

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, September 27, 2018
Health Center Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), E. Correa, M. Danforth, M. Dhada (Alt.), B. Frakes, R. Gearhart, I. Kasselstrand, C. Lam, A. Lauer, Y. Lee, M. Martinez, J. Millar, M. Rush, L. Sakamoto, A. Schmidt, M. Slaughter, B. Street, K. Szick, J. Tarjan, D. Zhou, K. Ziegler-Lopez, J. Zorn

Visitors: L. Zelezny, D. Jackson, V. Harper, K. Mulry, F. Gorham, L. Paris, D. Schecter

1) Call to Order

D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) Approval of Minutes

L. Sakamoto moved to approve the minutes. M. Rush seconded. Approved

3) Announcements and Information

[WSCUC Campus Update](#) – V. Harper (**Time Certain 10:05**) (handout) D. Boschini stated that V. Harper is at the Senate to engage the whole campus in the process of assessing our campus. V. Harper thanked the faculty, students and staff that have been working on the documents. 45-60 individuals first got together and started collecting more than 700 documents that have a significant role in the campus' reaffirmation. Then about 40 individuals got together in workgroups and developed the writing teams that produced the first draft in the spring. M. MacArthur, Professor of English, did a marvelous job editing over the summer. V. Harper wanted it on record that he thanks all the individuals who worked on creating the document. He then explained the affirmation through context and [timeline](#), how the Lines of Inquiry fit into this process, and then taking questions:

The Institutional Report Draft #2 is available to campus on the [WSCUC Draft Institutional Report](#) website. Email feedback directly to WSCUCIRFeedback@csub.edu. The Steering Committee and the editor will come together to develop Draft #3. It will be available to Cabinet. As Cabinet reviews and provides feedback, it allows us to work on Draft #4. It will be available to the entire campus in Box.com on February 12, 2019. The WSCUC visiting commission team will be here to review Draft #4. Ten weeks later there will also be an off-

site visit (teleconference) attended by our President, Provost, CFO, and Steering Committee. That's when the visiting team gives CSUB their initial feedback on our strengths and weaknesses. In summer 2019 we will get a document, the WSCUC Lines of Inquiry (not to be confused with the [CSUB Lines of Inquiry](#)). In fall 2019, the visiting team will investigate and ask questions about the campus' strengths and challenges they learned about through the documents. The expectation is that CSUB will receive a letter informing us of being reaffirmed for ten years. If there are areas of challenge within the institution that the Commission would like to see addressed before the next reaffirmation, we could have a follow-up report or a follow-up visit on certain aspect(s).

The Institutional Report is made up of eight Essays, each designed to address a specific window into the institution such as Assessment Processes, Financial Stability, Sustainability, etc. The most important section presents the meaning and quality of degrees we offer to the community, and how we retain students. Note that there is a certain citation format; the Criteria for Review (CFR) is for the benefit of the visiting team. When the document is available on Box.com anyone can click on the citation and it will spawn the document(s). The CSU Lines of Inquiry document is very important from an institutional standpoint. The precursor for the Institutional Report is the self-study – the institution evaluating itself. Last year there were questionnaires and open forums to generate information from self-study phase. The data for the questionnaire was written by V. Kohli. All the members WSCUC workgroups, Steering Committee and the writing team met in January to discuss institutional strengths and weaknesses. The results of that are in Draft #2. The group committed to attempt to address the Lines of Inquiry before the Commission arrives in fall 2019.

D. Boschini (a member of the WSCUC Steering Committee) stated that what is at stake is the accreditation for our campus. The [CSUB Line of Inquiry](#) is an internal document that the Steering Committee prepared based on the sessions they attended. This is the short list of hot topics that we should be working on. Part of this document looks at where we need to be in terms of financial transparency. So when the WSCUC team asks about financial stability, we are prepared to answer that question. We want to say what we're doing to

