CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, December 5, 2019
Health Center Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.


Absent: J. Choi, A. Lauer

1. Call to Order
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes
   B. Frakes moved to approve November 21, 2019 Minutes. S. Gamboa seconded. Approved.

3. Announcements and Information
   • Response to First Reading Ethnic Studies – Open Forum December 10, 2:00 – 3:45
     Location: Health Center Conference Room  M. Danforth has agreed to compile
     the feedback to ASCSU. If one cannot attend, email M. Danforth directly. The
     meeting will be video conferenced to the Antelope Valley.
   • CSU Board of Trustees Special Committee to Consider the Selection of the
     Chancellor – Open Forum  Noon – 2:00 p.m. today
   • Handbook Error Log - No update
   • Elections and Appointments – Elected to the Search Committee for SSE Dean
     Michael Ault – Political Science
     Bre Evans-Santiago – Teacher Education
     Brian Street – Kinesiology
     Isabel Sumaya – Psychology
Nominations for termed Senate positions begin in January

- IT Updates: F. Gorham announced that the on-line SOCIs mistakenly went to “All” students instead of “Enrolled” students. Students who dropped the course received SOCIs in error. It has been fixed and the online SOCIs will go out again for the students to resubmit. V. Harper commended F. Gorham for bringing the issue to him very quickly. There were 484 course sections and 207 instructors affected. The integrity of SOCIs and effect on RTP is very important. A variety of options were explored. The best solution is to purge the data and then resend the SOCI. A message will be sent to encourage these sections to complete the surveys. F. Gorham has prepared separate messages to faculty, and students. There will be a campaign to get people to complete the surveys. They have done everything they can to mitigate the effect on lecturers and tenure track faculty. He also thanked the Executive Committee for working through the discussion the same day. There are meetings scheduled with the CFA, and ASI to explain the issue. We want to make sure that the RTP process is preserved and that this situation doesn’t happen again. V. Harper also thanked D. Schecter for his counsel. Questions and answers and comments followed:
  
  o Include a short note with the SOCIs for the RTP committees “This was one of the sections that asked the students to resubmit their opinion”.
  o Faculty can make a note in their file that specific sections were affected by the SOCI distribution situation.
  o Stop student’s online SOCI access as soon as faculty submits grades.
  o F. Gorham will check with PeopleSoft and the Registrar. There may be a policy that states when grades can be released.
  o The suggestion for future SOCIs distribution is to calendar it for week 12 instead of the end of semester. Release online SOCIs before Thanksgiving.
  o Giving students enough time to submit their opinion is the top priority.
  o Normally online SOCIs submission window is two weeks. Since face to face classroom SOCIs are done is one day, to ask students to submit the online SOCI within one week does not seem unreasonable. Another suggestion was to maintain a two week window because that’s what was offered.
  o To date, approximately 2000 student responses out of 16,000 have been received for the affected courses. It is a low percentage of participation. More participation is expected at the end. The number of students who would have to resubmit their SOCI is approximately 12%.

D. Boschini said there are issues whether the new window for response is one week or two weeks. A straw poll of the Senate should not be the decision. ASI has their meeting
tomorrow. B. Street suggested that the solution minimize the steps. A. Wan said that F. Gorham will get the student feedback tomorrow, yet the ASI Board can be represented at this meeting. He suggested to vote today. V. Harper accepted the recommendation and the outcome of the Senate’s vote for expediency. D. Schecter summarized the discussion: There are email drafts for faculty and students. The email to faculty to say, the student portal will close for student evaluations when grades are turned in. The email to students will say that when the instructors’ grades are submitted, the portal for student evaluation will close. Internally, IT will program that the portal will be closed when grades are turned in. D. Boschini reminded the body that the decision doesn’t have to be hurried. The pros and cons of giving students one week or two weeks was discussed. 50% of part-time faculty RTP are based on SOCI. If students aren’t aware of the window, it will hurt faculty members. D. Boschini asked if the Senate was ready to take a straw poll. We need to give feedback to the people who are writing letters to faculty and students. The options are: 1) SOCI’s can be submitted for one week from today, December 12. 2) The SOCI portal open potentially for two weeks - the SOCI portal would close when the instructor submitted grades. The majority voted for one week. D. Boschini reminded the members that it will create problems and be prepared for feedback that disagrees with today’s decision. D. Schecter offered verbal drafts to the group. The letter to faculty will state that there was an issue with online SOCI that has been corrected. After consultation with faculty and student leadership, the SOCI will be reissued with a deadline for students to submit by December 12. The letter to students will begin with an apology for the error. It has been fixed. After consultation with student and faculty leadership, you are requested to please resubmit your SOCI between now and December 12. D. Schecter thanked the Senate for their feedback to make it better.

