

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, February 21, 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 (Alt), R. Gearhart, I. Kasselstrand, C. Lam, A. Lauer, Y. Lee, M. Martinez, J. Millar, M. Rees, M. Rush, L. Sakomoto (Alt.), A. Schmidt, M. Slaughter, B. Street, K. Szick (Alt.), J. Tarjan, D. Zhou, K. Ziegler-Lopez, V. Harper

Visitors: L. Zelezny, A. Maiorano, A. Jacobsen, J. Haney, K. Krishnan, F. Gorham, D. Jackson, V. Lakhani, C. Asher, B. Chen, K. Shaw, S. Bacon

1) Call to Order

D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) Approval of Minutes

M. Rees moved to modify page 5, 7 e. to clarify that a “consultation” occurred in FAC.

E. Correa moved to approve minutes as modified. M. Rees seconded. Approved.

3) Announcements and Information

- President Zelezny’s Report and Q&A (Time Certain) 10:05 – 10:20

The President provided updates on the Strategic Planning and Budget process, Tenure Density Trend and Student Faculty Ratio Trend Systemwide and for Bakersfield. (handouts) She thanked those on the Strategic Planning and Budget committee that participated in the first meeting. The committee looked at the summarized data from campus town halls, feedback website, forums, and other venues. An advisor from the Association of State Colleges and Universities was there to help the committee to stay on track. See *Workplan* for timeline and schedule. Representatives had received a draft listing of five themes:

1. Life-long success
2. Academic programs
3. Outreach/engagement public profile

4. Faculty and staff success
5. Innovation enhanced resources for facilities and finances

These themes, or goals, will be refined by the Strategic Budget and Planning team when they convene in March after reflection. There will be a Town Hall for the entire campus, Friday, March 8, 08:30 – 11:30 in the Icardo Center. It's a working meeting; join your colleagues to see how these goals have been refined. You will be working in teams on the metrics of these goals. We'll be using the framework of CSUB's Mission, Values and Vision. There will be a Budget Forum in April to discuss the Strategic Plan. If you care how we are going to be using resources in the next five years, attend the Strategic Plan Town Hall meeting, Friday March 8. President Zelezny then talked about the CSUB/Bakersfield College (BC) collaboration. She began talking with BC President Christian broadly about collaborating on higher education for students seeking that opportunity. BC's lease at its SW campus is about to expire. The idea is still in play. President Zelezny shared the agreements reached to date. The BC Board is considering CSUB's land where we already have BOT approval of land use for a university office center. [G. Bynum](#) (a CSUB alum) is the land holder and has the ability to lease those offices. A board member from BC brought forward a list of potential tenants in the office center that CSUB might consider. BC was on the list. Realize that CSUB is leasing its land to G. Bynum. In terms of authority, he decides on the tenants. However, he does consult CSUB. After talking with BC President Christian and other community members, it became an idea worth exploring. CSUB data shows that we have success with transfer students. There is a potential of 2,000 students at this site. They are all Associate Degree Transfer (ADT) students where we have articulated agreements, and there are no other agreements. The timeline is unknown. There is the hope if all the regulations from the fire marshal, environmental reports and other statewide authorities come through, we could move forward. There is interest in moving forward using temporary modulars in August. The Fire Marshal is a barrier. If all that happened, the MOU that Dr. Christian, the Chancellor of Kern Community

College and President Zelezny signed says simply that they agree to explore how the faculty at CSUB and BC might collaborate on research projects, GE, and topics unknown. They also agreed on the CSUB staff member in advising, already signed and located at BC. It's a location transfer, not a new assignment. The start date has not been established and there is time to explore the services that would have to be in place before the permanent building is constructed. The earliest would be 2021. There will be coordinating meetings with faculty, staff, and students. We are hopeful that this is a real win for the community and for student success. It would be unique in California to have a satellite community college on leased land from a CSU. E. Correa asked about the staff and/or advising positions that may be redundant, servicing two populations. Do we need more advisors, or less? President Zelezny said CSUB is in growth mode, however the answer isn't known. The hope is in the budget – enrollment growth money. Currently, the CSUB advisor at BC is sufficient. She expects there to be a conversation about the student/advisor ratio. The Interim Provost has been in conversation about the benefits of having a joint acceptance at this location. Once they are ADT certified, they would stay on this campus. That's the win for the student and CSUB. A. Hegde thanked the President for discussing the CSUB/BC collaboration. CSUB has several programs that collaborate with BC already. Part of the problem is getting courses at BC, just as CSUB has that issue. Perhaps BC can offer a section on CSUB's campus. Can CSUB students that start here, and if they couldn't get into a GE class here, will they be able to take it at BC? President Zelezny responded that none of those services have been decided yet, and those kind of questions are expected as part of the conversation. ADT classes will be offered. There are 62 classes that have been articulated. No upper division. Bring more questions to the Provost and the advising team. She relies on the faculty judgement and the advising expertise to help the process. M. Rush asked about the square footage and whether CSUB would be the only tenant. President Zelezny replied that the building is approximately 60,000 sq.ft. BC would be the first tenant. She asked that the tenants be involved