improve it. This is a very weighty list of topics. Each and every one of them comes up over and over again at the General Faculty Meetings. If you sit through the Senate for a year, these are the things that come up. The only other thing which we probably need to inject is in Faculty Excellence. Meaning, creating an environment where faculty can engage in scholarly and creative activity. One of the topics that came up in the General Faculty Meeting is workload. While the word “workload” isn’t in the document, the Line of Inquiry gives a space for that topic to come up. The reason why faculty is not engaged in more scholarly and creative activity is because the workload is so heavy. The Lines of Inquiry can certainly show the indicators that these are the general topics we are talking about. If there is anything that should be on here and isn’t, it’s because it’s an emerging topic or becoming more important than it was twelve months ago. This Draft #2 is for us. Please review the document in the next couple weeks. This document has already been through M. MacArthur, and if you know her you know that this is not a rough draft. It is worth your time. This is our Institutional Report, unless you give different input. J. Zorn echoed what V. Harper and D. Boschini said. A WSCUC report is worked not because they are coming to town but because it’s about doing something meaningful for our campus. WSCUC will be happy with seeing continuous improvement through self-reflection and introspection. WSCUC wants to make sure we stay focused on the things CSUB are doing well. The letter will have areas of challenge. The team is likely to understand our mission. We hope to get ten year reaccreditation without interim visits. The areas where we have challenges are not the kinds of things that would hold us back. We just want to do what’s right for the campus. V. Harper said that after competing draft #2, he felt that there were two sections missing. Sections that will be added to the Report are: One dedicated area for the Antelope Valley campus. R. Schultz is working Essay 4. The other is Extended Education and Global Outreach. A section is being drafted. D. Boschini requested that feedback arrived before November 10. Dr. Harper expects that Dr. Jackson, who has been incredibly helpful coming on as Interim Associate Dean and has written substantial sections of the report, will be working to get the feedback into Draft #3. D. Boschini added that the Draft #2 has gone out to the entire campus. By the time Draft #4 comes back to the Senate later in this

academic year, we want to see a document that we all are reasonably satisfied with – in terms of accuracy at the level we can agree is best for our campus. V. Harper announced there will be three Open Forums: one on a Monday, one on a Thursday, and one specifically at the Antelope Valley campus.

Elections and Appointments – A. Hegde and B. Bywaters – the elections are run by the Senate for positions on the Senate and other committees. The appointments are generally made upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee (EC) in consultations with the committees themselves or the interest from individuals. In the past, it's been whoever wants to continue to serve or ask certain individuals. This time, we send out a Call for Interest letting people know what the positions are, what the committees do, and solicit interest from individuals asking them to submit why they would be interested and suited for the committee(s). When there are multiple interests, then the EC will decide (if it's the purview of the committee to do that) whether the individuals are suited, make the appointment, and then announce the names to the Senate. The Call for Interest for a long list of committees was made this morning. This is an opportunity for people to gain experience doing committee service. Every one of these are important committees. And if we don't represent ourselves, we cannot complain about shared governance or the process. A. Hegde encouraged the Senators to encourage others to respond with their interest to B. Bywaters. Further, there are vacancies on committees for elected positions. A Call for Nominations will go out, then an election if necessary. Find information on committees on the Senate webpage, [Elections and Appointments](#).

4) Approval of Agenda

E. Correa moved to approve. B. Frakes seconded. Approved.

5) ASCSU Report - J. Tarjan and J. Miller - Nothing new to report.

6) Provost Report - J. Zorn reported that Commencement will be the Friday before Memorial weekend. The committee is thinking about having the undergrad ceremony start at 07:30 a.m. The grad ceremony will be Wednesday night instead of Thursday. Last year, there were 100 who couldn't get in. We are going to have to either ticket or move

Commencement to the front third of the soccer stadium. Cost will not be a factor to change the venue. ASI's input will be a consideration.

7) Committee and Report Requests

(Minutes from [AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC](#) are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)

