out a statement now or form a resolution to go before the full Senate. The Senators are not expected to sign their names. J. Tarjan is in support of the statement, as is. M. Rees suggested to say people of color instead of minorities. It’s important that Hispanics feel included. The campus needs programming to address the situation. A. Hegde suggested to the University Week Planning Committee to focus on solutions. Perhaps the campus can create Social Justice Across the Curriculum modeled after the existing Ethics Across the Curriculum program. The full Senate needs to weigh in on the approach. He and R. Gearhart are discussing ways to incorporate the impact of social justice in the Economics department courses. J. Tarjan said one of the Strategic Plan themes is Quality of Life. When the themes were put together, Sustainability and Social Justice were put together. He suggested to separate the two. A. Hegde will work with M. Rees to finalize the statement, and then distribute it to the Summer Senate where they can opt to sign it. Later, the topic will go before the Senate, should there be interest in forming a resolution. It’s important to be proactive and find solutions now.

J. Tarjan motioned to extend the meeting for ten minutes. All approved.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Exceptional Service Award (Article 20.37) The contract said the awards are allowed. There are fifteen WTUs available. The review committee recommended the following: Allison Evans, Lindsay Nelson, and Rhonda Dugan. They are to receive three WTUs each, for a total of nine WTUs. M. Rees moved to approve. B. Street seconded. All in favor. Approved.

b. UPRC Annual Report (deferred)

c. Academic Testing – J. Tarjan reminded the group that there are no plans for a campus testing center in Fall. Academic integrity is the confidence that grades reflect the students’ work. Testing can be done using parking lots, proctoring, and social distancing. V. Harper responded that the logistics of doing it for thousands of students would be very difficult to control. It is not part of CSUB’s Instructional Plan that was submitted to the CO. The CSU’s rejection of campus plans had to do with large number of students on campus. He said it’s not our decision, a testing center would be difficult to employ, and likely refused by the CO. M. Rees suggested that academic integrity be covered during University Week. B. Street said that the topic of testing has been a concern pre-COVID-19 and extends beyond the current situation. Testing in a gymnasium is very common. J. Tarjan said we know there is widespread cheating. To say it’s difficult to change our testing method is not a good answer. Certifying that someone has fulfilled the requirements for a degree is one of the most essential things that we do. D. Boschini shared what happens in Nursing instructional centers based on conversations she’s had with Nursing Directors throughout the state. When one student tests positive for COVID-19, it sends everything in disarray. There is so much that has to happen as a consequence. It would be a waste of resources to set-up a testing center and then have to close it. The request to have a testing center is unrealistic under the current circumstances. A. Hegde said that the system’s Academic Senate Chairs are discussing the issue, too. The topic will carry to the next Summer Senate meeting.


e. Fall Office Hours – J. Tarjan requested that group consider that all faculty schedule brief meeting with students individually to assure engagement between them and better outcomes. Invite each student to an optional 5-minute meeting. He suggested making a statement at the beginning of the semester and/or consider a resolution to recommend that faculty make it their practice. They could be stacked to come in and out of a Zoom meeting. V. Harper agreed. J. Tarjan went on to say that faculty need PCs, cameras, printers, and scanners to do their job. Many students are only using their
smartphones and have difficulty with the Learning Management System (LMS) using different browsers, etc. V. Harper said that faculty should not plan on routine visits to campus to copy, scan, etc. He supports faculty purchasing scanners through their department. The topic will carry to the next Summer Senate meeting.

f. American Institutions – Government (deferred)

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
     - **RES 202104 GWAR Testing – AY 2020/21**
     - Old Business
     - Open Forum Items

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   - None.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   - A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:45