with education. If you want to know more, ask A. Maiorano, legal counsel. A. Maiorano said that CSUB does have contract authority over the major tenants of the building. President Zelezny said she has taken the suggestion from EC to have a university forum to answer questions. J. Millar asked for clarification on the role of students and impact to Student Affairs by the increase of 2,000 BC students. Specifically, serving their mental health when they are not a CSUB student. President Zelezny replied that those services are fee based and go to the fee committee. It hasn't been proposed yet. In the meantime, BC will provide for those services. J. Tarjan believes the delay of the Kern County Community College District BOT that these students would have been denied access to education due to cancelled classes. President Zelezny thinks it a real win the way it's worked out. V. Harper is leading the planning committee with five or six faculty members. M. Martinez expressed concerns over prerequisites for some of our GEs – why take American Government at CSUB when it can be taken at BC with no prerequisites? President Zelezny said that the planning committee can work that out. D. Boschini said that these items on the table are part of the conversation with the President, starting now. One of the main concerns heard across campus is SW campus was already offering a lot of courses and services for BC before they lost their lease. The conversation of BC is coming here has caught people's attention. Anyone who wasn't aware of the SW location now know more about the location, and that it's easier to come here than to go to BC. Lower Division GE faculty are particularly interested in knowing the details. President Zelezny distributed data (handout) on CSUB tenure density and student faculty ratio. There is trending up on tenure density. SFR is trending down. This is for another conversation. Save the date, May 3 Investiture and Taste of Bakersfield reception.

- CSU General Counsel welcome – President Zelezny introduced A. Maiorano. He is a legal expert and serves on our Cabinet. He is assigned to CSUB and he is on campus once a month for a couple of days. A. Maiorano said his career has been in public

service. He expressed that the tangible impact faculty has on students is great and that he's looking forward to serving.

- Trustee visits: L. Norton visits February 27 and R. Sabalius on April 23, 2019.
- CSU Dashboard Workshop – K. Krishnan (handout) This is an opportunity to explore the tool that helps toward making decisions and tracking factors that support student success. For example, the characteristics of our student population and the gaps that may exist by segment, etc. A recording of the session will be posted <https://www.csub.edu/livestream/ssd/> K. Krishnan offered to send questions to the Chancellor's Office on behalf of faculty. V. Harper said there are five school lunches for faculty to examine the data. It will be school-specific. Afterwards, he will work with the school deans to augment their current plan or develop a plan on retention. During start-up this fall, the Provost Office will have a day focused on retention and graduation rates. There will be speakers. That's where the data, school lunches, and plans interconnect.

- Elections and Appointments – A. Hegde

Academic Administrator Review Committee - Deans

BPA (3) Tenured Faculty –

- BJ Moore elected
- David Olson elected
- John Tarjan elected

NSME - (3) Tenured Faculty

- Charles Lam elected
- Karlo Lopez elected
- Debra Wilson elected

SS&E (3) Tenured Faculty

- Elaine Correa – CAFS elected
- Anne Duran – Psychology elected
- Yvonne Ortiz-Bush – Advanced Education elected

Academic Senate

- A&H – Second Call – Friday – Tuesday, February 22-26
- BPA – Jeremy Woods elected
- NSME– Kathy Szick elected
- SS&E– election– Wednesday, February 25-27

Joshua Miller – Kinesiology
Brian Street - Kinesiology
Mahmoud Suleiman – Teacher Education