- a) Executive Committee (A. Hegde) Most of the meeting was hearing from V. Harper. There was discussion at what point we should get involved in the WSCUC as the Senate. There is an [email address](#) where you can send feedback. There are several committees in need of filling vacancies. Rather than have certain people make recommendations to the EC, the committee decided to put out a Call for Interest. There will be a Budget Forum in the spring, open to everyone. The EC discussed a replacement of Staff person to BPC. The Faculty Survey results were viewed. Each standing committee chair is combing through items to decide which issue belongs to which committee where a referral may be made. The EC identified some editorial changes to the Handbook and an opportunity to make clear where items have been moved so there is internal consistency. The Handbook was return to B. Hartsell of the Handbook Task Force. Upon receiving those edits, it will be return to Senate for approval.
- b) Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth) J. Paschal/Advisor provided valuable input on the GI Hold Proposal at the last meeting. The committee asked the GI Hold Proposal task force to make it clearer for someone who is outside the task force to be able to understand exactly when these holds are being put in place for each of the levels of students and what the hold(s) mean. It was written more from the staff advisors' pre-enrollment process point of view. AAC requested clarity on which holds apply to the faculty advisors. The committee asked for a revision of the GI Hold Proposal to clearly show when these holds go into place to the level of what this cell in this table really means. The GI Hold Proposal task force representative will return to present the revision and to see if the objective was achieved; would students understand when they are put on Hold.

- c) Academic Support & Student Services Committee (E. Correa) - Since there are no referrals, the committee members were asked to read the Institutional Report and then provide feedback.
- d) Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street) - The President attended last week's meeting. The committee focused on the Budget planning and financial transparency, and BPC's input on the Strategic Plan. October is when the committee is involved in data acquisition. B. Street is scheduled to meet with K. Krishnan of IRPA. Due to organizational changes, IRPA will look for an outside source to help get the faculty profile by the committee's meeting on October 4th. The committee is looking at the total cost of instruction. The cost of instruction is not limited to FTE, especially with the new programs. All Senators have access to Questica. J. Kegley has proven to be an excellent resource due to her institutional knowledge. She remembers a Budget Book from a decade ago. BPC's Librarian member located it and the committee will be working through the actual data. November is when BPC prepares its recommendations to go before the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Council. There is \$1M which needs to be prioritized. D. Boschini clarified that the latest Budget Book in the Library is from 2007. It's still useful to see the type and amount of information that used to be available. She provided examples of our sister campuses' financial data to the President for comparison. J. Zorn thanked the committee chair for acknowledging K. Krishnan's crisis. This is census week and he's singularly processing it because it has to go to the CO. It affects our campus funding. Lastly, B. Street reported that the committee started discussion on the cost of ownership and the different ways faculty, staff can generate their own funds to improve opportunities for scholarship or equipment they need.
- e) Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush) - See RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP, below.
- f) Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez) - Advising starts October 14 and Registration starts October 29.

g) ASI Report (A. Schmidt) - The Health Center will no longer be close during lunch. When there is a closure, it will be posted on their website. V. Harper and Provost Zorn will be coming to the ASI meeting to talk with ASI Board members. She welcomed the Senators to join them. The ASI was the only place in Bakersfield that held Voter Registration on Registration Day. The ASI Lobby Core is meeting with legislatures today. ASI partnered with National Prevention week by purchasing the viewing rights to the movie HAZE. S. Schmidt has begun talking to faculty members about attending board meetings to discuss what tenure actually means and to answer questions.

8) Resolutions – (Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)

a) New Business

i) RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee - First Reading
FAC was tasked with providing clarity in the Handbook about sabbatical. There are three changes proposed changes to section 307, shown in underline. The first is editorial. The second change clarifies that faculty would be supported since most faculty members use their offices, computers, etc. while on sabbatical. The third change was made to protect sabbatical time for research. Most of the faculty members realize that if one is on campus during sabbatical there are some who want to do service work, particularly if one is a faculty member who had students who are working on their undergraduate and graduate research projects. That's something that can have sabbatical application, but maybe not necessarily on the administrative side. Can a faculty member still function that way? The resolution leaves that up to the discretion of the faculty member how much of that service they can do while on sabbatical. The thought around RTP is that – at least in mathematics where they form one committee – it's a high workload. The resolution allows person on sabbatical to serve as an alternate. They are on volunteer status whereby they could say yes or no if asked to serve. J. Tarjan – in addition to research, creative activity, instructional improvement also applies to sabbatical. Replace the word "augmented" with "alternate". Some faculty members said that the administration position on page two was not acceptable. D. Schecter responded

