

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes

Thursday, January 24, 2019

Health Center Conference Room

10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

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

Visitors: D. Schecter, F. Gorham, K. Krishnan, D. Jackson, J. Drnek, L. Zuzarte, J. McCune, J. Lorta

1) Call to Order

Debbie Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) Approval of Minutes

All were in favor of approving the Minutes of November 29, 2018.

3) Announcements and Information

General Faculty Meeting – February 11, 11:30-1:00, Stockdale Room, sponsored by the Interim Provost. He will be addressing the General Faculty Meeting and take Q & A. WSCUC Institutional Report: Draft #3 was emailed to campus last week, for review. There were eight areas the Institution has identified as challenges. He has been working with the executive team on developing responses on how to address financial transparency, student learning outcomes, student success, etc. D. Boschini said that there were very few edit changes from Draft #2 to Draft #3. There was some discussion about having the Senate endorse it by way of a resolution before release. WASC has to submit the Institutional Report by February 10. Since the next Senate meeting is February 7, there would be an opportunity for only the First Reading. D. Boschini asked the Senate for their comments on how it is to participate in this review process. A. Hegde suggested to waive the First Reading. D. Boschini acknowledged that it's important to consider, and then have input. Since this is the first week of school, it's likely that the Institutional Report Draft #3 has not been read. The absolute final draft needs to be complete by the time the resolution is put on the February 4, Senate Agenda. Submit feedback by Tuesday January 29, 2019 by 08:00 so it can put before the EC. A reasonable plan is for the EC to review the Institutional

Report on January 29, approve the final draft by February 4 and then present to the Senate February 7, 2019.

Elections and Appointments were announced by A. Hegde:

New Senate members introduced: M. Rees, A. Jacobsen, and V. Harper

Call for Faculty Director of the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) ends January 30, 5:00 p.m.

Call for Nominations to the Search Committee for Associate VP Enrollment Management ends January 31, 5:00 p.m.

Calls for Administrative Review Committee Deans of A&H, BPA, NSME, SSE, and AV to be announced next week.

4) Approval of Agenda

M. Rush motioned to approve the Agenda. A. Jacobsen seconded. Approved.

5) ASCSU Report

J. Tarjan read the [Report from the ASCSU, January 17-18, 2019](#) from Janet Millar and him. Future funding may be tied to the Graduation Initiative 2025 progress. The current interpretation and implementation of EOs seem at odds with the goal espoused from the original task force. There has been discussion of getting rid of GE. CSUB does all the things that the initiative asks for, although the message we're getting is that we have not. Three recommendations for Faculty Trustee appointment went forward to the Governor's Office, including J. Tarjan's name. J. Millar reported that the CSU Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) discussed software, Course Hero. The purpose is for students to access course notes, but students have been uploading syllabi, study guides, and faculty's original documents. AAC aims to create a resolution to have the CO more involved in encouraging campuses' Students Rights and Responsibility (SRR) better understanding of academic dishonesty and plagiarism. A. Schmidt informed the group that Course Hero is a way for students to make electronic flashcards. Are we taking away a method that works for students? J. Millar said the issue has to do with protecting faculty intellectual property. It's not about what a student has made. It's about posting professor's research and quotes as the student's own and passing it along in a way that others can use it without the professor's permission. D. Boschini closed by saying it takes academic dishonesty far. For example, nursing book test banks are already on Quizlet. At some point, if one is using flashcards on Quizlet, it's potentially equivalent to having access to the test bank and test questions in advance. That is the definition of cheating. It's creating additional workload for faculty who have to build extra test questions. When students are limited to studying the material, their grades went down dramatically and they complained that professors increased grading difficulty mid-semester. Further, those students are affecting faculty SOCl's. D. Boschini thanked the

ASCSU representatives for their work and the fine reporting. V. Harper responded to J. Tarjan's comments on the EO, and made commendations to the Math Department and others. The initial data from the CO shows that the students in the revised courses are performing markedly better compared to prior years. It's entirely due to faculty's work to restructure courses and provide support to the students entering the university and gets them on their pathway. He commends faculty for their work.