4. Approval of Agenda
M. Suleiman moved to approve the agenda. J. Tarjan seconded. Approved.

5. ASCSU Report
J. Tarjan and J. Millar had nothing to report until after the Interim meetings December 12.

6. Interim Provost Report
V. Harper thanked the Senate for quick deliberation and feedback about online SOCI.

The Provost office has put aside funds dedicated to developing a faculty advising professional development program. He thanked faculty for bringing the need to his
attention. Twelve faculty members have expressed interest in serving on the committee that will be working on the faculty advising professional development program. V. Harper will be looking for leadership - a coordinator or special assistant to the faculty advising professional development program – in the spring.

It’s been a very good term. Accomplishments include investment of $200,000 into the academy through student success. Advising is working on retention plans within the schools. The Provost Office is in the process on bringing on 34 tenure-track faculty into the next cycle whereby 14 are expansion hires to improve our tenure track density. He thanked the Senate for their support.

D. Boschini opened the floor to questions. A. Hegde informed the group that several years ago, consultants were brought in to work with the professional advisors, and then there was an advising summit. Before spending money, look at how we’re doing advising, and what are the expected outcomes this time. V. Harper responded that when the EAB counselor came to campus, faculty participated in the conversation. Two surveys were produced: one for students, and one for faculty. The changes that took place were in professional advising – hired specifically to SP2, SP3, separate than faculty advising. Three of the four schools have SP3. BPA is hiring a SP3 as a coordinator. Professional advisors received a summary of all the changes that have occurred since the EAB visit. There are ten outcomes to move CSUB advising forward. For example, enhanced the role of the Advising Leadership Team (ALT) to make it more policy-making, and give all professional advisors access to the same software. Seven out of ten recommendations were implemented. He will share the report with the DCLC. There have been significant accomplishments in professional advising in the four years he’s been here. He’s seen that CSUB’s decentralized model is specialized and beneficial, such as with Nursing, Liberal Studies, etc. In BPA, most students who go through school go through the school’s advisors which is very different than A&H advisors. The decentralized structure has evolved to suit the purpose of each school. V. Harper has spent considerable time working with the Deans to make sure the advising structure is optimized and we achieve our GI 2025 goals. All six measures indicate improvement. The advisors have done a lot through block scheduling, etc. We are going to be very thoughtful with every dollar allocated to Academic Affairs and how it’s deployed. D. Boschini said that the information in the EAB report is new to the EC. She requested that the EAB report be emailed to the Senators. It was time certain for resolutions.

7. Committee and Report Requests (deferred)
   (Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)
a. Executive Committee (A. Hegde)
b. Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth)
c. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (J. Millar)
d. Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rees)
e. Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street)
f. Staff Report (L. Lara)
g. ASI Report (A. Wan)

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

a. Old Business

i. RES 192006 Master of Science in Kinesiology – *Second Reading*  M. Danforth summarized the discussion from the first reading. Upon the campus approvals, it goes to go to the Board of Trustees in January. The program would be available Fall 2020. J. Stark moved to approve. J. Woods seconded. The resolution was unanimously approved.

ii. RES 192007 Online and Hybrid Courses Handbook Changes – *Second Reading*  M. Danforth emailed a summary of first reading comments to the AAC for their input, since they could not meet last Thursday due to Thanksgiving. Most of the conversation was around 203.1. M. Danforth suggested a change to the last sentence of Handbook 203.1. The key is that online and hybrid courses be approved by department or program based on a documented rationale consistent with the Distributed Learning Policy. M. Danforth introduced a motion to approve the suggested change to the resolution. R. Gearhart seconded. D. Boschini opened the floor for edits.

B. Frakes asked whether online and hybrid courses are to be approved by the department chair. M. Danforth replied it depends on the course - whatever the normal process is within the department. The Computer and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science department uses a shared governance approach. They decide, based on the department’s discussion of documented rationale.

J. Tarjan stated that the Management and Marketing department has been asked to teach online although it does not have enough certified instructors to teach a masters program. If the resolution goes into effect next semester, should those online courses be cancelled? D. Boschini replied that he raised an issue for another time. Currently, there is a list of certified instructors and we are not engaging in policing policy at this point.