that the position for few years is that a leave is a leave and that faculty not serve while on sabbatical. The definition came about from an organic process. In January 2014, the list of sabbaticals taken was low. There have been years when it's been twenty-two, or higher. At the same time the deans were clarifying who could sit on RTP. That made the process more organized. Those things came to a head in 2016. Academic Affairs (AA) made the pitch to faculty and administration that faculty should not serve. It's treated similar to a medical leave. It's sacred; they apply for; the committee of their peers grants their leave because it's what they should do the work for what they applied for. At the same time, the Administration cannot and should not ask faculty to serve. At the practical level there are faculty who want to serve. The position AA has taken is to welcome a full discussion. The FAC has taken on a healthy discussion. The majority of the committee supports the language. There are a lot of pros and cons. 1) Is the RTP committee so special in the mind of the Senate it deserves an exception? There have been many inquiries – if someone is on sabbatical, may they serve on the Senate? How about outside things like sitting on research boards, grant research? Most of which AA said OK if the granting agency ok with it. There are all kinds of things open for exceptions. 2) The majority of other campuses have language that clearly prohibits faculty on sabbaticals from participating. AA did an informal poll of other campuses. It doesn't mean CSUB can't make an exception. But that's been the position of the CO and the labor commission representing other campuses. 3) If we're going to allow this kind of exception, there needs to be guidance what this paragraph means in relation to a paragraph in another section in the Handbook where committees have to be elected. D. Schechter thinks that the proposal from FAC is threading the needle quite well. It says that a faculty member may or may not serve. There is an election process that needs to take place. So, balancing the needs of this section with the other need to be considered. To answer Senator Tarjan's question, that's been the Administration's position and the rationale behind it. J. Zorn sees that how the resolution is phrased, the recipient can ask directly to the person – is that in the

election process? M. Rush responded “No”. J. Zorn requested clarification that it pertains only to the augmented person. Her concerns is that this is a slippery slope. Serving on RTP, and not on Senate, etc. It’s cleaner to say all or none. The other aspect is the pressure it puts on senior faculty. She doesn’t want senior faculty to deal with the pressure of needing to get an article done but they were too busy doing service. Also, it opens the door for the Dean, the President, their colleagues to ask senior faculty to do things while on sabbatical. J. Tarjan asked if the Administration had opposition toward faculty using resources while on sabbatical. J. Zorn said “no”. M. Slaughter asked M. Rush to define “augmented”. M. Rush – It could be within or outside their discipline, yet it has to be agreeable. M. Slaughter asked whether their vote counted as much. M. Rush replied, yes. The RTP process doesn’t change, nor the construction of the committees. M. Martinez has seen where the sabbatical is deferred and deferred, etc. He suggested that 307.2 Procedures and Preparation #3, state that the timetable for the proposal allow only one deferment. D. Boschini replied that FAC has received feedback. If they want to broaden their conversation or request a second referral, it’s been noted. D. Schechter said there is occasion after the date the sabbatical is awarded may be deferment. The best example is they are waiting for money for a grant. In the two or three times a deferment has been asked for, it is sent back to the committee chair of FHAC to see if it’s OK. M. Rush added that committee spoke about how often that faculty on sabbatical is asked to serve on an RTP. It happens more often than you think. Last term, E. Montoya – the only statistician – volunteered to be on the hiring committee for a statistician. He wasn’t even asked. He just naturally walked in. It didn’t interfere with his work. There seems to be an underlying assumption that this kind of work would have negative consequences. It doesn’t always have to be the case. People do other things when they are not at CSUB that we can’t track. When the committee thought about a total prohibition, Senator Rush was stuck with the reality of things have been happening pretty well, anyway. It could stall natural work that the unit has to do across the board than it is worth. M. Danforth

acknowledged the Administrative feedback and asked if there was union feedback. M. Rush – CFA Steward B. Hartsell is on the FAC committee and is silent on the matter. The committee looked at universities outside of CSUB. The policy is all over the place. Some universities allow any committee work. E. Correa replied that 1) she is respectful of the time taken to put together the sabbatical and not impose anything to obstruct it and 2) we like to think the quality of the work stands when we go up for RTP. There is a process is someone feels they weren't treated fairly. She thinks the union is a good idea to make sure we have consistency with the kinds of decisions that are being made. On a personal note if she wants a sabbatical she wants to be away. How else do you say no when asked to do committee work? On a practical note, because of space issues, if she's away, the department is going to have the person who is taking over for her to use her office. We need the protection of a policy that institutionalizes the time off. D. Boschini said the Senate wants to give the feedback to the committee and avoid rehashing the subject here. It's helpful to have D. Schecter, J. Zorn and L. Zelezny present. These are the people who will have to approve any resolution that the Senate passes. We definitely want our Provost and Vice-Provost to be up to date and in support of how we are interpreting the Handbook as the committee is recommending. J. Zorn acknowledge a powerful case why faculty would come in for a hiring. So the slippery slope has started already. M. Slaughter said there may be an occasion when a faculty member on sabbatical needs to write a minority report for someone to get tenure because of reasons that were very much not about the quality of their work. M. Rush the committee discussed why RTP is more important than other committees, for that reason. It's unique as a participant, and it's equally important to the RTP person. Both roles have to do with one's professional life. C. Lam suggested no sabbatical recipient should be asked to serve in any committees. M. Rush said it would emphasize the choice to volunteer to serve.