6) Interim Provost Report

D. Boschini expressed her gratitude for V. Harper accepting the position under difficult circumstances. She has already met with V. Harper, D. Schechter, K. Knutzen, and the people working behind the scenes to keep things running smoothly. There's already time set for them to attend the standing committee meetings. Because there will be much information going out to the committees, it's important the members attend their standing committees. V. Harper expressed his respect for the Senate. He emphasized his gratitude for all the work former Provost Zorn had done for the university to get us at this point and for him, personally. He outlined the steps for the Institutional Report as reported on the website and in numerous emails. V. Harper stated that the information from the Institutional Report will play a significant role in our strategic plan. The President and President of Bakersfield College (BC) Sonya Christian did a joint op-ed announcing a partnership of a co-located center on this campus that is still to-be-determined. There will be Bakersfield College students pursuing associate degrees of transfer and participating in the campus community. While details have yet to be worked out, we are happy to tighten the relationship with Bakersfield College. 40% of our graduating students are transfer students. This year, transfer applications increased by 25%. He is working with D. Schechter and the VP of Instruction at BC on what the shared services and enrollment will look like.

7) Committee and Report Requests

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

The December 18 University Strategic Planning meeting was cancelled. Part of the reason is that there isn't enough movement on the strategic plan to have a meeting. There is another one scheduled this spring semester. The University Strategic Planning (USP) and Budget Advisory Council (BAC) has been separated although the same members participate; the budget meeting is chaired by T. Davis in the fall and the strategic planning meeting is chaired by the Provost in spring. The budget includes the \$1.5 million from the CO. Recall that only six new tenured track faculty hires have been committed for next year. The discussion at EC was that the entire fund was intended for eleven new tenure track faculty hires. However, the President says the some of the money is going to high-impact practices.

The other campuses have used all the money for TT hires. V. Harper said he would take the issue to the President.

The committee discussed RTP dates and that SOClS haven't been ready. January 18, (the first day that faculty returned) was the deadline for the files. There are some first year lecturers and first year tenure-track faculty who need the SOClS. D. Boschini shared that there is different understanding for different schools – drop dead date is still January 28. A. Hegde had discussion with V. Harper and there may be some flexibility especially for first year individuals. Deadlines are set by campus with contract language to guide the process.

The EC talked about the GE Faculty Director process. GECCo will be handling the candidate interviews and then submitting their recommendation through the EC and then on to the Interim Provost for his decision on the appointment.

Searches were discussed. K. Knutzen is the Interim AVP EM for this semester. The search for AVP EM will take place this spring. The GE Director search is expected to be complete this semester. The Director of Academic Operations position is expected to be posted in 10 days. The Interim AVP AP appointment forthcoming. The Associate Dean Graduate and Undergraduate search is going on with a decision by end of March. Interim Provost & VP AA is in position for 18 months and the call for a search committee is forthcoming.

The EC approved the IRB and IACUC appointment recommendations agreed unanimously:

- i. Dr. John Stark appointed to the IRB for Non-scientific Concerns member Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2020
- ii. Mr. Grant Herndon reappointed to the IRB for Community Member from December 31, 2018 – December 30, 2021
- iii. Mr. Larry Saslaw reappointed to the IACUC for Community Member from Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2021
- iv. Dr. Andy Troup reappointed to the IACUC for Non-scientific Concerns member from Jan 1, 2019-December 31, 2021

The President visits the committee on January 29, February 12, and April 30th. She will return to the Senate on February 21 and April 4th 10:05 – 10:30 where she has been invited to provide her report and time for Q and A.

The EC discussed the on-boarding of new faculty and the need to speed-up their access to email, BB, and other services.