M. Rees’ understanding was that a Dean could allow someone to teach under special circumstances, if they haven’t been certified. For example, a part-time
person who may be brought in a semester cannot take the DLC training unless they are hired. It’s a Catch 22. The word “must” is at issue. D. Boschini acknowledged that the word “must” refers to an established policy that we’re having difficulty implementing. She directed the group to focus on the change in language to 203.1. 
M. Danforth made a friendly motion to add “not solely based on instructor preference”. D. Schecter shared that most of the calls his office received has to do with who is going to teach a course. He asked Senators if there was an appetite to include “and who gets to teach online”. Most departments come to decisions quickly about what can be taught online, but not who will teach. Not all departments have rotations or systems in place to address the teaching assignment. He can envision problems coming from that sentence where someone could say, the department says it’s okay so I can teach it. The real problem comes at the who, not the what. D. Boschini replied that it’s a legitimate issue. The proposed changes on the floor don’t make the situation he described any worse. D. Schecter asked upon the final approval of the resolution, if the department chairs would suggest who gets to teach online and why. D. Boschini asked for D. Schecter present his idea to DCLC upon the final approval by the President. D. Boschini asked for final comments on the changes to 203.1. None were given. All Senators were in favor of the addition. D. Schecter asked if the Senate would entertain a motion to delete the “before offering...be approved by DLC” and then add “the process of getting certified”. M. Danforth prefers “certified or receive an exception waiver”. The exception waiver would specify how long they could wait to get the training. It would be up to the DLC to provide training to the instructor. A. Hegde said there is always exception to policy. In terms of process of getting certified, it can go on indefinitely. He suggests leaving as is, and noting that there is exception to policy. It’s important to know who to get it from. M. Danforth suggested that the DLC work with the chairs. B. Frakes acknowledged the situation described by Senator Rees. There are situations where someone was certified elsewhere and they are asked to teach at CSUB two days before class begins. J. Stark recommended removing “Before offering...by the Distributed Learning Committee” from 203.1 since it no longer applies. It’s just about the courses, not about the teachers. A. Hegde is in favor, since it’s addressed later in the resolution under 303.3.1. The motion on the floor is to delete “Before offering...by the Distributed Learning Committee” from 203.1. All in favor of that change to the resolution.
The Senate looked at the proposed change to 303.3.1 of the resolution. D. Boschini said that the implementation of Handbook language that sometime can’t be met. It comes at the discretion of the responsible person’s interpretation of policy. J. Tarjan prefers to remove “by the Distributed Learning Committee” from 303.1.1. The outside entity, Quality Matters, certifies people, not the DLC. J. Stark referred to the situation brought up by A&H. Who is responsible for certifying instructors to teach online and hybrid courses? D. Boschini stated that the group is starting to raise questions about the function of DLC again. She announced a pause, since RES 192008 needed to be approved and the Open Forum (Time Certain) was near. A. Hegde moved to table discussion and begin addressing RES 192008. K. Szick seconded. The Senators approved to shift their attention to the calendar resolution and then to Open Forum.

iii. RES 192008 Academic Calendars Fall 2020/Spring 2021/Summer Session 2021—Second Reading - D. Boschini reminded the group that the decision on when Spring Break takes place is still being discussed in BPC. J. Tarjan asked that BPC consider aligning Spring Break to that of the public schools. He’s seen mass absences during the time. We’re losing too many students here because of that. M. Rees requested that the May 15 Reading Day be made clear that it’s a Saturday. B. Street moved to add “(Saturday)” to the calendar next to May 15 Reading Day. R. Gearhart seconded. The addition of “(Saturday)” was approved. D. Jackson referred to last meeting’s discussion about Registration date. Enrollment Management is considering moving Registration for new students. The historical Spring registration for Fall does not align with the mid-summer receipt of transcripts and other documents needed. It’s a problem for students attempting to enroll in classes and then changing their schedule, etc. There are a couple date change proposals being discussed. She asked if it was possible, upon approval of this resolution, to change the Registration date from April 19 to another. D. Boschini replied that there are elements of the calendar that can be changed (such as Advising Week) and some that can’t (such as Spring Break). V. Harper said the decision needs more consultation. J. Tarjan reminded the body that the President has parliamentary power to make adjustments. He suggested for those concerned to contact their chair and other faculty and then make changes. D. Boschini said the conversation about changes will go up the chain of command. She asked for those in favor of RES 192008 to voice their approval. No objection. Approved.

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

J. Millar informed the body that the Counseling Center is not taking any new scheduled appointments. Walk-in are being taken.
K. Szick commented that she is receiving a number of emails to train for Canvas. If the decision to migrate from Blackboard is still pending, why is there the persistence to attend instruction on Canvas? F. Gorham said the training comes from TLC and not from IT. The surveys are from IT.

J. Woods announced the Entrepreneurship Club is hosting a speaker panel this Friday, 2:30-4pm, in the Student Union Multi-Purpose Room. It’s a panel of five leaders from the local ag sector talking about job opportunities and pressing needs for entrepreneurial solutions to address the water needs of the ag industry (i.e., opportunities to help ag companies save on the cost of water, lowering the cost of food, making the environment healthier, and how the entrepreneur who helped all that happen makes money. Two of the ventures we’re tracking for our campus incubator for future commercialization potential recently won $30k CERC Chevron research grants each to pursue technologies related to this topic. We expect some investors and business leaders to be there, so it would be great to have campus leaders like yourselves there as well. Please come for as long or as short of a time as you can attend.

10. Adjournment
   D. Boschini adjourned the meeting at 11:30.