4) Approval of Agenda

M. Rush moved to change to order New Business in front of Old Business. All in favor of changing the Agenda.

5) ASCSU Report

J. Tarjan reported that the Northridge Faculty Senate sent minutes to the CSU Senators and Senate Chairs on their resolution to the Chancellor related to the Executive Order (EO) 1000 and EO 1100. The points they made are 1) It would impact their ability to opt for some of the courses they think are important for student success within General Education (GE), 2) there isn't a pilot study to indicate that the changes would help our students. The GE Task Force report has been released. In the meantime, there was a memo that went out to the Presidents from Dr. Blanchard about the GE Task Force. There is some discussion about what that meant. The CO has spoken with the Executive Committee of ASCSU, and said that there is no EO forthcoming related to the Task Force report. Dr. Blanchard's memo seemed to indicate that there was an effort to go through shared governance and faculty recommendation. It's unclear whether the faculty recommendations are just a conceptual thought piece. However, if it were implemented, and the chair of the board, Trustee Eisen, indicated that there was a willingness to explore eliminating upper division GE by reducing 3 units upper level GE, and the American Institution requirement by taking an exam or double counting/combining that type of thing. The implication for CSUB is that we may have to consider if we want things like First Year Experience to continue, we'd have to make them university requirements rather than GE requirements. M. Danforth strongly recommends that faculty that have an accredited program should read the Task Force Report. D. Boschini has experience and she is concerned about the statement, "no double counting". By reducing the units, that would relieve some pressure but the Nursing program would have 16 units cut to meet the mandatory 180. There was question about the Lower Division GE Task Force after several campuses completely revised their GE programs, in the context of EO 1000 and EO 1110. Then the GE task force is asking for significant changes to what

has been done. The concern Senator Tarjan raised about whether there is an EO coming speaks to the CO's perception that the GE Task Force did the work. The Chancellor-at some future date-might come in to say, "shared governance, check – we did that". The GE Task Force did not represent a true Systemwide consultation. The concern is that the Task Force's work is re-framed as faculty involvement. J. Tarjan said the revised EO 1100 was flawed. He recommended that some faculty and administration make statements about the changes and impacts on campuses. The statement should say that the work wasn't done. CO said nothing is coming out. However, the BOT is very focused on graduation. M. Martinez said that the report discusses cross-cutting values. Its suggestion is to reduce the number of units for American History, American Institutions, etc. from six to three units. Emails went around the Political Science department and now they are on the radar of the state legislature. Cutting down on democratic institutional structure is not a good idea. The people who administer the college entrance exam correlated success to education in Computer Science and the US Constitution. He recommended that a unified statement come from the Senate. D. Boschini said that the Task Force Report is on the next EC agenda. When the report came out, there wasn't analysis with it. Now that individuals are reading it, there will be more concerns to be addressed.

6) Interim Provost Report

In interest of time, V. Harper offered to waive his report.

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) the EC heard from the Interim Provost on CSUB's response to the GE Initiative. He presented a diagram of the student flow and numbers of Potential-to-Graduate and Expected-to-Graduate and the things being done to get them graduated. There is a concern that the use of Independent Studies as a departments' solution puts a load on faculty. Some of the issues raised in the General Faculty Meeting were discussed, particularly low faculty morale. There is still interest in what "best practices" means in relationship to the strategic plan, especially the monetary component. Since there are more funds coming to the CSU, we need to

establish a five-year hiring plan. There is a request for more classroom teaching tips from TLC and GECCo. V. Harper said there is a new foci for TLC. There is room for improvement on communication between faculty and faculty, and faculty and administration.

- b) Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth)
- c) Academic Support & Student Services Committee (E. Correa)
- d) Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street)
- e) Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush)
- f) Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez)
- g) ASI Report (A. Schmidt)

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

a) New Business

i) RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change * First Reading

M. Rush introduced on behalf of FAC. The committee was charged to look at the award process so that the faculty awards committee can confer with the departments on nominees. It allows for back and forth conversation with departments to check the veracity of the information received for the award. D. Boschini said that it applies to the five faculty awards. The change is in the nomination process which applies to all. M. Rush said it gives the award committee direction to obtain documents from the department or head of a program conferred to the nominee. A. Jacobson informed the group that the Emeritus award already goes through the unit. The word change was made to make Emeritus and other faculty awards consistent across the board. J. Tarjan suggested a parallel process to the Honorary Doctorate Degree. D. Boschini said that the FAC would issue a request to the Faculty Honors and Award Committee to the chair; that would be the process. A. Hegde said the general understanding is that the endorsement has to come from the Chair. If someone is suggesting that the language specify that it come from the department chair, then there could be a chair deciding on his/her own without consulting the department. The “department” implies consultation and the memo

comes from the chair on behalf of the department. M. Slaughter requested that the language be specific so the interpretation is clear. M. Rees asked what if the nominee is the chair? M. Slaughter advocates for consultation. D. Boschini said M. Rush will take the ideas back to FAC and then prepare a Second Reading.