Issues with BB – Over the break, the system was changed to auto enroll and to auto create courses. There were behind-the-scenes discussion with F. Gorham. The issues have been

fixed temporarily. It's going to be an ongoing discussion about what to do going forward and improving the communication.

SOCI timeline – After the meeting, D. Schechter sent a message explaining that the reason the SOCIs were delayed was due to a staffing issue around Scantron processing. SOCI's are scheduled to be complete by early next week.

D. Boschini opened the floor to questions.

M. Rush asked for clarity on the deadlines for RTP. D. Schechter replied that the party line remains January 18 as the date that the files are due. Faculty has the opportunity to add to it until January 28. Since first year lecturers are only reviewed at the department level and dean level, if the dean wants to provide additional days for someone or the unit committee to review, they may. More importantly there needs to be the built-in rebuttal period so that faculty has a chance to work with the unit committee. If there isn't, then we get into spring break and end of semester and people want it to have happened sooner. Faculty was notified about the January 18 deadline in November, 2018. The lecturers only have to submit a teaching portfolio. There was early notification for the August deadline as well. We set the date when the RTP process has to be completed and the back-out the dates. We're afraid to change it. M. Rees noted that the calendar posted on the Faculty Affairs webpage shows the file deadline is January 28 is the last date someone else can put something into the file. D. Schechter replied that the 18th is the date we tell everybody because that file is still reviewable and the applicant can still add something. Some chairs may write or have discussion with the applicant to help improve the organization of the material, etc. Then January 28, the window closes so the Committee can begin looking at the file. D. Boschini said there are differences for further discussion and it's Time Certain for Resolutions.

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

a) Old Business

- i) RES 181903 – Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading D. Boschini asked the Senate to consider whether the resolution in the packet from AAC is ready for a vote. M. Danforth reported on behalf of the AAC that the committee supports the Second Reading. M. Rush has shared with the group (handout) some recommended new changes to AAC's resolution as shown in underline. Recommended changes that omit language are shown by strike-out. In summary, Instructor initiated drops are based on attendance instead of coursework. Rather than faculty initiating a drop for work not done, she recommended that students could be dropped within the Schedule Adjustment Period for not coming to class. For classes with waitlists, any students who miss class during the Scheduled Adjustment Period can be dropped.

Students who are on the wait list and attend class, and complete work assigned during the adjustment period, may be added in waitlist order. This is a change from currently policy whereby a student can be dropped for not attending the first day of class. M. Danforth suggested edits whereby header reads "Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Guidelines for Both Face to Face & Online Classes". J. Tarjan seconded the motion to approve the changes as proposed. A. Hegde clarified that those who are on the waitlist, must complete the work. To be consistent, if one is waitlisted, the criteria should be the same. M. Rush edited the first paragraph, third sentence "Students who are on the waitlist and attend class during the adjustment period may be added, by waitlist order." R. Gearhart department doesn't use waitlist. D. Boschini clarified that it's optional for participation. If one doesn't have waitlist they don't have to use this policy. A. Schmidt asked why drop a student, if there isn't anyone waiting. A. Hegde clarified that when the waitlist is full, if someone drops, no one else can add. In theory, the system updates to take the first person on the waitlist. If there isn't any waitlist, the minute someone drops, the instructor or anyone else can add. D. Boschini said it's already the case: any student drops for any reason, another student can add a class if there isn't a waitlist. M. Slaughter has seen where faculty turn in waitlists for classes that are not impacted. She said it's an important distinction. J. Millar sees that classes that have an instructor waitlist, are subjective as to who gets added. A. Hegde replied that the waitlist entry is discretionary. For example, where there is a student who is about to graduate. D. Boschini if an instructor is not using the policy constructively, or if there is a waitlist problem-there are ways that students could be either helped or hurt. We can't fix everything. M. Rush restated the changes: "We are continuing to use class attendance as measure of a student's seriousness to be in a course and not whether or not they attend and do the work." D. Boschini asked the group if there was other discussion. No discussion. The body was asked to vote on the changes. The majority voted in favor. One voted no. J. Tarjan suggested that students must be notified that the drop is pending within at least 24 hour notice. Changes made. All were in favor of the additional reference of notice. D. Boschini returned the group back to original resolution amended by the past two votes. K. Ziegler worried about interpretation. D. Boschini said that in the event that mistakes were made, there are ways to fix it. D. Boschini called the vote on the resolution as amended. All in favor. Approved. D. Boschini thanked M. Danforth, M. Rush, and J. Tarjan for offering amendments.