- ii) BPC Staff Appointment to complete term of member promoted to interim registrar/MPP. The staff member is comfortable with the Senate re-assigning the

role for the remainder of the academic year. A vote was put forth on R. Dean to replace J. McCune. Approved.

- 9) Open Forum Items (Time Certain 11:15) The Provost received a recommendation from faculty that the seating for Commencement be on the side facing the students from the front. J. Tarjan heard that there was a problem with prerequisites quarter courses and translating them into PeopleSoft. M. Danforth replied that they've seemed to have tracked this down to – in the semester catalogue – only the semester courses have been listed. Before, J. Dirkse would distribute a spreadsheet with the quarters and semesters prerequisites. At some point when one turns in course change form, they align the prerequisites to what's in the catalogue and implicitly drop off all the quarter system equivalent. As far as the team can tell, if one directly converted a class, PeopleSoft could understand that; behind the scenes one wouldn't see a problem. But for all the departments who transferred from three quarter classes to semester classes, or fourth quarter classes to a three semester classes, the semester courses are different courses in PeopleSoft. It has to be manually encoded. If the manual codings are wrong, they get prerequisite errors. That's what it seems to be occurring. It's a case where we need to have the quarter system in the back-end of the catalogue or we just need to have behind-the-scenes exceptions in the course change forms where one is allowed to say "3040/304 or 2120/295, etc. So they know the three digit course number is the quarter system equivalent. D. Boschini shared that the topic came up in the Department Chair Leadership Committee (DCLC). V. Harper learned that there is a both a tech and human problem. The technical problem had to do as M. Danforth described. It was also an organizational problem. There were two parties doing entry. All entry will occur now in Academic Programs so no override will take place. That is in addition to the actual technical problem that was identified. The tech problem should disappear in the next couple weeks. K. Ziegler said there is a similar issue that advisors see when they get grad check responses back – students are not being credited for taking Gen Ed classes taken prior to the Q-S conversion so those issues are shown as outstanding. For example, as student taking Theater 232 for their A-1. Then on their grad check responses, it says the student needs A-

1. They took it. Because it wasn't populating in academic requirement screen, the evaluators were putting it on the student's grad check. M. Martinez said it happened with PPA 275 as well. V. Harper said that no student will be harmed. The Dean's office issues the outstanding and grad check response because it wasn't populating in Student record. K. Ziegler replied that not all students will come back to their advisor to identify that they have to repeat prerequisites so they can graduate. They thought they could graduate in the spring, but have to delay until the next fall because they have to take these extra four or five classes. V. Harper said for students encountering problems, he's the person responsible for making sure they are not harmed. He asked that when all front-facing faculty and chairs encounter a student with that particular problem, make sure they are directed to his office. D. Boschini asked K. Ziegler and M. Martinez to send examples of students' situations to V. Harper. If it's a problem that we haven't yet identified, he will be able to look into it. That's important. A. Schmidt suggested that for those students who are not going to be able to graduate, that they be emailed an updated grad check so the student knows they are on track. J. Zorn will talk with V. Harper/Academic Programs and V. Lakhani/Enrollment Management. Once V. Harper identifies the problem, and if it gets rectified, stopping students from getting erroneous grad checks is one thing. For those who have received erroneous grad checks, we'll see if we can follow-up. D. Boschini asked V. Harper to coordinate the after-response: See if there is a problem and communicate back. V. Harper said, absolutely.

10) Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25