ii) RES 181910 University Council – Addition Library Member First Reading

M. Rush introduced on behalf of FAC. M. Rush moved to waive the First Reading based on the rationale. The additional member would be the Dean of the Library. The school deans are already members of the University Council. A. Jacobsen seconded waiving the First Reading. J. Tarjan suggested a friendly amendment to change the rationale to “This would improve consultation. This is supported by both the President and the Dean of the Library.” Approved unanimously.

b) Old Business

i) RES 181905– Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * Second Reading

M. Rush introduced on behalf of FAC. She moved to approve that the position report to the President. A. Jacobsen informed the group that this topic has had purposeful discussion for three years. The role had been taken out of the Provost’s Office. There would have to be a level that would be taking the faculty ombudsperson out of reporting to someone who the ombudsperson would be mediating with. D. Boschini thinks that the appointment could be made by the Provost-who would be closer to who would be a good mediator and upon the advice of the EC, and the reporting goes to the President. J. Tarjan in favor of the change to have the Provost make the appointment. This person still maintains duties to faculty, Universitywide. Operationally, the Provost is member of the EC, which makes it easier in the consultation process. A. Schmidt seconded. D. Boschini asked if all in favor of changing the recommended change from President to Provost for appointment purposes. Approved. Thank you to Senators Rush and Senator Millar.

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

Jacobsen concerned about the lack of calls for Research Council of the University (RCU) Grants and whether they will be offering them more frequently. D. Boschini asked V.

Harper to follow up. A. Hegde asked about the Diversity Grant. It's a separate call made by the RCU. The money that was available has shrunk. A. Jacobsen responded that the Diversity Grant was renamed to the Provost Development and IP. It's still being run. There are three pools of funding. RCU is university wide for labs and assigned time and creative activities. For some schools, the assigned time is more important. E. Correa reported that B. Chen came to the AS&SS meeting to hold a vote on the testing of software which would replace CSUB's homegrown program for online SOCI. The intent is to implement "Class Climate" software in spring. B. Chen said that he went to other CSUs and then IT found a solution. It does not replace paper SOCI. The advantage to the software is that if one logs into BB one can see real time response, and it is mobile friendly. IT did a pilot during winter session and a survey. IT is ready to go forward with it. D. Boschini said there is a problem with the real time response because faculty shouldn't see the students' response until the grades are awarded and closed. M. Danforth asked if the new tool was the equivalent of the individual responses. The summary responses aren't always useful. One can't pull responses to individual faculty members' evaluation in class. B. Chen responded that it will be exactly the same as a paper SOCI. A senator said that it's important that students fill out SOCI for the correct class. B. Chen will look into it. D. Boschini said that AS&SS has done a good job and that there are enough questions remaining that faculty need more time to discuss. IT has heard from a few people about what satisfies those individuals, and then went forward without broader discussion. The homegrown solution will be outgrown but we won't go forward without spending time on the proposed solution. A. Schmidt said that IRA applications have opened. C. Lam asked a question about the President's report. Between now and when the new students come in, will there be enough facilities such as parking, food, restrooms and other resources? President Zelezny said that it is separate to BC and will be accommodated by the G. Bynum project. The Environmental report has to show no impact before it can move forward. M. Slaughter is concerned about the BC transfer unit effect on CSUB tenure density. For example, our A1 offerings. BC offers 60 sections of A1. The Communications department doesn't have the faculty. We have Part Timers and BC is their first choice. We get the

people who want to augment their BC work here. That's how we staff the majority of sections. Every fall, CSUB's A1 classes are impacted – waitlist only. We lose FTEs because we don't have enough faculty to teach lower division GE. The solution is to get more faculty; she can see how we would lose more faculty to BC. President Zelezny expects with the enrollment growth money that there will be more classes, faculty hires, and support services. The amount of money will be known in June. K. Ziegler noted that since community colleges pay more for staff, advising, and faculty positions, CSUB risks losing higher quality employees to BC's campus on CSUB land.

10) Adjournment

* Changes to the Handbook