- ii) RES 181905– Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * Second Reading (deferred)

b) New Business

i) RES 181907 Academic Calendars (deferred)

9) Open Forum Items (Time Certain 11:15)

D. Boschini said that the RTP deadlines have caused different conversations in different schools about the meaning of the January 28 date. Treating the dates as if it means the same to everyone is creating tension. There is contract language that introduces this ten day moment before the drop dead deadline. Given the pressure of the SOCI's not having been delivered by the date that the files are due, it creates a problem for the faculty who don't have their files complete for the unit committees to review. Can the unit committees grant this grace period, and who has given them the green light to make the decision? It has not happened yet. While the deadline is early, the real problem is that the SOCI's haven't been returned. It's a different set of concerns. If we depend on students to process the SOCI's, there needs to be a better workflow and not put them on the front line of this crisis. If the official date can't be changed, perhaps we can communicate calmly and supportively to the people whose files are due and to their unit committee who are unclear about what their obligations are. D. Schecter responded that it's not unusual that the SOCI's are not available. Faculty knows that sometimes they will not have SOCI's until the first weeks into the semester, because they sometimes get delayed by faculty or chairs going into the end of the semester. First year faculty often do not include SOCI's. That has been how things have been. He is not blaming S. Miller. He had to return packets to two schools because they were not coming back the way they were supposed to. There were new people at the school level that didn't know the process. The January submission of the file has been fluid over the recent years. J. Tarjan found the logic unsatisfactory that this is the way things have been done. Further, the files should be open for such time that faculty have the opportunity to respond when students have complaints recorded on their SOCI's and give the chairs the opportunity to put a note into the file. He suggested that the EC make a referral to AAC for a consistent interpretation of the dates. D. Boschini saw that there is a different interpretation between schools on the two dates. When we were on the quarter system, it was several weeks into the new session before SOCI's were received and we may be mixing up our experience. M. Danforth offered solution and comment 1) if it's a student assistant issue, then there needs to be some kind of workload changes to have them come in January 2nd so SOCI's could be done in a timely manner, 2) she's never experienced where the SOCI's were not available for the faculty to review before the due date. It's important for the faculty writing their personal statement and for the unit committee. Not having a timely period for that process to occur is very concerning. C. Lam shared thoughts 1) first year tenure track faculty should get the SOCI's and have a reflection before they submit the file for review so that they are much better prepared for the second year review when it goes to a higher level. 2) He agrees with D. Boschini that department

allow more time, especially this year. 3) Is it possible to prioritize the SOCI process for faculty up for their review first? 4) if this is still going to be a problem, isolate the first year tenure track packets so it's easy to pick them up to process first. V. Harper supports Senator Lam's suggestions and acknowledges the tension around this issue. He will report back to Senate after conferring with D. Schecter on improving the process. F. Gorman spoke on behalf of the office that handles the technology that collect data and runs the paper SOCI. IT had student staff from beginning of semester, not just the beginning of classes. The SOCI are coming in so late and not in the proper way. He suggests the chairs do more of the quality control. Also, the campus is behind in converting to electronic SOCI. D. Boschini replied that there will be a date that we go electronic. She thanked the group for the information and asked D. Schecter if he would send something to the unit or committee level because faculty feels there isn't information getting to the decision level. D. Schecter replied that the SOCI Task Force had reviewed the process and will look at it again.

10) Adjournment

* Changes to the Handbook